WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

May 1975 Vol. 18 No. 5 50¢

British students /115
Old and new in anti-communism /88
Historic defeat of German fascism /4
Democracy, ideology, creativity /80
Scientific socialism in Africa /105
World War II —figures /49

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

May 1975, Vol. 18, No. 5

Thirtieth anniversary of the defeat of German fascism

4 Great landmark in world history
G. Husak

15 How victory was forged
R. Arismendi

22 In battle for independence
I. Eskandari

29 Traditions of the Resistance live on
G. Willard

37 Liberation struggle on the upgrade
Kh. Muhyi al-Din

Facts and figures

41 Reality versus preconceptions
V. Dashichev, S. Sluch

49 World War II in figures

The Party

59 Awareness of historical responsibility
C.R. Rao

70 The Marxist-Leninist party of our time (International exchange of opinions – conclusion)

80 Democracy, ideology, creativity
J. Kossak

Theory

88 The old and new in anti-communism
H. Adamo

96 Some problems of the revolutionary movement
R. Iscaro

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

105 Scientific socialism in Africa
M. Ngouabi

Political panorama

115 Political changes in the British student movement
D. Cook

126 A 'miracle' propped up by bayonets
C. Braga

128 The dark night will end
H. Fazio

134 Fighting the crisis: the pressing task
K.P. Silva

The press

139 CMEA and raw materials prices
O. Behr

141 Book reviews

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is the North American edition of the monthly journal Problems of Peace and Socialism published in Prague.

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $5.00 a year, $9.00 for two years. Single copies 50 cents. Overseas: $8.50 a year.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Rumanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Subscriptions to these may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto.
M5V 1T4

Or, in USA from IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, 320 West Ohio St.,
Chicago, Ill. 60610

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published by PROGRESS BOOKS, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
M5V 1T4

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

Thirtieth anniversary of the defeat of German fascism

The defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism brought down reactionary regimes in many European and Asian countries and created a situation favorable to the working people's fight for socialism. As a result of successful revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, the socialist world system came into being, the general crisis of capitalism went deeper and the world revolutionary process gathered greater momentum. The peoples of the socialist community, led by their Communist and Workers' parties, scored tremendous successes in every economic, political and cultural field and moved their countries into the ranks of developed states, thereby demonstrating the inexhaustible potentialities of the new social system.

Victory over fascism provided favorable conditions for the progress of the working-class movement in capitalist countries and for the growth and consolidation of the Communist and Workers' parties, the most active fighters for the cause of the working class and other working people. The international communist movement became the most influential political force of our time.

The defeat of nazi Germany and militarist Japan made for a powerful upsurge of the national-liberation movement and for the collapse of the imperialist colonial system. After the war many Asian, African and Latin American countries, having delivered themselves from colonial slavery, confidently took the road of independent development.

Due to radical changes in the world balance of forces in favor of socialism, imperialism can no longer shape the destinies of peoples at will, nor can it today discount the power of the socialist countries, their active foreign policy and the international solidarity of the forces of peace and progress.

(From CC CPSU decision on the 30th Anniversary of the Soviet People's Victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45)

Great landmark in world history

Gustav Husak
General Secretary, CC,
CP of Czechoslovakia

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic celebrates Victory Day together with all the peoples of the world. It was in our capital, Prague, that the Soviet Army finished its great liberating mission in Europe.

The defeat of nazi Germany brought to a victorious conclusion the Czechoslovak people's six-year struggle for national liberation. Our people made their own distinct contribution to the great international struggle against fascist reaction and to the re-establishment of their national freedom and independence.

The victory over nazism was the joint victory of the international alliance of national-liberation, democratic and progressive forces forged in the course of the war and led by the working class and the Communist parties. Ranged against the fascist bloc led by nazi Germany and militarist Japan was the anti-Hitler coalition, which has gone down in history as a convincing example of successful cooperation in armed struggle of countries with different social systems against a common foe. Such cooperation became necessary and possible, because for many European countries the continued spread of the nazi aggression meant national disaster and placed in question their very existence. World civilization was imperilled.

After the collapse of the non-intervention policy, after Munich, the partition and occupation of Czechoslovakia, the attack on Poland, the defeat of France, the nazi invasion of the Balkans, the reverses in Northern Africa – after all this, even the Western ruling element realized, at long last, that the nazi aggression had created a strength pattern that could spell disaster for them too. They realized, also, that the only way to prevent that was to join their military efforts with those of the socialist Soviet Union, the chief target of nazi expansionism.

The armed aggression by the nazis, the most reactionary shock-force of international imperialism, against the world's first socialist state determined the nature and implications of the Second World War. And in this historic class confrontation the Soviet Union de-

monstrated to the world not only its might and military prowess, but also the inconquerable strength, viability and superiority of the socialist system.

In the 1930s, it will be recalled, bourgeois propaganda maintained that Soviet society would not survive a war. Even when the Great Patriotic War broke out prominent bourgeois politicians gave the Red Army no more than two months. Soviet society gave a fitting answer to these sorry prophets. The socialist system enabled the Soviet people, united around the Communist Party, to mobilize all their forces and to crush the enemy, who, when he attacked the USSR, had at his command the military and economic potential of nearly the whole of continental Europe.

The heroic Soviet people and their army bore the brunt of the Second World War. They made numberless sacrifices and played the decisive part in defeating nazism and liberating many countries, Czechoslovakia among them. And this despite the fact that nazi Germany had concentrated on the Soviet front the largest, best-trained and best-equipped part of its armed forces. Some 20 million Soviet people gave their lives in battle with this strong and insidious aggressor. The Soviet Army changed the course not only of the Great Patriotic War, but of the Second World War in general by covering itself with glory, first in the battle at Moscow and later at Stalingrad, followed by a series of victorious strategic operations culminating in the battle of Berlin and the unconditional surrender of nazi Germany.

The Second World War, when it became a just liberation war of the peoples against nazism, was, essentially, a struggle between revolution and counter-revolution, social progress and reaction, democracy and terroristic dictatorship, the forces of peace and the forces of aggression. It ended not only in the defeat of nazism and Japanese militarism; it weakened the entire capitalist world, ushering in a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism and its colonial system, and a profound crisis of bourgeois society as a whole.

On the other hand, the victory enhanced the international prestige of the Soviet Union and the influence of socialist ideas. It was followed by an unparalleled upsurge of the national-liberation, democratic and anti-imperialist movements. The realization that the war, the most devastating in the whole of history, was a result of the predatory policies of the most reactionary imperialist faction, tended to activize the masses, produced a new line-up of class forces, and in a number of countries led to the formation of broad anti-fascist, anti-imperialist popular fronts.

On the eve of the war – and this is still fresh in memory – many European bourgeois governments discredited themselves by their total inability to prevent their peoples from falling into fascist bon-

dage. A large part of the ruling bourgeoisie continued this treasonous, anti-national reactionary policy even during the war, acting in collusion with the nazi invaders. This applied in full measure to the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie, which in the 20 years of its rule had neither solved the vital problems of our people nor assured effective defense of their freedom and independence.

The Czechoslovak working people, and primarily the working class, drew important lessons from this train of tragic events. The decisive role of the socialist Soviet Union in the fight against nazism heightened the attractive power of socialism and helped the people appreciate the need for fundamental social change. The revolutionary policy of the national-liberation movement, of which the Communist Party was the main exponent, accorded with the people's firm determination not to allow a return to the old order and to provide guarantees against national catastrophe in the future. In the course of the anti-fascist struggle this revolutionary policy, aimed both at national and social liberation, came into irreconcilable contradiction with the bourgeois conception of the Resistance. The bourgeoisie wanted to deny the masses any part in shaping the future social relations and planned to re-establish the old prewar class structure.

But the results of government by the bourgeoisie, the Munich betrayal and capitulation, the partition of the Republic and the nazi occupation, made the Czechoslovak people, who both at home and abroad were courageously fighting for national freedom and independence, keenly vigilant. In both parts of the divided Republic, in the Czech lands and in Slovakia, the illegal Communist Party was the most resolute, active and consistent force of the Resistance. It creatively carried out, in the concrete conditions then obtaining, the political line of its leadership abroad headed by Klement Gottwald.

The national-liberation struggle, in which our Party's revolutionary policy prevailed, developed into the anti-fascist national and democratic revolution begun by the Slovak national rising. As a result, the Czechoslovak Republic was reconstituted on entirely new principles, and a start was made on the revolutionary reorganization of society. The national-democratic revolution continued on the territory gradually liberated by the Soviet Army and in the Prague rising of the Czech people. Its first stage culminated in the formation of people's democratic rule and its consolidation throughout Czechoslovakia. The rise of people's democracy was an important landmark in the history of our nations, our people and state.

The concluding stage of the Second World War saw Europe swept by an offensive of the revolutionary and democratic forces. Besides Czechoslovakia, governments with communist participation were formed in liberated Central and Southeast Europe, and also in France, Italy, Belgium and several other countries.

However, in Western Europe the reactionary imperialist forces were able to check the revolutionary offensive. In Central and Southeast Europe, where the national-liberation struggle merged with the liberating mission of the Soviet Army (and after the defeat of militarist Japan the same happened in some Asian countries), the revolutionary wave continued to rise. The deep-going social changes determined the transition from national-democratic to socialist revolution.

As was only to be expected, working-class policy, which fully accorded with the interests of the masses and was implemented by the Marxist-Leninist parties, came up against the adamant resistance of the reactionary forces which, with the support of international imperialism, attempted counter-revolutionary coups in Czechoslovakia and in the other European People's Democracies. But in all of them, as in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, these class confrontations ended with the capture of political power by the working class. This opened the road to socialism.

As a result of the Soviet Union's victory in the Second World War, the emergence of the People's Democracies, far-reaching changes in the political attitudes of the working class in capitalist countries, the crisis and collapse of the colonial system, the world balance of forces was rapidly changing in favor of socialism. World capitalism retaliated by a policy which destroyed the anti-Hitler coalition and aggravated relations between the two systems.

The political battles within the People's Democracies were a component part of the international class struggle. The reactionaries found support in the anti-Soviet and anti-communist policies of world imperialism. Those difficult early postwar years showed how tremendously important the very existence of the Soviet Union was for the young People's Democracies. From the very outset it was a reliable bulwark against all the plans and designs of the reactionary imperialist forces. Its consistent internationalism found expression also in the disinterested economic assistance it gave our countries, though it had its own pressing problem of rebuilding the war-ravaged economy. Let me cite one example: the supply of hundreds of thousands of tons of grain to Czechoslovakia, which helped us cope with the consequences of the catastrophic 1947 drought and prevented the reactionaries from exploiting the situation.

The victory of socialist revolution in Central and Southeast Europe completed the formation of the socialist world system. This produced a new, qualitative change in the world alignment of class forces in favor of socialism. The community of socialist states became a potent international force, a powerful propellent of world history.

The victory over fascism created favorable conditions for pro-

found democratic and socialist transformations in Czechoslovakia. It released the immense creative energies of the working people, now inspired by the knowledge that socialism had saved the world from barbarity and the Czechoslovak peoples from annihilation.

Led by the Communist Party, the working class was at the head of the national-liberation struggle and of the effort to rebuild the country, exhausted and largely devastated by six years of occupation. In firm alliance with the laboring peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia, and overcoming the resistance of the class enemy, the working class set out to build the new Czechoslovakia. Its resoulute defense of the revolutionary gains in February 1948 paved the way for our socialist development and united the working people in a concerted effort to build the new society according to the Communist Party's general line which creatively applied Lenin's plan of socialist construction.

Czechoslovakia, which after liberation by the Soviet Army could take the socialist path, was a relatively developed industrial country with a strong working class, a large intelligentsia and rich democratic and cultural traditions. Our experience has proved that, in these conditions too, socialism convincingly demonstrates its irrefutable superiority over capitalism. We have successfully solved the major national, political and socio-economic problems that capitalism could not solve.

Socialism changed the class principles underlying our national life. It made the working class and the working people masters of the country. It did away with the economic anarchy of capitalism and brought millions into the purposeful and planned work of building the new life. Public ownership of the means of production and economic planning made for unparalleled expansion of the productive forces.

Czechoslovakia now has a much bigger industrial base, its industrial output is more than nine times the prewar figure, and its growth rate is higher than in most developed capitalist countries.

The socialist repatterning of agriculture enabled us to organize large-scale production on the cooperative and state farms by using new technology and more efficient farming methods. Labor productivity in agriculture is four times as high as it was in the bourgeois republic. We are successfully working towards our goal of self-sufficiency in basic foods.

One of the outstanding achievements of socialism is doubtlessly its solution of the national question, notably as it affects relations between the Czechs and the Slovaks. Application of the Leninist principles of a federative state structure has provided optimal conditions for the development of the creative energies and abilities of the two fraternal nations and of all nationality groups within a single state. With the aid of the fraternal Czech working class, the Slovak people

built up their industrial-agrarian economy. Slovakia now produces 33 times as much as in 1937 and its share in Czechoslovakia's industrial output has increased from less than eight to more than 25 per cent and continues to grow.

Economic planning, socialist industrialization, rebuilding of our towns and villages, cultural development, have combined to eliminate, within the life of a single generation, the age-old regional differences. Poverty, hunger and unemployment have been banished for all time.

Still another indicator of socialist Czechoslovakia's progress is the living standard of its people. Per capita consumption has increased more than threefold, with a more impressive increase in social consumption, which covers nearly a third of the people's requirements and is higher than in any capitalist country. This applies to free medical care, free education, sick benefits, old-age pensions, etc. Expenditure on these and other social-service items is nearly ten times the 1937 figure. The number of doctors per thousand of the population has increased threefold.

The unparalleled growth of culture and education is a clear indication of the growth of the living standard. The working class, the working people, have lovingly selected and preserved all that was valuable in the rich cultural heritage of the preceding generations. And access to all cultural values is open to every citizen. The Party and the state attach great significance to the growth of culture and art, to deepening their socialist content. The socialist system of education and culture reposes on the achievements of science and technology which, when combined with the advantages of socialism, serve the interests of the working people, enhance their cultural level, and help overcome the distinctions between mental and physical labor. The enrolment in secondary schools is three times as high and university-level establishments are finished by more than five times as many young people as before the war. We have extensive modern scientific research facilities. Socialist ideas and our socialist reality have taken hold in the consciousness of the people. The working-class outlook, the Marxist-Leninist ideology, are striking ever deeper root in the thinking and behavior of Czechoslovak working people.

Comparing the results of socialist construction with developments in the capitalist part of the world, one should not, of course, confine oneself to just the more rapid rate of economic growth and the material and cultural uplift. All the changes wrought by socialism in our country have their own specific criteria, higher and more exacting from the historical standpoint: the moulding of new relations among people, establishment of a new, socialist way of life, and cultivation of the socialist personality.

The revolutionary transformations performed under the leadership

of the Communist Party have created a new society, rallied around the working class and devoid of class antagonisms. The working class has grown numerically, has unfolded its creative capacity and raised its cultural and technical standard to unprecedented heights. A new class closely linked with the working class – the cooperative farmers – has come into being. The finest members of the intelligentsia loyal to progressive traditions and socialist ideals ranged themselves with the working class and helped raise a large new people's intelligentsia from among the laboring masses.

The democratism of the working class and popular masses is expanding. The development of socialist relations of production has cemented the moral and political unity of our society, facilitates the gradual convergence of classes and social groups, and assures active participation of the people in the management of social processes unthinkable under capitalism.

The 30 years of the new Czechoslovakia, whose results we are now summing up with legitimate pride, have not been easy ones. The biggest social reconstruction experienced in our history naturally involved quest, difficulties, temporary setbacks, subjective mistakes exploited by the class adversary, and costly lessons. But after every setback and miscalculation, learning from mistakes, the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party continued the struggle for their revolutionary aims with still greater energy.

We have laid the foundations of socialism and are successfully implementing the 14th Party Congress line of building developed socialist society. In this we have the support of the people. We can safely say that the values which socialism introduced into our reality in the life-span of one generation are in all respects superior to everything achieved under capitalism in several centuries. Socialism has created conditions for free and all-round activity by every citizen, for the evolution of the socialist personality, the flowering of the creative faculties, moral strength and culture of every man, woman and child.

The advantages of the socialist way of life in Czechoslovakia and the fraternal countries are particularly striking against the background of the economic turmoil and political and moral instability in the capitalist countries, and their obvious inability to resolve the present crucial social problems. Socialism, on the other hand, is making good headway, proving by each advance that it is the society of the future.

Our socialist development has reaffirmed the fact that the leading role of the Communist Party is the main condition for the successful accomplishment of the complicated and far-reaching revolutionary objectives. We have learned from experience that only a united, close-knit party loyal to Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian inter-

nationalism, and guided by Leninist norms within its own ranks and in all its activity, a party closely linked with the people and also with the world Communist and working-class movement, is able to ensure success in the revolutionary reconstruction of society.

Under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, the working class, society's determining force, is introducing a whole range of radical changes into the life of Czechoslovakia and thereby performing its historical mission of building socialism. In the course of this historical process it has displayed sterling revolutionary qualities in the struggle against the enemy and in its creative and constructive labor. Not only is it the producer of all material values, but also the ruler and master of its country, and the chief guarantor of socialist power and the revolutionary gains.

The revolutionism, organization and political consciousness of the working class and its place in socialist production and social relations objectively condition the continuous growth of its leading role in society. By following the guidelines of its 14th Congress, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia assures the further growth of the leading role of the working class, its rising educational standard, political and class consciousness, and its weight as the main driving force in the struggle for the country's all-round development, for the socialist way of life.

From the very beginning of the revolutionary process, the broad mass of working people has been closely rallied around the working class. The alliance of the working class, cooperative peasants and intelligentsia has become the class basis of our society, the basis of the National Front, the political association of working people in town and country. Like the other socialist countries, Czechoslovakia has realized Lenin's idea that socialism is the cause of the popular masses themselves. The facts have proved that the more fully the working people accept socialism as their own vital cause, as the result of their collective efforts in labor and of their collective intelligence, the more energy and ability they devote to the implementation of the Party's policy.

The democracy of the socialist system in Czechoslovakia is characterized by the mounting political activity of workers and other working people, women and the youth, the diverse forms of their participation in running the state and the economy, growth of the innovation movement and the initiative of our people, extensive participation of citizens in implementing the election programs of the National Committees and in the work of public organizations, and the initiative of groups and individuals discussing and resolving problems related to the socialist way of life.

Czechoslovakia's foreign-policy orientation on close alliance with

the Soviet Union embodies the historical lesson our people has drawn from the debacle of the bourgeois republic. The vital significance of this alliance for our people was revealed during the Second World War, the years of building the foundations of socialism, when the imperialist powers imposed the cold war and applied discrimination, economic embargo, political pressure and blackmail, and also in the subsequent years of socialist construction. The present significance of this alliance for the consolidation, development and defense of socialism in Czechoslovakia is also obvious.

As reaffirmed by the 14th Congress of the CPC, the relations of fraternal cooperation, friendship and close alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are a dependable basis of the foreign-policy line of our Party and state. We do not spare efforts for the further all-round development of this fraternal cooperation in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, cementing the unity and increasing the might of the entire socialist community, and deepening the lasting friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union, our liberator and most faithful friend.

The results of the Second World War and the subsequent 30 years, marked by unprecedented, far-reaching and profound changes throughout the world, in Europe, in various countries and in our own Czechoslovakia, are a great victory for the forces of socialism, democracy, social progress and peace. Also, they are instructive historical lessons for the nations and peoples of all countries, for present and future generations.

The political map of the world has changed completely in these 30 years. The present situation is high-lighted by the advancement of socialism, the upsurge of the powerful international revolutionary working-class movement, the sweep of national-liberation revolutions, the emergence of many peoples on the road of social progress, political and economic independence, effective struggle for peace.

The profound social and political changes of the postwar period are an embodiment of the determining objective laws of the present epoch, of which revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism is the main content. The class battles in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America represent different phases of this irrepressible process.

The socialist world system, the greatest gain and bastion of the world Communist and working-class movement, is a mighty moral, ideological, political and material force promoting revolutionary development, and the decisive factor in the struggle for peace and social progress.

The socialist world system leans on the tremendous political, economic and defensive potential of the Soviet Union, a mighty

modern socialist power with unbounded prestige and authority throughout the world.

The greatest credit for the fact that Europe celebrates the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism in a setting of peace and that there are realistic pre-conditions for further positive changes in international relations, goes unquestionably to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Peace Program of the 24th CPSU Congress, which the Soviet Union is putting into effect through its dynamic policy with the complete and active support of other countries of the socialist community, has opened up unprecedented opportunities for safeguarding security and peace, particularly in Europe.

But despite this favorable situation for mankind, we should not take lightly the many attempts of the reactionary bourgeoisie to distort the facts of history, the aims and the course of the Second World War, and to depreciate the liberative role of the Soviet Union and the anti-fascist Resistance led by Communist parties.

As was to be expected, bourgeois propaganda has become more strident on the eve of the 30th anniversary of fascism's defeat. In the FRG, for example, the processing of public opinion also involves a campaign alleging persecution of Germans before Munich and after the end of the war. In substance, of course, this is meant to divert attention from the nazi atrocities, blunt vigilance towards neo-fascism, conceal the crimes of the nazis, shift the responsibility for them solely on to Hitler and the several condemned war criminals. It is intended to place in question the achievements of socialism's peace offensive, and to discredit the socialist community, the world Communist movement and their advanced and supremely humane ideology. This is why it is so important that the historical truth about the Second World War, its consequences and lessons, should be spread far and wide in order to isolate ideologically and politically the adversaries of international détente, and to expand the cooperation of nations.

Consolidation of peace and continued détente depend in decisive measure on the strength and unity of the socialist community, the activeness of the progressive and peace-loving forces the world over. The people of socialist Czechoslovakia contribute to this mainly by assuring successful growth of socialism in their country. For us this is the main task and internationalist duty. The growth of our socialist economy and the general prosperity of our land enable us to participate more and more actively in the peace offensive of the socialist countries.

The foundation for the unity of world socialism, inspiring mankind and opening up the optimistic perspective of peaceful life, is laid by the coordinated actions of the fraternal socialist countries and their

Communist parties. The preconditions for this are rooted in their common Marxist-Leninist ideology, the identity of class interests and the same aims of building socialism and communism, the Leninist norms of relations, and the common objective laws of communist construction tested through the experience of the Soviet Union and, in the past 30 years, also the experience of other socialist countries. Joint defense of socialism is also important, because the more reactionary imperialist forces have not reconciled themselves to the loss of their positions and are eager to reverse the situation at any price. Last but not least, we are joined by common struggle against opportunists and revisionists of all kinds, who are objectively playing into the hands of anti-socialist and reactionary forces.

Czechoslovakia's experience in 1968 and 1969, summed up in the document, 'Lessons of the Crisis Development in the Party and Society After the 13th Congress of the CPC,' has shown beyond a doubt that ignoring the universal objective laws of socialist construction, tolerance of opportunism, and departures from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism create an immediate threat to socialism. The fact that the fate of socialism in one country is not a matter of indifference to the other socialist allies and that defense of socialism is an expression of internationalist assistance was reaffirmed as the danger of counter-revolution grew in Czechoslovakia and socialism was in jeopardy. This certainly strengthened the positions of world socialism.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and our Party, mindful of the finest internationalist traditions, coordinate their activity with that of the other countries of the socialist community and their parties. Mutual consultations, meetings and conferences help our international political efforts and deepen the all-round cooperation of the socialist countries and fraternal parties.

The further successful development of our community, as we see it, hinges on the implementation of the jointly elaborated Comprehensive Program for Socialist Economic Integration, the highest stage of mutual economic relations. This cooperation enables each of our countries to make the best use of its economic potential, multiplies our strength, and meets the interests of all participants.

Socialism is becoming more mature, more experienced, more powerful. It is inspiring confidence and optimism in all people everywhere. This process was very aptly described by L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, at the 24th Congress of the CPSU: 'The socialist world is all in motion, and is perfecting itself continuously.'

We are proud that Czechoslovakia is an indivisible part of the

socialist world system. Our country, whose peoples had for centuries struggled for national survival and statehood, a country whose borders and fate had depended on the whims of the great capitalist powers, is now guaranteed its security, tranquil constructive labor, free national development and economic prosperity, and occupies its due place as an equal member of the community of fraternal socialist peoples. Czechoslovakia marches shoulder to shoulder with them in the front ranks of the peace forces and pioneers of social progress.

Cherishing the historic victory over fascism 30 years ago, we in Czechoslovakia will to the best of our ability and resources continue to contribute to the strengthening and prosperity of world socialism.

The orientation on lasting friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the building of a developed socialist society augments the strength of our state, heightens the economic, cultural and political level of our people, and assures Czechoslovakia a strong international position. The prestige of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the eyes of all peace-loving and progressive forces is rising steadily as a result of the successful socialist construction in our country, its policy of peace, its good political and commercial contacts with many other countries.

Our policy, set by the 14th Party Congress, is putting into effect the bequests of the victorious anti-fascist national-liberation struggle, consolidating and developing the results of the victory over fascism in the interests of the further advancement of socialist Czechoslovakia, socialism, and world peace.

How victory was forged

Rodney Arismendi
First Secretary,
CC CP Uruguay

Herculean exploits

Berlin has fallen! The news swept the globe like wildfire, sparking joy and jubilation. The red banner fluttering over the Reichstag symbolized a great event in world history, with its fundamental lessons.

It was still several days to the de jure, and even de facto, end of the war, but the peoples were already celebrating victory. On May 2, 1945, Uruguayans came out into the streets. Workers left their factories to join the endless columns of demonstrators converging on

downtown Montevideo. The whole people enthusiastically acclaimed the victors over nazism, firstly and especially warmly the Soviet Union and its soldiers, the internationalist liberation mission of the Soviet Army reared by the Party of Lenin. Our people are politically alert, the working class is organized, the mass struggle is rich in diversity of forms, but never had there been a demonstration on such a scale. Whence such a profound affinity of feelings? Wherefore such great political and emotional fervor?

During the war Uruguayans, like all those around the world who had been on the side of the fighters against fascism, felt that the fate of mankind was perhaps being determined for centuries ahead. People saw that the decisive role in the titanic confrontation of nations and peoples, involving millions of soldiers and vast quantities of arms, belonged to the first and only socialist state, born out of the victorious proletarian revolution of 1917, which ushered in a new era in history. Hitler's armies, after conquering almost all Europe and gaining control of its resources and industries, were being decimated in the battles of unprecedented scope raging on the scorched earth of the USSR. And that obvious fact reduced to so much paper rubbish the slanderous epistles of enemies about the Soviet Union, as the gloomy walls of falsehood erected in the capitalist world by bourgeois and Social-Democratic propaganda between socialism and the consciousness of the working class and the peoples crumbled to the ground.

Defeats and victories merged in a tragic symphony of heroism. The exploits of hero-cities. The bravery of soldiers and guerrillas in the face of the enemy. Selfless devotion on battlefield and in factory. Old people, women and children working. How much can the human heart, so sensitive and so enduring, stand, how many obstacles can it overcome when close to it lies a little red Party card with the image of Lenin?

This was not an Iliad, though one could have been written, not lone heroes, but the exploit of a people.

The last war was on a world-historic and political scale which sets it apart from all previous major wars. The main force in it was the proletariat holding power in the first socialist state. That is what underscored and elevated the overall democratic character of the struggle against nazism and fascism, making it liberative and revolutionary in content, just as by its participation in the democratic and anti-imperialist revolution the proletariat, discarding all shades of sectarianism, makes its characteristic imprint on it.

In defending their country and the gains of the October Revolution the peoples of the Soviet Union were delivering mankind from the threat of world domination by fascism, which, in the words of the Seventh Comintern Congress, represented an open terrorist dictator-

ship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital. The danger emanated from Germany and a number of other countries. Imperialism, which had fostered fascism, dreamed, after first using it as a watchdog in its struggle against revolutionary movements in Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland and Germany, of directing it against the young socialist state. Its role as the strike force of international imperialism became apparent during the heroic struggle in Spain, from its annexations and conquests, and the Munich deal on the eve of the world holocaust.

German imperialism and its allies set themselves the goal of defeating France and Great Britain, subordinating the whole of Europe and then establishing their undivided rule over the planet. They are known to have drawn up plans for occupying South America and for a final showdown with the United States.

Against the mad utopias and horrors of the '1000-year nazi Reich' stood the great Soviet Union. This was a powerful stimulus for the anti-fascist resistance of the working class, Communists and other patriots of occupied Europe, as well as of the peoples of the whole world, who from it derived confidence in victory.

The flames of the battles in the East illuminated the road to unity for all forces in the world fighting against nazism: the working class and Communist parties, the fighters for national independence and democracy, the champions of peace and human rights and, through or together with them, the governments of countries threatened by aggression or at war with the bloc of fascist states. The gravity of the situation drove even imperialist governments to realize that their efforts to survive coincided with the interests of the Soviet Union, the international proletariat, democrats, opponents of imperialism and anti-fascists all over the world. Thus was formed the great anti-Hitler coalition of such vast political and military import.

By one of the ironies of history the capitalists of Britain, the United States and other countries who had armed Hitler against victorious socialism were confronted with the fact that their national independence and very existence depended on the heroism and will to fight and win of the socialist state forged by the genius of Lenin, on the material and moral values created by socialism. Thus, that total battle – political, military, economic, scientific, technological and ideological – spelled the doom of evil imperialist hopes of turning history back to pre-1917 times.

World history took a tremendous step forward. Despite all the vicissitudes of the struggle, the world is to this day riding the crest of the tremendous revolutionary wave that rose at that time.

Not only did the gains of October not perish, as the imperialists and fascists had hoped, but socialism was no longer confined to one

country and became a world system. People's democratic states which later took the road of socialism were founded in Central and Eastern Europe. The defeat of Japanese militariam in Manchuria contributed to the success of the Chinese revolution and the victories in Korea and Vietnam. Democracy made big strides in Western Europe, notably in France and Italy, where the Communist parties quickly gained in strength, rallying millions to their cause. New independent states appeared in Asia and Africa. Many of them have opted for the road of progressive, democratic, non-capitalist development and set themselves socialist objectives. Latin America entered a new stage in its history, the struggle for its 'second independence,' and with the victory of the Cuban revolution socialism set foot on our continent.

The crisis of the capitalist system that began after the 1917 October Revolution has become deeper and is entering new phases, while socialism is developing, the actions of the international working class are becoming more mature, the struggle is growing more acute in colonial and dependent countries, and internal contradictions are demolishing the decadent bourgeois society. And today, 30 years after the victory over nazism, the continuing accumulation of qualitative change pushes capitalism towards new crises.

In these 30 years the Soviet Union and other socialist countries restored their economies, built developed socialism and communism, and self-critically exposed and overcame negative features that cropped up during the triumphant advance towards their goal. In foreign policy the Soviet Union and other socialist countries defeated the cold war, and frustrate imperialist provocations, aggression, and the threat of nuclear war against socialism. The war in Korea, the epic of the Vietnamese and other peoples of Indochina, the aggression against Cuba, the provocations against the GDR – all these are indications that imperialism has not given up its attempts to halt the march of history.

The latter is also the purpose of a ceaseless anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign on the ideological, political and economic front in anticipation of unleashing (should the opportunity present itself) a war against the Soviet Union, the historical center and prime force of socialism, mainstay of the international working class and the peoples' national-liberation and social struggle.

However, a glance at the political map will show that history is following its course despite bitter struggles and the far from idyllic reality.

The imperialists have been unable to unleash a nuclear war against socialism. Today they are forced to discuss the Peace Program formulated by the 24th Congress of the CPSU. And although it would be

naive to imagine that imperialism has abandoned its bellicose intentions against socialism, the world balance of forces has changed most radically and decisively. In spite of individual defeats, some of them tragic and painful, such as in Chile, in the years remaining till the end of the century the world will be embarking on the realization of the cherished historical tasks of our time: building the edifice of developed socialism and communism, maximum use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and the struggle for the victory of socialist revolutions in other countries; final liquidation of imperialism's colonial system; establishment of advanced democratic regimes in many capitalist countries, defense of world peace and the imposing of peaceful coexistence on imperialism, which must be denied the possibility of conducting a policy of local wars and export of counter-revolution. These objectives are the key to the main tendencies of contemporary history, and their close interconnection is increasingly apparent.

Imperialism is incapable of regaining its lost historical initiative: thus states the Document of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in 1969 in Moscow, the capital of socialism, which Hitler failed to capture.

The sources

The world was at the threshold of the gravest catastrophe – the 'thousand-year Reich' dreamed up by Goebbels and Rosenberg. The world was saved. By no miracle. And least of all because of 'general winter,' so loudly acclaimed by some bourgeois historians. Nor by divine providence. The world owes its salvation to the national heroism of the peoples of the USSR, in the first place the Russian people, who have displayed their mettle in so many historical accomplishments in the past. Heroism can move mountains, and machines are dead without it. But, of course, heroism alone is not enough to win a war. The answer to the question how the world was saved can be given in socio-political and ideological terms.

Before the October Socialist Revolution, Russia was a colossus with feet of clay. The Soviet Union won the war against fascism because of the superiority of socialism over capitalism. Within an incredibly short period of time socialism was able to resolve the dual task of expanding the economy and forging the political, moral and ideological unity of millions. The Soviet Union managed to solve the nationalities question, involve all the peoples formerly oppressed by tsarist imperialism in socialist construction, and preserve their national identity. And victory was also possible because the great socialist revolution had bred revolutionary enthusiasm and solidarity among the most aware and active detachments of the international

working class, the peoples fighting imperialism, the finest representatives of the intelligentsia.

Progressive humanity was confident that the Soviet Union would win.

The historical roots of the defeat of fascism by the forces of socialism and democracy reach back to the victory of the October Revolution: it gave the world's proletariat a socialist fatherland, an example and support to the colonial and dependent peoples, and basic guidelines in the struggle to all progressive forces.

The socialist revolution and socialist construction could be carried out only under the leadership of the Communist Party founded and fostered by Lenin and led by him in person up to 1924.

The victory in October and transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war provided a practical answer to the issue of the ways of development of the international working-class movement, which had been the subject of an acute controversy. One current, the Marxist-Leninist, Bolshevik, led to the winning of power, to the rupture of the weakest link in the imperialist chain, and ushered in a new historical epoch. The other trend – various forms of Social-Democracy which dominated the Second International – led into the mire of betrayal, along the fatal road of revisionism and reformism. It was that trend which in the First World War had, in the words of Rosa Luxemburg, turned the Second International into a political corpse.

The Bolshevik line was in tune with Lenin's view of socialist revolution as a confluence of all revolutionary currents. The opportunist line helped salvage capitalism, led to underestimation of the awakening colonial and dependent peoples, and ultimately cleared the way for fascism. Its adherents became the ideological suppliers of anti-Sovietism.

With the defeat of European revolutions, history confronted the Bolshevisk Party with the task, foreseen by Lenin, of building socialism in one country. Revolutionary practice confirmed how right he was when, in his article 'Our Revolution (Apropos of N. Sukhanov's Notes),' he gave his answer to claims that the country lacked the possibilities for building socialism.

At the dawn of Soviet power a complex of dialectically interlinked tasks was formulated, and their solution determined the future victory in the war against fascism.

In the forefront of these tasks was ensuring the defense capacity of the first land of socialism and intensive economic development, pursued under constant threat of imperialist aggression. The building of socialism was a truly dramatic race against time.

The steadily growing might of the land of socialism enabled it to uphold world peace on the basis of the peaceful coexistence theory

and provide full support for colonial and dependent peoples in their liberation struggles, for which Lenin had called at the Second Congress of the Comintern. Life demanded the rejection of old Social-Democratic dogmas and an understanding of the dialectical link that connects the contradictions between the colonial peoples and imperialism with the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between capitalism and socialism, the fundamental antagonism of the epoch. Today these contradictions cut across not only the political map of the world, but the society of every capitalist country.

During that period the main thing within the international working-class movement was to defend and develop Marxism (now Marxism-Leninism), form the new, Communist International and forge the new type of party as an ideological vanguard of the proletariat and a real political force in the respective countries, a party capable of conducting revolutionary, social and political struggle in all conditions. It was necessary to rear cadres, the core of the new type of party, people who would be up to the mark in all trials and ordeals, capable of repulsing hostile invasion and at the same time possessing creative acumen in the search for ways of bringing the socialist revolution nearer, in the search after forms of 'the *approach* to the proletarian revolution,' as Lenin insisted in his book '"Left"-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder' and as he declared at the Third Comintern Congress.

Lenin's ideas were forcefully reaffirmed at the Seventh Comintern Congress, where the question of perfecting revolutionary strategy and tactics was debated. The main speaker was Georgi Dimitrov, hero of the Leipzig trial, one of those leaders forged in the Bolshevik image.

Nazism and fascism were able to seize power in Germany and other countries mainly, as we know only too well, because of the split in the working class; following the Seventh Comintern Congress, the cementing of proletarian and democratic forces meant that a powerful barrier had been erected in the way of fascism.

Looking back at that highly dramatic and eventful segment of history from the perspective of the century, it can readily be observed that the victory over fascism was shaped by the Soviet five-year plans, the growth of Communist parties, the spread of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the struggle in Asia, Spain and other areas, resolutely supported by the Soviet Union. The Communist Parties were the soul of the Resistance in the underground, the guerrilla units in the cities and villages, of the flexible anti-fascist unity. Communists heroically stood up in the face of torture and concentration camps, they boldly faced death. Only fine ideals and noble deeds mould people of such lofty dignity and moral integrity.

And now a brief resume. Fascism's evil adventure was doomed from the outset. The broad masses rose against it: those who fought for a better future and those who did not want to lose the best of the past; nationalist patriots and Communist workers, believers and dialectical materialists; even bourgeois governments, when their interests were in jeopardy. The mainstay of that broad international alliance was the heroic struggle of the Soviet Union, the land of triumphant socialism, the principal gain of the international working class. In most countries the anti-fascist forces had a sterling leadership: the Communist parties. Having withstood the trials of war, these parties became the decisive force in many countries, and in some they came to power in alliance with other progressive organizations.

Thus there came about far-reaching, radical changes the irreversibility of which is reaffirmed today by this great anniversary.

Thus was the steel tempered, to use the words of Soviet writer Nikolai Ostrovsky, whose book kindled the enthusiasm of young people in those prewar years.

In battle for independence

Iradj Eskandari
First Secretary,
People's Party of Iran

The victory over nazism and Japanese militarism – to which the Soviet Union and its army made the decisive contribution – gave a powerful impetus to the Afro-Asian peoples' movement for national independence and genuine freedom. Their age-old longing for national independence was brought to reality in a historically short span as a result of this victory. In Asia and Africa the defeat of nazism and Japanese militarism was seen as a landmark in the history of the two continents and in the development of the anti-colonial revolution.

The Second World War completely transformed the world situation and a process of renewal set in. There arose the mighty community of socialist states; colonial countries won sovereignty; the forces of progress, democracy and socialism became the determining factor of history. But this new, radiant world of the future was born amidst

suffering and at the cost of much sacrifice. At first, the course of the war did not portend victory for the forces of democracy and progress. The nazi invader was in full control in West and East Europe, and was stretching out for the colonial territories of his French and British rivals. The Japanese imperialists, encouraged by the Western powers' appeasement policy and meeting little or no resistance, unleashed their military, economic and ideological expansion in Asia. The democratic, anti-fascist camp in the colonies was weakened also by the fact that the nationalist forces regarded the war as something alien, as one more clash between imperialist freebooters over a new redivision of the world. When the British involved India in the war, this was met with universal indignation and with protest demonstrations in a number of cities. The mortal danger presented by nazism and Japanese imperialism was fully appreciated only by the most progressive national forces in the colonies. The Communists, armed with the historic decisions of the Seventh Comintern Congress, fought the brown plague and local pro-fascist organizations.

In some countries the aggressors were helped by the vacillation of nationalists wanting to exploit the contradictions between the Anglo-Franco-American bloc and the Axis powers to win liberation through the 'new order.' Bourgeois circles in a number of Southeast Asian countries openly came out in support of Japan, preferring to get independence as a gift from the foreigner rather than to rely on their own people, whom they wanted to keep in a state of passivity. One could detect in the behavior of the bourgeois classes features which years later would come out in all their ugliness – national egoism and crass pragmatism, narrow-mindedness and opportunism. It was then that the policy of maneuvering and balancing, now followed by the ruling element of some developing countries, was first tested.

Attempts to exploit the confrontation of two imperialist groupings were made also by the colonial petty bourgeoisie. Cooperation with the Axis powers, some believed, would, in the end, help to expel the colonialists. That this was a very dangerous delusion they were to learn from bitter experience. Burma's national hero, Aung San, who at the beginning of the war advocated cooperation with Japan, later admitted: we invited the Japanese to Burma not because we were pro-fascist, but because of gross miscalculation and petty-bourgeois weakness.

But in the early years of the war such views were widespread, and widely used by fascist propaganda. It depicted Germany, Italy and Japan as 'friends' of the oppressed nations. In fact, Mussolini even proclaimed himself 'Protector of Islam' in a bid for support, chiefly from the feudal and aristocratic element, in Libya, Egypt and Somalia. Nor were the Japanese imperialists entirely unsuccessful in

posing as liberators in Southeast Asia. This was bound to cause consternation and disorganization in the national-liberation movement and to weaken it in the face of aggression.

Another complicating factor was that the ruling element in non-occupied countries, Turkey and Iran, for instance, were banking on Germany. This was attended by the growth of the pro-fascist and right forces and by rampant reaction.

Harsh colonial rule and confusion within the nationalist camp hampered full development of the democratic, liberation anti-fascist struggle started by the patriotic forces. Their efforts were scattered and isolated until the war against Hitler was joined by the one power capable of waging the worldwide battle against fascism, closely linking it with the fight for social progress.

With the Soviet Union's entry into the war as a result of nazi aggression, a sharp line of division was drawn between the two opposing camps, and much became clear to the peoples of Asia and Africa. The Axis powers were now opposed by a powerful anti-fascist alliance uniting all supporters of democracy and all opponents of totalitarian dictatorship and reaction. Gradually this alliance was joined by the colonial masses participating in the anti-fascist resistance. The spread of the war to the Soviet Union, Nehru wrote, increased Indian support for the progressive forces.

The Soviet Union's participation in the anti-Hitler coalition greatly accelerated the disillusionment of the nationalists in the 'new order.' The war was no longer something alien. The fascist menace was increasingly seen as worldwide, and the battles in far-off Russia became something very personal for millions in Asia and Africa. This was vividly put by Gabriel D'Arboussier, the Senegalese political leader who recalls how the radio brought news of the Soviet Army's victories to villages thousands of kilometres from the battlefront. And it was instinctively accepted by all as a victory of their own.

U.S. and British participation, together with the Soviet Union, in the anti-fascist alliance had a definite impact on their policy, notably colonial policy. This was expressed in the Atlantic Charter they adopted on August 14, 1941, which reaffirmed the principle of national self-determination. True, Churchill was quick to announce that the self-determination principle would not apply to British colonies. But the more far-seeing statesmen realized that the colonial world would not be the same after the defeat of nazism.

From the very first day of the war on the Soviet front the Soviet people took a consistent internationalist stand, considering it their sacred duty to spare mankind the nightmare of a fascist-ruled world. In defending their country, the Soviet people were defending the creation of the international proletariat, the first socialist state, the

bulwark of the revolutionary and anti-colonial struggle. For the destinies of the anti-fascist struggle in Europe, Africa and Asia depended on the course of the war on the Soviet front. Every battle won on that front had worldwide reverberations. This was especially true of the epochal battle of Stalingrad, the campaign in the Caucasus, the Kursk Bulge and other battlefields in the USSR and Central and Southeast Europe. One example: the Soviet Army's crushing defeat of the nazi forces in the Soviet Caucasus barred them the road to Central and Southeast Asia and the Middle East, which helped the peoples of these areas in their fight for national liberation.

Everywhere the Soviet Army was an army of liberation, the champion of progressive internationalist ideas. The entry of Soviet forces into Iran in August 1941 to foil nazi plans and prevent a nazi take-over of this key link in the Allied communications system changed the situation in our country. The pro-fascist Shah was forced to abdicate and the reactionary pro-Hitler government was replaced. The fall of the pro-fascist dictatorship led to an – albeit brief – democratic upsurge. Among other things, political prisoners were amnestied. The People's Party of Iran (Tudeh), the party of our working people, founded in October 1941, made appreciable progress in its campaign against fascism, feudal oppression, and for the interests of the working class and equality for the national minorities.

At the concluding stage of the war, when the glorious Soviet Army entered China and Korea to liberate them from the Japanese invader, the peoples of these countries became convinced from their own experience of the genuine internationalism of this liberating army. It helped them liquidate the consequences of the occupation and normalize life. The presence of Soviet troops in North Korea was a major guarantee of the irreversibility of the revolutionary process led by the Korean working class and its party.

In the course of the Second World War, thanks chiefly to the efforts of the heroic Soviet Army, the balance of forces was changed in favor of the anti-Hitler coalition. This had a tremendous revolutionizing influence on the position in the colonies, regardless of whether they were under the 'old' or the 'new' rulers. Everywhere there was a marked rise of anti-fascist, liberation sentiments, the maturing of popular actions and risings, with the anti-imperialist forces speaking with a louder voice in all Afro-Asian countries. On the other hand, there was the declining influence of the collaborationist feudalists and compradores.

This shift in the world balance of forces was especially important for the colonial countries in the concluding period of the war. In many countries the imminent collapse of nazism and Japanese militarism created an explosive situation. The Soviet Union's entry into the war

against Japan predetermined the final defeat of the Japanese war machine and greatly hastened the disintegration of the colonial empire the Japanese had built up in Southeast Asia. In these conditions, the peoples of Vietnam and Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaya, stepped up their fight for independence. There were liberating revolutions in Vietnam and Indonesia in August 1945. The destruction of the first links of the colonial chain began a cardinal tendency of the postwar world, the disintegration and collapse of the colonial system.

The defeat of nazism and Japanese militarisn introduced new long-term factors into the situation in Asian and African countries, and international affairs generally. One of these was the unparalleled scale of the anti-war movement, which united the socialist states, the peace forces in capitalist countries, and the peoples of the developing states. The participation of Afro-Asian countries in the movement for peace and security, disarmament and détente, is a historic projection of the democratic traditions shaped in the former colonies during the world war and stemming from the struggle against aggression. Nowadays, the peoples in those countries regard just and democratic peace as a cardinal condition of progress.

The other factor of an international order is the active Afro-Asian role in the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement. Here, too, there is an obvious link with the wartime experience. Before the war, the liberation struggle was mainly against the particular colonialists (British, French, Dutch, or some other), against concrete colonialisms. During the global conflict, on the other hand, the battle was objectively directed against colonialism as a *system,* the product of imperialism. Fascist slavery, which threatened all the peoples, could have become a new variety of that system. The awareness of this danger helped patriots in developing countries to understand the international character of the war fought by progressive mankind, first and foremost the Soviet Union. At the same time dependable foundations were laid for anti-colonial solidarity, whose traditions have made tremendous advances in our day.

The third and most important international factor, which assures the stability of the first two, was the birth of the socialist world system, the mainstay of the liberation struggle in all parts of the world and the mighty and dependable ally of the movement for national liberation. The battle against nazism and the Japanese invaders wrought the closest of ties between the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and their Soviet brothers. National and social emancipation, the war showed, is possible only in alliance with socialism. It showed that this alliance is essential in the elaboration of a victorious strategy of national liberation.

The Second World War was a serious test for many contingents of

anti-colonial revolution, a test of their maturity and insight. There was a painful reassessment of old attitudes. The strategy of anti-colonial revolution acquired features which later enabled the colonial peoples not only to repulse the 'old' colonialists' attempts at restoration, but also to defeat them, to achieve independence and consolidate its gains, and subsequently to embark on a new, more mature stage.

The most important of these features is *consistency* in upholding the national patriotic ideals. The experience of the war, of colonialism and neo-colonialism, taught the peoples to fight without compromise against all forms of foreign oppression, to repulse all attempts at 'buying' their cooperation in return for some imperialist concession. Although in the postwar imperialists had often succeeded in winning local bourgeois and pro-bourgeois elements to their side, in capitalizing on their reformism and opportunism, the consistent radical principle affirmed itself ever more forcefully. Its bearers were the proletariat and its party, the revolutionary democrats, and the bulk of the laboring masses. It is these classes and social strata that today, too, head the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism, and consistently expose the attempts of local exploiters to obtain 'equal' cooperation with international monopolies. Like any other type of collaborationism, such cooperation would be surrender to imperialism.

During the Second World War, the *democratic* content of the liberation movement grew more profound. For the peoples of Asia and Africa the war was a school of struggle for democracy and against fascism, against international and home reaction. Since then they have mounted extensive battles for socio-economic changes and against reactionary regimes, demanding freedom of speech, press and assembly. The experience of fighting against nazism and Japanese militarism is helping the national patriotic forces to recognize and expose their enemies acting under the banner of reactionary nationalism and chauvinism. Not even the exploiting strata can afford to ignore the anti-fascist traditions. These days, even the most conservative sections of the bourgeoisie and the feudal elements would not dare act from racist, man-hating positions. It is no accident, therefore, that fascist ideology has not sunk any visible roots in Asian and African countries in the postwar period.

However, there still are reactionary regimes akin to the fascists in method and political practice, against which the patriots are fighting with courage and perseverance. Fidelity to anti-fascist democratic tradition, forged 30 years ago, is the guarantee of success in combating these regimes.

The continued growth of the progressive *social* content of the present-day national-liberation revolutions is another important fea-

ture. But it should be remembered that the world conflict of 1939-45 put the problem of national independence on a fundamentally new plane. In the past, the forces of national liberation laid the accent mainly on freedom of secession, and regarded the social content of independence as a matter of the future. The defeat of fascism and its consequences have greatly extended the self-awareness of the oppressed peoples. They saw with their own eyes how the democratic upsurge in wartime and the early postwar years tied up, even identified, the ideas of national liberation and social emancipation in some of the Asian and Central and Southeast European countries. As a result, Communist-led people's democratic revolutions came out victorious. The liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutions in the other Asian countries, too, gradually acquired the nature of profound social overturns.

Although the colonialists managed to retain power in most colonial countries for a certain period after the war, the progressive social tendency of the national-liberation movement as a whole was unaffected. Quite the contrary. In the very first postwar years, in fact, revolutionary democrats came to power in a number of the liberated Asian states, where the influence of Communists and other progressive forces grew visibly. Later, the same changes occurred much more intensively in many other Asian and African states. Take Syria, Iraq and Algeria, South Yemen and Somalia, the Republic of Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo and other countries where revolutionary democrats are in power and, in many cases, cooperate with Communists.

Despite the designs of domestic and international reaction and the temporary retreats and mistakes of the revolutionary contingents, the character of the liberation movement in Asian and African countries has changed substantially over the past 30 years. Now the fusion of the national-liberation revolution with the social revolution has become irreversible. It has taken effect in more and more countries opting for the non-capitalist way, the way they regard as a crucial stage of transition to socialism.

Looking back, consistent revolutionaries and all decent people in Asia and Africa associate the gains of the liberation revolution with the success of the socialist world system and the international working-class movement. And this is as it should be: the progressive classes and social strata in these countries are assimilating the wealth of experience of the worldwide anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle, which has taught them international action, given them a sense of belonging to the progressive section of mankind and paved the way to deliverance from foreign slavery. This is why the peoples of the developing countries celebrate the 30th anniversary of the victory over nazism and Japanese militarism as their own great holiday.

Traditions of the Resistance live on

Germaine Willard
French historian

The Resistance Movement in fascist-occupied France, just as in other nazi-occupied countries, included people of different ideological and political views. The only organized force in it was the French Communist Party. All the other parties had disintegrated after the 1940 debacle. Depending on their nature, their members and electors chose Petain collaborationism, passivism or the Resistance. In sum, the FCP played the determining role in the struggle for liberation. And this was natural: for the FCP Resistance was not a rupture with, but on the contrary a continuation of, its fundamental policy.

Since the early 30s FCP policy had been oriented on struggle against fascism at home and abroad. Mindful of the analysis of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, the French Communists saw its dual content. First and foremost it implied struggle by the French and international working class to safeguard democratic and socialist gains, struggle against the worst type of reaction, of which nazi Germany was the shock force. But it also implied national struggle, because the fascist states were bent on conquest, on enslaving entire nations, France included. It followed that in its class struggle the working class assumed responsibility for the national interest.

The French ruling class was mainly concerned with its own positions, jeopardized by the broad democratic Popular Front, and was eager to weaken the French and international working-class movement. Its reactionary home policy and mollification of the fascist states disarmed the country in face of the nazi aggressor. The Munich policy, which it followed even after the declaration of war in 1939, led to the crushing defeat of June 1940.

A party of the working class embodying the nation's future, the French Communist Party affirmed itself as the most faithful defender of the national interest. And after June 1940 it continued its twofold struggle – social and national.

This continuity in FCP policy explains why, though working underground after September 1939, it was the only political force to

mount resistance in national territory in the summer of 1940. It also explains why in its Appeal to the People of France of July 10, 1940, signed by Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos, the Party was able to define the content, objectives and essential means of the liberation struggle.

The Appeal was a study of the situation and its causes. It explained the deep-lying reasons for the defeat – the treason of the ruling class then triumphantly ensconced in Vichy – and stressed the two main aspects of the situation: 'occupation of half of France by the German army, with France paying the occupation costs' and 'installation of a government of traitors and mercenaries . . . depending on outside aid to maintain itself in power against the will of the nation.' The Appeal emphasized the link between the military defeat, the country's occupation, and the Petain government, the link between the loss of national independence and the social and political oppression of the new regime. This clarified the objectives of the struggle – 'national and social liberation' and 'freedom, independence and revival of France' – and named the forces to conduct it: first of all the working class, which would continue the social and national struggle of the preceding years, but also all the other working people, the entire people of France menaced by the dual oppression – internal and external. What was needed was the unity of the French nation.

The Party's analysis gave the national struggle the necessary orientation. It became a social and patriotic struggle of the entire nation against foreign invaders and the handful of French exploiters in their employ. Ultimately, this conception of Resistance was ratified by the affiliated organizations in the unanimously adopted program of the National Resistance Council (NRC) in March 1944. The program envisaged the country's liberation by mass actions of the French people, in other words, a national insurrection, and pronounced itself in favor of a set of measures for the democratic and social renovation of the country after liberation.

The FCP decided to open the battle immediately. It was able to do so, because it possessed extensive experience of mass struggle and because, despite clandestinity, it had continuously strengthened its bonds with the masses. Popular committees began to be formed in the summer of 1940, serving as the initial bases of mass resistance.

The resistance had to extend to all spheres, which meant that it had to adopt all possible forms. To resist meant to expose the lies and destroy the illusions peddled by nazi and Vichy propaganda. Hence the importance attached to *L'Humanite*, the only underground newspaper put out in the country throughout the occupation. To resist meant to impede use of the country's economic potential by the occupation forces, to combat the super-exploitation of the masses which assured the nazis and their French collaborationists super-

profits. This culminated in a multiform strike struggle, which began in the summer of 1940 and led up to the miners' strike in Nord and Pas-de-Calais in May 1941, the first major mass action of the Resistance. To resist also meant hitting the German war machine. Hence the necessity of the Special Organization (SO), which mounted an armed struggle in the autumn of 1940. The Franc tireurs and Partisans of France, the big organization of mass armed struggle formed at the end of 1941, was the immediate successor of the SO.

The initiative in all Resistance actions belonged invariably to the FCP. Thanks to its ties with the masses, its ability to see the changes in the correlation of forces, the Party was always able to marshal strength at the right moment and determine the most suitable form of struggle. Following the unparalleled military defeat and collapse of the Republic, French public opinion was in a state of shock. It was on the order of the day to prevent people from submerging themselves in apathy and accepting the national and social demagogy of the Vichy government. So, the French Communists began the 'hour of truth' campaign, explaining the essence of Vichy policy, a cover and transmission belt for the occupation authoities,which had nothing in common with Petain's professions of 'national revolution.' It was an anti-national reaction of the capitalist oligarcy, which had set out to achieve its class aims with the support of foreign arms. The FCP began rallying the working class for economic struggle, because precisely this form of struggle was best suited in the then prevailing situation.

But whenever there was a favorable change, the Party advanced more militant initiatives. A special issue of *L'Humanite*, for example, was put out to analyze the crucial political turn of June 22, 1941. The Soviet Union's involvement in the war created a real prospect of nazi Germany's defeat, clarified the war aims of the fascist states, and imparted a liberative and just character to the Second World War. Last but not least, it eased the situation of occupied France. The political and military conditions changed, encouraging a build-up of the Resistance Movement. And the FCP responded at once by intensifying the massive armed struggle.

The strategic change in the fortunes of war after the decisive Stalingrad Battle in the winter of 1942-43 had an immediate effect on the situation in France. The entire anti-Hitler coalition came into motion. The time had come for the French Resistance to go on the offensive. The FCP called for immediate preparations for a national insurrection. Its motto: 'Unite, Arm, Fight.' As far back as May 15, 1941, the Party had issued an appeal to form a national front of struggle for the independence of France encompassing 'all Frenchmen, excluding the defeatists and traitors.' And this National Front

subsequently became the mightiest and broadest of Resistance organizations.

However, in a complex society like the French, where a variety of ideological and political currents were closely intertwined, certain people, certain social strata, sought other ways of patriotic struggle. Outside the country, General de Gaulle formed the Free France Committee the armed forces of which were engaged against the fascist armies in 1941. At home, especially in the winter of 1941-42, various Resistance organizations were constituted with their own forms of action.

For the Resistance Movement to gain the necessary dimensions, all these patriotic forces had to be coordinated. This was not easy. Nor was clandestinity the main obstacle. There were serious differences over the conception of the struggle and the conditions of the country's revival after liberation, reflecting the class contradictions. The more conservative elements, notably among General de Gaulle's following and in certain movements, watched the growth of the popular Resistance with undisguised fear, for the decisive role in it belonged to the FCP. They were afraid that after liberation the popular and democratic forces would possess the greatest weight, and therefore tried to reduce the Resistance to a movement of a select group of army specialists, urging a 'wait-and-see' policy on the pretext that strength should be conserved for the decisive hour – the landing of Allied troops in France.

If the coordination of forces was finally achieved through the constitution of the National Resistance Council in May 1943, this was due mainly to the fact that the FCP found the right approach to the problem of alliance with General de Gaulle, whose influence in the Resistance organizations was very great. General de Gaulle was a man of the Right and initially conceived the Resistance Movement as a mainly military action of specialists operating largely outside the country. But this does not belittle the positive role his Free France organization played in the battle for national independence. Entering the anti-Hitler coalition, it made its contribution to the struggle against the country's oppressors.

The rapprochement of the main Resistance forces came about under the impact of new dangers for national independence following the Anglo-American landing in North Africa at the end of 1942. The leaders of Britain and the United States wanted to profit from the enfeeblement of France to extend their imperialist positions in her colonies and France proper. In 1943 they began nursing plans of a military occupation regime (AMGOT)* in liberated France, which

* Allied Military Government of Occupied Territories. – *Ed.*

would have made the country dependent on the United States. If these plans were to be frustrated, the French people would have to be much more than a mere auxiliary force assisting the disembarked troops. A national insurrection would give it a decisive role in the country's liberation. This was the essential basis for the accords concluded by General de Gaulle and Fernand Grenier, who represented the FCP, in the beginning of 1943. This alliance, based on the interests of national independence, paved the way for the NRC and, later, the French Committee of National Liberation, which included two Communist ministers.

However, action and nothing but action could make the alliance real. And here again the decisive role belonged to the FCP, for it found the concrete aims that would rally the patriots and give purpose to their struggle. Take the battle against the FLS (Forced Labor Service) formed by Vichy on nazi orders, which placed the French youth in danger of deportation to Germany. The peril applied to all categories of the population. The FCP set out to build the campaign against this service into a massive nationwide movement. This was the terrain on which the first joint actions were carried out by the FCP and other Resistance organizations. Furthermore, since persons evading forced shipment to Germany hid out in villages, the sabotage campaign against the FLS strengthened the alliance of workers and farmers. Actions against forced labor in Germany also helped to extend the armed struggle, with partisans organizing those who had evaded deportation and bringing them into their activities.

By their concrete actions the Communists succeeded in proving the necessity of immediate armed struggle. The initiative and courage of Party activists, the results they achieved, brought around many patriots who had earlier adopted wait-and-see tactics. This paved the way to a national insurrection, crowning the broad Resistance Movement that had gradually drawn in new and larger sections of the population.

The national insurrection upset the Anglo-American plans. The British and U.S. leaders were denied use of the occupation 'francs' they had printed and the 'mayors' and 'prefects' they had trained at special AMGOT courses. That the French people were the makers of their own liberation they owe chiefly to the FCP, gaining the opportunity to build an independent and democratic France and assure the country's renascence.

The outlook for rebirth was promising enough when the government formed by the Resistance Movement, and subsequently recognized by the Anglo-American allies, set itself up in Paris in August 1944. The collapse of the Vichy regime and Germany's military defeat in our country cut the ground from under the extreme reactionary

forces. The big bourgeoisie had discredited itself by its anti-national policy. Broad democratic forces, strongly influenced by the FCP, grew up alongside the Resistance Movement and the national insurrection. The climate was favorable for the birth of a new France, as envisaged in the program of the National Resistance Council – the blueprint of a comprehensive new-type democracy providing for radical restraints on the money magnates in all spheres of national life, a social program with a progressive content, and genuine people's participation in running the country.

But there were also aspects less favorable for the democratic forces. First of all the state of the economy. The nazis had plundered the country, and the battles of 1944, too, had cost France much of its economic potential. This applied particularly to power and transport. The supply problem was very acute, and the living standard of the masses was going down. Besides, though compelled to withdraw into the background for a time, the reactionary forces were still alive. The class contradictions that had existed in the Resistance Movement surfaced strongly. Before liberation, the Gaullist services had built a state apparatus which almost completely precluded the participation of Communists. Making the most of General de Gaulle's prestige, the ruling classes gradually joined forces and, among other things, formed the Popular Republican Movement party in an attempt to take the offensive. Last but not least, though France had succeeded in avoiding a military occupation regime, large Anglo-American forces remained in the country until the end of the war. And it will be recalled that the British and U.S. leaders proved in Greece and elsewhere that they would not hesitate to use brute force in crushing the popular movement.

Furthermore, the international situation was contradictory. On the one hand, the crushing defeat of the fascist states had greatly weakened the reactionary forces. Having played the decisive part in the war, the Soviet Union won admiration and sympathy. Socialism's prestige had risen considerably. Also, the popular resistance in many European countries and the rest of the world had brought about the birth of People's Democracies which subsequently began building socialism.

But on the other hand U.S. imperialism with its economic potential, which had grown during the war, lost no time in building a base for a counter-offensive against the international working-class and democratic movement. Less than a year after the war, in March 1946, Winston Churchill in his Fulton speech proclaimed a policy that Truman later christened the policy of 'containment' and 'rolling back' communism. Its aggressive nature became more than obvious very soon.

One of the aspects of this policy was to contain the popular masses of Western Europe, first of all in France. Under the guise of 'aid,' professedly rendered to rehabilitate the French economy, U.S. imperialism began imposing its economic and political patronage. The FCP exposed these designs, showing the true meaning of the Blum-Byrnes agreements of May 1946. The U.S. 'generosity,' the Communists showed, was really meant to create a dependent French economy and integrate France in the imperialist bloc directed against the socialist world. National independence and the chances of democratic development were again in jeopardy. The big bourgeoisie, of course, did its utmost to back the U.S. policy. It badly needed an American policeman to wage a class war against the workers and democratic forces, and did not shrink – for the nth time – from resorting to an anti-national policy in the name of its class privileges.

Aware of these implications, the Communist Party defined its own policy.

It was impossible to create an independent and democratic France, to restore the country's economy, without reliance on 'a broad movement of the united forces of resistance and liberation, which have become the factor of our country's economic, political and moral renascence,' said Maurice Thorez in a speech on November 30, 1944. This and nothing else had enabled France to send its forces into the decisive battle against the fascist states. This and nothing else had assured the implementation of the progressive program of the NRC, the foundation of national unity in the struggle against Hitler Germany. This and nothing else would pave the way for a renewed and extended democracy as a stage on the road to socialism. This was what Maurice Thorez said in an interview to the London *Times* on November 18, 1946.

This was why the FCP defined maintenance of the broad alliance that had grown out of the Resistance Movement, and growth of the workers' united front, as the basic objectives. To promote them, it was decided that it was best for the country for the Communists to participate in a government 'of broad national and democratic unity. This government should lean on the people in order to conduct a program of national and social revival consonant with the wishes of the people.'* This was the FCP's view of the maximum possibilities of the time, based on a thorough analysis of the alignment of forces. The Party rejected the adventurism and provocations of some of the organizations of the Resistance Movement (liberation committees, the patriotic militia) clamoring for revolutionary seizure of power but

* Maurice Thorez. Report to 10th Congress of the FCP, June 1945.

in fact leading to isolation of the FCP. The Communists denounced the pseudo-revolutionary rhetoric concerning, say, unlimited nationalization, falsely paraded as a 'socialist' act. Nationalization in the spirit of the NRC program, and consequently in the interests of the democratic and national forces, the FCP maintained, was the really effective act, resulting in the unity of patriots and republicans, in a solid popular movement.

But struggle was unavoidable to maintain and consolidate the alliance. The French Communist Party applied considerable efforts, therefore, to mobilize the masses, first of all the working class, to promote the NRC program, to safeguard national independence. This yielded a number of appreciable gains: nationalization, factory committees, employee status, social insurance, wage increases, and the like. Despite compromises, the Constitution adopted in 1946 contained a number of principles in the spirit of the NRC program.

FCP policy was particularly effective in the 'battle in industry.' This became a major class battle of the proletariat, a projection of the struggle that had begun during the Resistance. This nationwide battle was the prime condition for affirming France's independence in the face of U.S. imperialist designs. Also, it was an important political and social battle. To win it, it was essential to purge the apparatus of traitors, to punish them, because the collaborationists who were still in evidence in factory managements, were still their co-owners, were sabotaging economic growth. To win the battle, it was essential to carry out the planned nationalization, because the big bourgeoisie, still in control of the main economic levers, was also liable to sabotage rehabilitation. To win, it was essential to combat the policy of social regression which the ruling classes wanted to impose by depressing wages, increasing prices, sabotaging supplies, and thus undermining working-class efforts in production. The FCP exposed the theory that it was ostensibly impossible to eliminate the 'satanic cycle of wages and prices' if the economic demands of the workers were not dampened. The Party showed that it was possible and necessary to meet the workers' legitimate demands and organized the struggle for them. The battle in the factories grew into a major social, political and national battle, which the FCP supported through its Communist ministers in the government.

The counter-offensive mounted by imperialism on a national and international scale in 1947 held up the growth of the democratic and national movement in France. The first sign of this counter-offensive came when the Communist ministers were removed from the government under U.S. pressure. But the gains won during the Resistance Movement and in the subsequent struggle for social progress and alliance of all forces capable of assuring it, were not all lost. The

traditions of those years have taken deep root in the popular masses, and are being used by the French Communist Party in its present work for a broad anti-monopoly union of all working-class and democratic forces.

Liberation struggle on the upgrade

Khalid Muhyi al-Din,
Egyptian public figure

The Arab peoples' record of resistance to fascism dates back to the 1930s, when progressive forces in the Middle East actively opposed its ideology and policies. It was a time when the Axis powers concentrated their efforts on establishing a foothold for expansion in an area they regarded as the gateway to Asia, and especially India. By a combination of propaganda and plots, the fascists hoped to exploit certain social forces in the Arab countries to achieve their ends.

In the first place, they counted on some national circles that had turned to fascism in the mistaken belief that it was the main enemy of British rule. Fascist reaction sought to take advantage of such illusions to mislead the national movement and bring it into its orbit. But although wavering sections of the petty-bourgeoisie, completely divorced from the people, fell for fascist demagogy, the masses supported the slogan advanced by the Left forces at that time: 'No to British Occupation, No to Fascism!'

Fascism also counted on the most reactionary forces. In Egypt, for example, the Royal Palace and conservative feudal circles at a time of Axis military successes banked on the fascists and made secret contacts with them through the Egyptian embassy in Teheran. Documents found after the war proved that a large number of the most reactionary personalities had received money from nazi Germany. During the first period of the war the Royal Palace, the most reactionary institution of Egyptian society hostile to the interests of the people, remained the center of Axis plots against Arab countries.

Finally, fascism tried to exploit the chauvinistic sentiments of the more backward sections of the population; playing up its hostility to the Jews, nazism presented itself as the 'natural ally' of the Arabs, who were at the time facing Zionist conspiracies linked with plans for

implementing the Balfour Declaration.* It should also be remembered that there was a large Italian community in Egypt with a well-armed fascist organization.

The conscious class and political forces were, however, able to expose and foil the fascist plans. From the outset the Arab peoples rejected the idea of fascism. The history of the struggle against its machinations in Egypt is highly instructive. Already in the early 30s a number of anti-fascist organizations were formed, anti-nazi campaigns were sponsored in the press, and a series of anti-fascist books and articles appeared. In 1933, the Society Against Anti-Semitism was established, and then the Cultural Transformers' Club, which launched an anti-fascist campaign, attacking anti-Semitism and defending democracy. In 1936 the Art and Freedom Society, comprising a number of the most famous artists, engaged in anti-fascist activity. When the nazis in Germany burned works by progressive artists, declaring their art 'decadent,' the Art and Freedom group issued a statement, 'Long Live "Decadent" Art!,' which was signed by many Egyptian cultural workers. Other anti-fascist organizations included the Peace Society and the Democratic Club, set up in the latter 30s.

During the Spanish civil war, Egyptian Leftist groups organized a campaign in support of the Republican forces, raised funds for them and called for volunteers to the front. In short, the Left movement in Egypt in the latter 30s and early 40s rose mainly on the crest of an anti-fascist wave, and though the struggle was difficult, our country and people remained loyal to the forces of democracy, thus helping to bring the defeat of fascism closer.

The Soviet Union bore the brunt of the struggle against nazi Germany, a struggle crowned by the rout of Hitler's war machine. Its peoples gave a remarkable object lesson of heroism and patriotism, demonstrating the Soviet society's capacity to repulse the enemy. During the war even imperialist propaganda was constrained to utter quite a few words of praise about the ally in the anti-Hitler coalition and the Soviet people's bravery. To this day Stalingrad, Leningrad, Sevastopol, Odessa and other Soviet cities remain sacred memorials to the Soviet people's courage and fortitude. The exploits of these cities are among the most vivid manifestations of the superiority of the socialist system with its ability to mobilize the people to repulse aggression.

As a result of the Second World War and the defeat of fascism, the world balance of forces changed decisively in favor of the peoples, and the system of socialist states headed by the Soviet Union appeared as a new world force opposed to international imperialism

* Proclaimed by Britain in 1917, it provided for the establishment of a 'Jewish national home' in Palestine. – *Ed.*

headed by the United States. It became the decisive factor of world development, and today the destinies of mankind cannot be shaped without it. The socialist states declared their full support for the peoples' right to fight the colonialists and imperialists, for their right to be the masters of their own destinies, for their right to independence. This opened up new opportunities before the liberation movement, and already in the first 10 years after the war many peoples in Asia and Africa won independence.

The Arab liberation movement became one of the major forces of the world anti-imperialist front in the postwar period. Supported by the peoples of the world, above all the Soviet people, it achieved important successes, such as the nationalization of the Suez Canal, the defeat of the 1956 tripartite aggression against Egypt, etc. The socialist countries helped the Arab states equip their armies and build up their defense capacity. By using economic ties with the socialist world founded on new principles, the Arab states were able to develop their economy on an independent basis, substantially reduce their economies' dependence on the world capitalist market, and resist imperialist pressure.

Without the socialist world system headed by the Soviet Union many of the Arab countries' gains would have been impossible. These include the successes of the Palestine Resistance, the changes in Iraq in 1968, the overthrow of reactionary regimes in the Sudan and Libya in 1969, the important changes in Southern Yemen in 1969. Progressive national fronts were formed in Iraq, Syria and Democratic Yemen, and Egypt's patriotic unity strengthened in the face of Israeli aggression.

Today the national revolution in the Arab East has entered a new stage, that of far-reaching social change.

All these victories were not easily won. In 1967, Israel, imperialism's main base in the Middle East and enjoying U.S. support, occupied large areas of Egypt and Syria. Its objective was to deal a blow against progressive regimes, thus throwing back the Arab liberation movement and forcing it to deviate from its independent course; in other words, to turn back the wheel of history. But the aggressor's plans were doomed to failure.

After the 1967 defeat, Egypt, Syria and the Palestine Resistance again received the full political, military and economic support of the Soviet Union and the socialist states. They were able to consolidate, remain firm, rebuild their armed forces and improve their training for the coming campaign. The main force in the October 1973 war were the Egyptian, Syrian, Iraqi, Algerian and Palestinian armies. Using Soviet arms, they fought successfully against Israel armed by U.S. imperialism.

The existence of the socialist world contributed to the effectiveness of the policy of using oil as a weapon, the struggle for sovereignty over natural resources, and the nationalization of oil as in Iraq in 1972.

The changes in the world since the defeat of fascism and, in the first place, the emergence of the socialist system make it possible for Egypt, Syria and the Arab people of Palestine to fight persistently for a just and stable peace in the Middle East and put forward certain conditions for achieving it. Thanks to the stand taken by the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, which came out together with the independent nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the UN General Assembly in November 1974 supported the Palestine Liberation Organization and passed a decision recognizing the rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

It is, therefore, not accidental that U.S. imperialism and its Israeli ally strive above all to weaken the ties between the Arabs' liberation movement and its principal friend and ally, world socialism. The plots of imperialist and reactionary circles in Arab countries are aimed at bringing the latter under the undivided sway of the world capitalist market and strengthening U.S. influence in the Middle East.

But our people know that alliance with the socialist system headed by the Soviet Union is the principal guarantee of achieving a just peace and strengthening the Arab countries' economic and military potential. At the same time the Arab peoples realize that all the steps now being taken in the military field for the purpose of easing tension cannot serve as an alternative for an overall solution. The latter requires the full withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and recognition of the Palestinian people's national rights in accordance with UN decisions. The place where decisions aimed at achieving a just peace can be taken is the Geneva Conference. It is impossible to guarantee peace and justice in the Middle East without the active participation of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, for otherwise the danger of imperialist and reactionary plots will remain.

The Arab peoples are confident that, together with the world anti-imperialist front, they can defeat imperialism, zionism and reaction. These hopes acquire special force at a time when the peoples of the world are celebrating the 30th anniversary of victory over fascism.

Reality versus preconceptions

Vyacheslav Dashichev,
Sergei Sluch
Historians (Soviet Union)

The number of books dealing with various aspects of World War II runs into tens of thousands. The war is a subject of heated debates, of clashing views and ideological currents expressing the interests and outlooks of different classes and social groups. The controversy between bourgeois and Marxist historians centers on the origins of the war, the Soviet contribution to the victory over fascism and the causes of nazi Germany's defeat.

The origins of the war stand out among the problems holding the attention of bourgeois historians. World War II, like World War I, was a product of the imperialist system. It was caused by the imperialist powers' struggle for a redivision of the world and for economic and political domination. This struggle conditioned the policies of the main imperialist powers and culminated in an armed conflict. Trying to conceal this fact, bourgeois historians avoid analysis of the innermost social and economic causes.

In numerous memoirs and other writings published in the early postwar years, Halder, Manstein, Kesselring, Guderian, Tippelskirch and other Wehrmacht generals tried to exonerate German militarism by putting all the blame for the war and defeat on one or several 'incompetent' leaders. To use Churchill's figure of speech, German generals at their desks took revenge for battles lost in the field. Those memoirs started a flow of falsifications by H. Greiner, G. Ritter, P. Schramm and other reactionary West German historians.

With the outbreak of the cold war these falsifications were taken up by bourgeois authors of other countries, such as B. Liddell Hart, J. Fuller, H. Baldwin and T. Baily. Subjective factors, especially Hitler's personal traits, were emphasized. P. Schramm described the war as Hitler's own handiwork.[1] M. Baumont, a French historian, came to a similar conclusion. 'Had the German state not been headed by Adolf Hitler,' he wrote, 'there is good reason to think that the Second World War would not have taken place. The origins of the 1939 war lie essentially in Adolf Hitler's insatiable appetites.'[2] The 'Führer' is

portrayed in isolation from the social forces which brought him to power and whose interests and schemes he championed.

Bourgeois historians also put forward other concepts most of which are just as far from the truth. The 'moderate' trend sees the appeasement policy as the cause of the war. This view is held by L. Lafore. D. Fleming, W. Shirer, R. Sontag and other American historians. Some British historians have advanced the 'anti-appeasement' theory. D. Thomson believes that World War II was a result of Britain's abandonment of the policy of appeasing nazi Germany.[3]

Many historians on the extreme right allege that the Soviet-German non-aggression pact paved the way for aggression in 1939. This allegation is repeated by reactionaries of many countries, including Sulzberger, Fabry, Tippelskirch, Taylor, Aron, Rossi and Braunthal. Yet published records show beyond all doubt that nazi Germany began intensive war preparations much earlier. As far back as August 1936, the nazi leadership set out to achieve war preparedness by 1939. An order issued by the High Command on April 3, 1939, or five months before the attack on Poland, said: 'With regard to Operation Weiss (against Poland. – *Authors' note*), the Führer has issued the following instructions: preparations to be carried on with a view to ensuring preparedness for the operation by September 1, 1939 at the latest.'[4]

The Soviet Union and Communist parties warned world public opinion that fascism meant war. The Soviet Union considered that the only way to stave off fascist aggression was to set up an effective collective security system in Europe. In 1933 the Soviet Communist Party resolved to work for the organization of such a system, and this became a key objective of Soviet foreign policy. However, the Western powers ignored or frustrated all Soviet peace proposals for Europe. Rather than collective security, they opted for appeasing the aggressors and coming to terms with Hitler and Mussolini on an anti-Soviet basis. The most glaring case in point was the infamous Munich deal, which virtually opened the door to war. This policy of the Western powers also came out during the Anglo-French-Soviet talks in the spring and summer of 1939. In the circumstances, the Soviet government signed a non-aggression pact with Germany to head off imperialist plans for isolating the Soviet Union, plans which could have posed a serious threat to the existence of the socialist state. Peace in Europe could not be preserved because the Western powers refused to cooperate with the Soviet Union in establishing a collective security system.

Bourgeois historians would like to get away from these unpalatable facts and to find in the antecedents of World War II a confirmation of their claims about the 'red peril,' 'communist menace,' and so on.

On the other hand, it is revealing that in some of the bourgeois

scholars' false concepts about the origins of World War II one can detect, if only faintly, attempts to look critically on past experience and bring its interpretation closer to the truth.

Some Western historians see the causes of the war in the nazi dictatorship and nazi Germany's aggressive foreign policy. This explanation was offered shortly after the war by German historians and philosophers, such as K. Jaspers, F. Meinecke and W. Hofer. It was accepted in the main by so prominent a West German analyst as H.-A. Jacobsen. He writes that the nazi regime with its policy of violence bears 'the biggest share of the responsibility to history for 1939 and its consequences'.[5] This line has been picked up by A. Bullock, E. Robertson and other British scholars. British analysts believe, in particular, that the only way out for the nazi regime amid the structural tensions in the economy and the crises caused by dictatorship and remilitarization was to strengthen the dictatorship and step up the arms race. The war for the possession of raw material and manpower resources was determined by the logic of Germany's economic development under the nazis.[6] P. Calvocoressi and G. Wint, British historians, came to the conclusion that 'the conflict of 1939-45 was a World War and not one man's war. It embraced a number of originally distinct wars which merged. Some of these were, in a formal sense, started by Hitler, but the causes of this six-year compendium of fighting in Europe have to be examined in terms of much more than Hitler, or the nazis, or Germany, or even of Europe. A World War has necessarily complex origins'.[7]

However, even such half-hearted attempts at a serious analysis of the causes of World War II are very rare.

Without saying anything explicit about the origins of World War II, bourgeois historians also fail to make a correct assessment of Hitler's 'conquest program.' Questioning the very existence of such a program, they regard the foreign and military policy of the Third Reich as a series of isolated improvisations. They affirm that when the war broke out in 1939 Germany had no overall strategic concept properly combining political sense and means with a military goal. This idea is presented in a monograph by A. Taylor, who believes that Hitler 'was not contemplating war, and probably not intending war at all.'[8]

In claiming that the nazi leadership had no precise program for conquest and advocating the 'improvisation' theory, bourgeois historians arbitrarily define the order in which individual countries were placed as targets in the German fascists' plans of aggression. There is, for example, an obvious tendency to minimize the significance of Operation Barbarossa,[9] the pivot of the Third Reich's foreign policy and the decisive operation in its struggle for supremacy in Europe. Some U.S. historians believe that to win world dominion, it was much

more important for the Reich to seize Britain's positions in the Middle East than to commit aggression against the Soviet Union. This is why the German attack on the Soviet Union is often presented as an action subordinated to the main objective, said to have been the defeat of Britain, and the operations of the British armed forces are described as being of all but decisive importance in the war. What we have here is not merely a mistake or misunderstanding but a deliberate falsification of the place and role of the Soviet-German front. Reactionary historians talk readily about Germany's 'forced' attack on the Soviet Union, repeating the old lie about a 'preventive' German war against the Soviet Union.

Numerous published records have compelled bourgeois historians to admit that these concepts are untenable. H.-A. Jacobsen, whom we have already mentioned, wrote in the early 60s: 'The German attack on the Soviet Union in 1941 was . . . no preventive war. Hitler's decision to take the offensive . . . was, in the final analysis, an expression of his policy of aggression.'[10] A. Hillgruber writes: 'The conquest of European Russia with a view to creating a German continental empire as a basis for winning Germany "world power" standing had been Hitler's great goal ever since the mid-1920s, when he conceived his program.' Hillgruber regards Operation Barbarossa as the 'crowning piece of all his previous decisions . . . to this end.'[11] This view is shared by Prof. A. Bullock of Britain. There was nothing improvised about Hitler's attack on Russia, he remarks. Of all his decisions, this was his most predetermined and most carefully planned.[12]

These opinions show that no serious analyst today can disregard the objective truth.

The controversy over the role of the Soviet-German front and the Soviet contribution to victory over nazi Germany goes on unabated.

It would seem to be perfectly clear that the Soviet-German front was the decisive front.[13] Yet many bourgeois historians misrepresent the actual course of the campaign, ignoring obvious facts.

Hanson Baldwin,[14] the U.S. military commentator and journalist, lists 11 'decisive' battles of World War II. According to him, they were the battle for Tarawa Atoll, the Anglo-American landing in Sicily, the invasion of Normandy, the naval engagement in Leyte Bay, the battles of the Ardennes and Okinawa Island, and some others. The only battle of the Soviet-German front included in the list is that of Stalingrad.

E. Dupuy, an American historian, devotes a mere three of the 33 chapters of his book[15] to the Soviet-German front. He includes the battles of the Coral Sea, Midway and Guadalcanal, the invasion of Normandy and the landing in southern France among the biggest

events of the war but does not mention a single major battle won by Soviet troops.

Developments on the Soviet-German front are misrepresented by most bourgeois historians, who generally attribute the reverses of German troops to the climate, the lack of hard-surface roads, the vast dimensions of Russia, and so on. The *Illustrated Encyclopedia of World War II* sees the main cause of the German troops being stopped before Moscow in the fact that 'so greatly had the cold disorganized the army that the Führer's orders could not be obeyed.'[16] Many Western authors link the gains of Soviet troops to the allies' military and economic aid, to the opportunity for the Soviet Union to fight on one front, and so on.

Here is a typical comment on the nazi rout before Moscow in the winter of 1941/42: 'If, in the final hour of faltering before Moscow, the Wehrmacht could have been reinforced by the German troops then committed against Britain in Africa, or compelled warily to stand guard in Western Europe and on the Mediterranean, if they could have thrown in the crack airborne battalions decimated in the bloody battle for Crete, if all the warplanes and their crews shot down in the Battle of Britain had been available, then Moscow must have fallen. Above all, had the start of Operation Barbarossa not been delayed for weeks by Wavell's victory in North Africa, and by Germany's engagement in the Balkans, total victory would probably have been achieved in Russia before the onset of winter.'[17] But an argument based on what could have happened but did not is no argument. Above all, it is absurd to imagine that a few airborne battalions or even divisions – there were about three of them in North Africa just then – could have prevented the rout of the Wehrmacht before Moscow.

R. Beitzell, an American analyst, not only puts one of the North African operations – the allies' Tunisian vistory – on a par with the Battle of Stalingrad but places the former first in some respects. The Tunisia offensive did play an appreciable part in the hostilities in North Africa.

But the fascist defeat in North Africa by no means turned the tide of World War II, whereas Stalingrad literally shook fascist Germany's military machinery to its foundations. There is indicative testimony by Field-Marshal Paulus, an experienced strategist who played a key role in planning Operation Barbarossa. 'With the beginning of the Russian November offensive and the encirclement of the Sixth Army and units of the Fourth Panzer Army – a total of 220,000 to 240,000 men,' he wrote, 'it became clearer and clearer . . . that the question was not one of "victoriously completing the war against Russia" but

of how to escape complete defeat in the East, and hence the loss of the whole war.'[18]

Western scholars seeking the truth take inspiration from the writings of Marxist historians and the publication of numerous historical records. Evaluating developments near Moscow in late 1941 and early 1942, K. Reinhardt, a young West German analyst, came to the conclusion that the fascist troops in the East were not stopped by the cold but before the first frosts – as a consequence of the disastrous state of the German units, inadequate supply and, above all, the Russian troops' staunch resistance.

H. Michel, secretary general of the International Committee on the History of World War II, assessed the battle of Stalingrad as follows: 'A great battle which sealed the fate of the Hitler invasion ... unfolded on the Volga, beneath the walls of Stalingrad. The battle brought about a decisive turn in the war. And this turn was perhaps the most amazing fact of the military history of the world.'[19] Michel also spoke highly of the Soviet Union's power and the solidity of its political system. 'In a colossal struggle whose burden it bore alone for a long time, the Soviet Union furnished conclusive proof of the solidity of its army, industry and population, and furthermore, of its political and social regime, which many doubted.'[20]

So far, the voices of bourgeois historians who try to approach the history of World War II objectively are drowned out by the chorus of falsifiers. Nevertheless, new books appearing every year give the Western reader a clearer idea of that tremendous event and the Soviet role in defeating fascism.

Bourgeois scholars of various countries and different trends examine with keen attention the record of Soviet cooperation with the West in the war years. They concern themselves, first of all, with the contradictions and differences inside the anti-Hitler coalition. Bourgeois analysts follow several lines: distorting the nature of the alliance between the Soviet Union, United States and Britain; accusing the Soviet Union of undermining the anti-Hitler coalition at the final stage of the war; attacking President Roosevelt for his alleged over-readiness to make concessions to the Soviet Union; and exaggerating the role of Anglo-American aid to the Soviet Union. Their ultimate object is to prove that the three powers' cooperation in the war years was 'unnatural.'

Not a few analysts allege that during the war the Roosevelt administration made a 'mistake' by regarding the Soviet Union as a U.S. ally. 'The strange alliance that would bring about the downfall of Nazi Germany,' writes Prof. R. Divine of Texas University, criticizing Roosevelt's foreign policy, 'had been forged largely on the basis of Roosevelt's personal diplomacy ... Roosevelt also ignored the warn-

ings of his diplomatic advisers, who believed that the divergence in principles and goals between the United States and the Soviet Union was irreconcilable.'[21]

The nature of the allies' military economic cooperation is falsified, too, by affirming, for instance, that the Soviet Union would have lost the war against Germany but for Anglo-American aid. Yet it is a fact that the Soviet Union's own war industry produced by far most of the materiel needed by the Soviet Army. And this fact is recognized by unbiased bourgeois historians. St. Embrose writes that the extension of lend-lease deliveries to the Soviet Union was of little significance to its defense. A. Clark, a British historian, draws an even more explicit conclusion. 'The Russians,' he writes, 'could have won the war on their own, or at least fought the Germans to a standstill, without any help from the West. Such relief as they derived from our participation – the distraction of a few enemy units, the supply of a large quantity of materiel, was marginal, not critical.''[22] These conclusions are logical, since the share of lend-lease deliveries to the Soviet Union amounted to less than four per cent of the country's own output.[23]

It would be wrong to deny the existence of contradictions, some of them rather serious, among the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition. However, they did not prevent the allies from cooperating effectively and fruitfully for the common goal of destroying the nazi tyranny.

Many prominent politicians and military leaders of capitalist powers showed wisdom by pointing out even during the war that this cooperation, forged in the fight against nazism, must be preserved so as to build a just world. In 1944 Admiral Leahy wrote to Roosevelt that any world conflict in the foreseeable future 'will find Britain and Russia in opposite camps.' In that event, he predicted, the United States would defend Britain but could not defeat Russia, nor could Russia defeat America. Therefore the best policy was, as he saw it, friendship among the three major allies.[24]

Shortly after the war Western leaders chose a different road, that of confrontation with the Soviet Union. This greatly damaged the cause of peace and progress. However, even in the cold war years, it was realized more and more that the sole alternative to a new world conflict endangering the very existence of mankind was cooperation among all countries to achieve durable peace. The war showed this cooperation to be feasible and fruitful. And by now it has become imperative. Unbiased evaluation of the events of World War II furthers this favorable process. It is the object of every conscientious analyst of past events.

1. See P. Schramm, *Hitler als militärischer Führer*. Frankfurt, 1962.
2. M. Baumont, *Les origines de la deuxième guerre mondiale*. Paris, 1969, pp. 12-13.
3. D. Thomson, *England in the Twentieth Century (1914-63)*. Penguin Books.
4. See V.I. Dashichev, *Bankrotstvo strategii germanskogo fashizma*. Vol. I. Moscow, 1973, pp. 323 and 359.
5. H.-A. Jacobsen, *Zur Konzeption einer Geschichte des Zweiten Weltkriegs 1939-1945*. Frankfurt, 1964, p. 23.
6. See *The Origins of the Second War*. Ed. by E. Robertson. London, 1971.
7. P. Calvocoressi and G. Wint, *Total War: Causes and Courses of the Second World War*. London, 1972, p. 4.
8. A. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War*. London, 1961, p. 218.
9. Nazi Germany's plan of a war of aggression against the Soviet Union.
10. H.-A. Jacobsen, *Deutsche Kriegsführung 1939-1945*. Hanover, 1961, p. 27.
11. A. Hillbruger, *Hitlers Strategie, Politik und Kriegsführung (1940-1941)*. Frankfurt, 1965, pp. 564-565.
12. See *The Origins of the Second War*. Ed. by E. Robertson.
13. See 'World War II: Some Figures' in this issue, p. 49.
14. Hanson Baldwin, *Battles Lost and Won: Great Campaigns of World War II*. New York, 1966.
15. E. Dupuy, *World War II*. A Compact History. New York, 1969.
16. *The Marshall Cavendish Illustrated Encyclopedia of World War II*. Vol. 5. New York, 1973, p. 584.
17. H. Maule, *The Great Battles of World War II*. London, 1972, p. 168.
18. See V.I. Dashichev, *Bankrotstvo strategii germanskogo fashizma*. Vol. II. Moscow, 1973, p. 391.
19. See *Vsemirno-istoricheskaya pobeda sovetskogo naroda 1941-1945 gg*. Materialy nauchnoi conferentsii, posvyashchenniye 25-letiu pobedy nad fashistskoi Germaniei. Moscow, 1971, p. 194.
20. H. Michel, *La Seconde guerre mondiale*. Paris, 1972, p. 122.
21. R. Divine, *Roosevelt and World War II*. Baltimore, 1972, p. 84.
22. A. Clark, *Barbarossa. The German-Russian Conflict 1941-1945*. London, 1965, p. 19.
23. See N. Voznesensky. *Voyennaya ekonomika SSSR v period Otechestvennoi voiny*. Moscow, 1948, pp. 73-74.
24. Quoted from L. Fischer. *The Road to Yalta: Soviet Foreign Relations, 1941-1945*. New York, 1972, p. 213.

World War II in figures*

Man's history, which abounds in armed conflicts, has known longer wars than World War II, which lasted six years. But no war was nearly as bloody or as devastating. Europe alone lost twice as many lives as in all the wars over the previous 350 years. The war was fought on the territory of 40 countries and involved 61 countries inhabited by 1,700 million people, or 80 per cent of the world's population. As many as 110 million men were under arms. Only six states declared formal neutrality.

Fascism means war

World War II was started by German fascism. The responsibility for its outbreak rests on imperialism as a social system.

Hitler was brought to power by the German monopolies. He served them, and had their support. Big business took the initiative of establishing a 'fund of the German industry for Hitler.' In 1933, contributions to the fund approached 30 million marks. In the six prewar years Germany's military spending exceeded 92,000 million marks and war production increased 12.5 times. Whereas in the year of the nazi coup the Krupp munitions concern made no net profit at all due to economic difficulties, in 1934-39 it made nearly 380 million marks. The profits of the Steel Trust more than doubled in 1933-37 and those of the Mannesmann industrial concern increased more than fivefold in 1933-40.

The arming of Germany was also profitable to U.S. and British monopolies. U.S. investments in German industry amounted to $1,000 million and American companies controlled 278 German firms. After Germany had become a fascist state, U.S. monopolies helped it to organize the production of synthetic fuels and other strategic materials, supplied it with patents for new inventions in aviation and sold it substantial quantities of arms.

Major British firms supplied Hitler Germany with copper, aluminum, nickel and other strategic raw materials under Bank of

*Based on data supplied by the Soviet Defense Ministry's Institute of Military History and from the press.

England guarantees. Late in 1934 this bank granted the German Reichsbank a loan of £750,000. Britain exported large quantities of arms to Germany.

Abetted by other imperialist powers intent on turning German aggression to the East, Hitler began to implement the plans for expansion long before 1939.

Munich was the culmination of the appeasement policy. In 1938 Czechoslovakia was sacrificed to Hitler. On September 1, 1939, the German fascists attacked Poland. World War II began.

Hitler over Western Europe

For eight months after Germany's attack on Poland, Britain and France, continuing their Munich policy, waged against Hitler's troops what came to be known as a 'phoney war.'

France had 110 divisions and Britain sent five divisions to the continent, but the allies refrained from active operations. By late December 1939 the French army's casualties were 1,433 killed, wounded and missing. The British had lost three men and the German troops, 696. The Wehrmacht command had left only 23 divisions on the Western front to pit its main military power against Poland. It took advantage of the Anglo-French command's inaction to seize Denmark, invade Norway and then strike at France, also overrunning Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg. Denmark was occupied in one day, Holland in five days, Belgium in 19 and France in 44 days. The hostilities in Norway lasted 63 days.

In April and June 1941 Hitler Germany occupied Yugoslavia and Greece, and seized Crete.

The Wehrmacht's casualties in killed, wounded, prisoners and missing were 44,303 in Poland, 156,501 in France, 12,207 in the Balkans and Crete and about 80,000 in North Africa, Denmark, Norway and the Atlantic and over British cities. By June 22, 1941, the nazi casualties were about 300,000 men.

In August 1940 Germany began an air war against Britain. Air raids on British cities and military objectives involved over 2,200 planes, including more than 1,200 bombers. Nevertheless, the nazis did not land in Britain, well knowing that the operation would prevent them from pursuing their chief goal, the attack on the Soviet Union.

The aggressor mobilizes against the Soviet Union

Throughout the early period of World War II nazi Germany was busy building up its military power.

In preparing to attack the Soviet Union, Germany allied itself with Italy and Japan in September, 1940, under an aggressive tripartite pact dividing the world into spheres of influence. The pact was joined

by Finland, Rumania, Hungary, Tiso Slovakia, Franco Spain and Bulgaria, as well as by the puppet government of Manchoukuo.

By then nazi Germany, which had taken possession of all the resources of the occupied and dependent countries of Europe, had substantially increased its military and economic power.

	Germany proper (within 1937 boundaries)	Together with resources of satellite and occupied countries
Population (millions)	70.2	290.0
Industrial workers (millions)	10.0	28.0
Production (million tons)		
coal	257.4	400.0
oil	0.9	7.5
steel	20.8	31.8

The nazis widely used forced labor by foreigners. In December 1940 the number of foreign workers forcibly brought to Germany totalled 1.3 million.

Germany's war production in 1940 was 76 per cent greater than in 1939 and 22 times that of 1933. Besides, nazi troops had captured the arms, ammunition and equipment of 30 Czechoslovak, 92 French, 12 British, 22 Belgian, 18 Dutch and 6 Norwegian divisions.

By June 1, 1941, the armed forces of Germany had more than doubled.

	As of Sept. 1, 1939	As of May 1, 1940	As of June 1, 1941
Divisions	103	156	214
Armored	6	10	21
Motorized	8	8	14
Tanks (in the field)	3,200	3,387	5,640
Aircraft (in action)	4,405	5,900	10,000

Decisive front of World War II

From the nazi attack on the Soviet Union to the defeat of Germany, the Soviet-German front was the decisive front of World War II.

*Ground forces of Nazi Germany and Its Satellites, 1941-1945**

Date	Soviet-German front: Divisions: German	Soviet-German front: Divisions: Satellite	Soviet-German front: Divisions: Total	Men (millions)	Guns and mortars (thous.)	Tanks and assault guns (thous.)	Aircraft (thous.)	Other fronts (divisions)	On occupied territories and in Germany (divisions)
As of June 22, 1941	153 70.3	37	190 72.6	4.6 77.0	44.0 52.0	3.7 66.0	4.0 60.0	2 0.9	63 28.8
As of Nov. 1, 1942	194 72.0	72	266 78.3	5.0 72.0	56.0 81.0	6.4 67.0	2.6 60.0	4 1.5	71 26.5
As of July 1, 1943	196 66.0	36	232 70.0	4.8 73.0	51.0 70.0	5.6 58.0	2.7 60.0	8 2.7	93 31.3
As of Jan. 1, 1944	201 63.4	44	245 67.9	4.2 63.0	46.7 71.4	5.3 53.3	2.8 56.0	21 6.6	95 30.0
As of June 1, 1944	182 55.5	58	240 62.1	3.2 48.0	38.7 71.5	4.9 57.0	2.4 51.3	26 7.9	12 36.6
As of Jan. 1, 1945	179 57.1	17	196 59.2	2.8 52.4	27.3 67.7	3.8 63.3	1.7 47.6	118 37.6	17 5.3

*Rounded figures. Numerator stands for absolute figures and denominator for percentages. Data on personnel and materiel refer to Germany only.

Throughout the war huge casualties on the Soviet-German front compelled the Hitler command to move more and more divisions to this front from Western Europe. It transferred 17 divisions in 1941, 69 in 1942, 46 in 1943, 80 in 1944 and 56 in 1945, or 268 divisions in all, 80 of which were replacements.

For 1,418 days Soviet troops fought the enemy on a front stretching 3,000 to 6,200 kilometres in length and 2,000 to 3,000 kilometres in depth. The length of the North African and Italian fronts was at most 350 kilometres, and the West European front was 800 kilometres long. Whereas on the Soviet-German front active combat operations were carried on for 1,320 days (93 per cent of the total duration of hostilities), in North Africa they lasted 309 days (29 per cent of the total duration there), in Italy 492 days (74 per cent) and in Western Europe 293 days (87 per cent).

The main forces of the Wehrmacht were defeated on the Soviet-German front. The Soviet Army destroyed, routed or took prisoner 506.5 German divisions, which exceeded more than three times the strength of Hitler's army in June 1941, when it invaded the Soviet Union. Also defeated were 100 divisions of Germany's satellites (Anglo-American troops defeated or took prisoner on all their fronts 176 divisions). Altogether, the armed forces of Germany lost in the East about 10 million men (77 per cent of their casualties in World War II), 62,000 planes (62 per cent), about 56,000 tanks and assault guns (about 75 per cent), and roughly 180,000 guns and mortars (about 74 per cent). Soviet troops destroyed over 2,500 warships and transport vessels of the nazi navy.

Soviet partisans during the war

The Great Patriotic War was waged both on the front and in the German rear, in the Soviet territories occupied by the nazi invaders.

The partisan movement, which numbered over 1,300,000, assumed a tremendous scale. Soviet partisans derailed more than 20,000 trains, blew up 58 armored trains, put 10,000 locomotives and 110,000 railway cars out of action, destroyed over 12,000 railway and highway bridges and more than 65,000 motor vehicles, mined and disabled over 2,300 tanks and armored cars and shot down or destroyed in airfields upwards of 1,100 planes. During the war partisans and other resistance fighters killed, wounded or took prisoner 1.5 million officers and men, members of the occupation personnel and traitors who helped them.

The fight in the occupied areas was led by Communist Party organizations. Operating in the Ukraine were 23 regional, 685 city and district underground Party committees and over 4,300 branches, and

in Byelorussia, 10 regional, 185 inter-district, city and district committees and 1,316 branches.

Victory of the socialist economy

The Soviet socialist economy proved its efficiency during the war by meeting the needs of the army and the home front.

In the early months after the German invasion, the Soviet Union lost important industrial and agricultural areas. From June to November 1941, industrial production decreased to less than half.

The Soviet economy had to be put on a war footing in the most trying conditions. In 1941-42 millions of people and over 2,500 industrial plants were evacuated to safe areas. The Eastern areas became the main manufacturers of munitions. In the second half of 1942 Soviet industry was producing more major weapons and other materiel than German industry. Up to 40 per cent of this output came from the Urals. During the war Soviet industry made 137,000 planes, 104,000 tanks and self-propelled guns, and 488,000 artillery pieces. It produced more war materiel than nazi Germany.

The Soviet Union received some weapons and materiel from the United States and Great Britain: 9,600 guns (less than two per cent of the Soviet output), 18,700 aircraft (about 12 per cent), 10,800 tanks (10 per cent). Automobile supplies were substantially greater, 401,400 vehicles. The total volume of Anglo-American supplies to the Soviet Union amounted to about four per cent of Soviet output.

Internationalist assistance to the peoples of Europe

The Soviet Union gave comprehensive political, material and military help to the peoples of Europe in their struggle for liberation from fascist occupation.

Soviet arms, ammunition, medical supplies and transmitters were delivered to partisans in other countries. In 1944 alone, Soviet long-range aircraft flew 1,460 missions to Yugoslavia with some 3,000 tons of military cargo. That year Czechoslovak anti-fascists received more than 10,000 rifles, submachine guns, carbines, handguns, about 1,000 machine guns, seven million rounds of ammunition, hundreds of anti-tank rifles. The Polish partisan headquarters were supplied with 53 trucks, 5 aircraft, 18 transmitters, 4,270 submachine guns, 8,600 rifles, 234 machine guns, 52 mortars, 137 anti-tank rifles, and 120 tons of explosives, ammunition and food. Soviet aircraft delivered large quantities of war materiel to Bulgaria, Greece, Albania and other countries.

Many leading figures of the communist movement lived in the Soviet Union during the war, and the bureaus of a number of Communist and Workers' parties functioned there. Representatives of the

Communist parties of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania were stationed with the Ukrainian Partisan Movement Headquarters for liaison. In April 1944, the headquarters helped set up a Polish partisan movement headquarters, assisted by many experienced Soviet resistance organizers. At the request of leaders of fraternal parties and national anti-fascist organizations, the Partisan Headquarters trained commandos for action behind enemy lines.

Foreign combat units were formed on Soviet territory, and they fought side by side with the Soviet Army. The Soviet Union helped to form two armies, three army corps, a tank and an air corps, 30 infantry, artillery, anti-aircraft and air divisions, 31 brigades and 182 regiments of different kinds, a large number of separate battalions, air squadrons and other Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav, Rumanian, Hungarian and French units. By the end of the war they numbered more than 550,000, and had some 960,000 rifles, carbines and submachine guns, 40,627 machine guns, 16,502 guns and mortars, 1,124 tanks and self-propelled gun mounts, 2,346 aircraft and other war materiel. In 1944-45, the Soviet Union also helped reorganize and rearm the Bulgarian People's Army, the Yugoslav National-Liberation Army and the Albanian National-Liberation Army.

Towards the end of March 1944, Soviet troops reached the frontier with Rumania, by mid-July they approached the Polish border and began to liberate a number of European countries. For more than a year over seven million Soviet soldiers engaged in heavy fighting with the nazis in Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Finland, Norway, Germany and Denmark. Soviet troops entered Bulgaria on a mission of liberation.

The Soviet Army paid a high price for the liberation of the peoples of other countries from fascism, with losses outside Soviet territory exceeding three million, more than a million of them killed in action: 600,000 in Poland, over 140,000 in Czechoslovakia, 140,000 in Hungary, 69,000 in Rumania, 26,000 in Austria, 8,000 in Yugoslavia, and more than 102,000 on German territory and in the course of the Berlin operation.

Although the Soviet Union's economic situation was difficult owing to the war dislocation, it gave the liberated peoples considerable help in food, medical supplies, and other assistance. Sixty thousand tons of grain and large quantities of fats and oils, sugar, vegetables and dried fruit were rushed to the starving population of nazi-ruined Warsaw. The people of Vienna received 92,000 tons of grain and cereals, 6,000 tons of sugar, 8,000 tons of meat, 2,500 tons of fats and oils. As many as 9,000 tons of grain were supplied to Prague, 4,400 tons of grain and 375 tons of sugar to Brno, and 3,600 tons of grain and 325 tons of sugar to Moravska Ostrava. Some 53,000 tons of grain and

other products were shipped to Yugoslavia. Material aid was also given to many cities of Rumania, Hungary, Finland and Germany. Immediately after the war Berlin was supplied with 105,000 tons of grain, 18,000 tons of meat products, 4,500 tons of fats and oils, 6,000 tons of sugar and large quantities of potatoes, salt, coffee and other products.

The resistance movement in occupied Europe

The anti-fascist struggle of the peoples of occupied Europe – the Resistance Movement – was an integral part of the Second World War.

Its main organizers and leaders were the Communist parties. To rally all patriotic forces against the fascist oppressors they elaborated national programs of liberation and anti-fascist struggle. Despite the opposition of right-wing bourgeois elements, they were able to forge and head national and patriotic fronts bringing together representatives of different sections of the population irrespective of political or religious views. The Resistance was a broad democratic movement.

In some countries (Yugoslavia, Poland, Slovakia, France, Belgium, Italy, Greece and Albania) the Resistance movements developed into wars of national liberation. In Holland, Denmark and Norway the main forms of resistance were strikes and mass anti-fascist demonstrations, in Germany anti-fascist groups engaged in clandestine activity.

Millions of partisans and other Resistance fighters battled the fascist invaders. There were 500,000 in France, 462,000 in Italy, 350,000 in Poland, 250,000 in Bulgaria, 140,000 in Greece. By the end of the war the Yugoslav People's Liberation Army numbered 800,000.

The Communists made the greatest sacrifices in the fight against fascism: 75,000 died in France, more than 50,000 in Yugoslavia, 25,000 in Czechoslovakia, 26,000 in Germany. Thousands of Communists met heroes' deaths in Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Austria, Belgium and other countries.

The Soviet Army's decisive victories and the landing of U.S. and British forces in France gave the Resistance Movement powerful impetus. Its final stages were highlighted by armed popular uprisings in Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Poland, Rumania, France, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In the final stages of the war the armies of Bulgaria and Rumania joined the fight against the nazis.

In Central and Southeastern Europe the anti-fascist national-liberation movements organized victorious popular revolutions. In Western Europe they prepared the ground for a powerful upsurge of the workers' and democratic movement.

Communist influence among the masses grew tremendously during

the war, with many people joining their ranks. In 1939 there were 61 Communist parties in the world with a total membership of around four million; by September 1945 there were 76 Communist and Workers' parties with 20 million members.

The anti-Hitler coalition

In the war against the powers of the fascist bloc, an alliance of states with opposite socio-political systems took shape for the first time in history.

The Soviet-British agreement on joint operations in the war against Germany was signed on July 12, 1941. Treaties were also signed between the Soviet Union and Poland and the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. A conference of representatives of the Soviet Union, United States and Great Britain in Moscow at the end of 1941 agreed on deliveries of war materiel, arms, raw materials and food. On May 26, 1942, the Soviet-British treaty of alliance in the war against Hitler Germany and her associates in Europe, and of collaboration and mutual assistance after the war, was signed in London. On June 11, 1942, the USSR and the USA signed a memorandum on the principles of mutual assistance in the war against aggression.

The formation of the anti-Hitler coalition created important prerequisites for victory over the common enemy.

The Soviet Union was the leading force of the coalition. Its program of a democratic solution of international issues provided the basis for the decisions of the Teheran, Crimean and Potsdam conferences of the three Great Powers.

However, the military and political strategy of the U.S. and Great Britain was influenced by their imperialist aspirations. This was especially evident in their approach to the problem of the second front, which was the most effective and swiftest way of bringing about the defeat of Hitler Germany.

The Soviet government raised the issue of a second front in Europe on July 18, 1941. Eleven months later the allies responded with a promise to open it before the end of 1942. Actually, as everyone knows, the allied landing in France began only in June 1944. For three years the Soviet Union fought the enemy alone while the allies limited themselves to operations in secondary theatres. No wonder that up to the summer of 1944 the nazi high command kept only from two to 21 divisions facing U.S. and British troops, that is, from 0.9 to 6.6 per cent of its ground forces.

The second front was opened only after it became apparent that the Soviet Union, with the support of the Resistance Movement, was capable of defeating Germany and liberating the whole of Europe by itself. In 11 months of action the allied armies occupied France,

Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and Denmark and the western part of Germany. The joint efforts of the armed forces of the Western allies and the USSR hastened the end of the war and were indicative of the strength and viability of the anti-fascist bloc.

Imperialism's most heinous crime

The Second World War wrought death and destruction on an unprecedented scale. It was imperialism's most heinous crime against humanity.

More than 50 million people perished in the flames of the war. In Europe alone damage is estimated at $260 billion (in contemporary prices).

The Soviet Union suffered the greatest losses. More than 20 million Soviet people died on the battlefields, in nazi air raids, were shot by the invaders or annihilated in concentration camps. Some three million Soviet Communists lost their lives in action.

The invaders reduced to ruins 1,710 Soviet cities and towns and more than 70,000 villages. They blew up or gutted 32,000 industrial enterprises, destroyed 65,000 kilometres of railway track, plundered 98,000 collective farms, 1,876 state farms and 2,890 machine-and-tractor stations. The country lost 30 per cent of its national wealth; the material damage suffered by the Soviet Union is estimated at $128 billion. Add to this the cost of fighting the war, and the Soviet Union's bill runs up to $485 billion, or considerably more than the combined total of the United States, Great Britain and France.

The nazis are guilty of the death of 6,028,000 Polish citizens, of whom only 644,000 died as a result of military action. The others were murdered.

Yugoslavia lost 1.7 million people in the war, or 10.8 per cent of its total population. Of these, the losses of the People's Liberation Army made up 306,000 persons, the rest died as a result of fascist reprisals.

The peoples of Great Britain, France and other European countries also suffered heavy losses.

Hitler fascism is also responsible for the national catastrophe it brought on the German people. Germany lost about six million dead, five million of them on the battle-fronts, 410,000 in air raids, and 200,000 people were victims of nazi terror.

The experience of the 30 years since the end of the war in Europe shows that its cruel lessons have not been wasted on mankind. Proof of this is the unparalleled movement of the peoples for peace, with the socialist countries in the front ranks. 'Never again!' is the clarion call of hundreds of millions all over the world, who thereby pay homage to those who died in the Second World War and to the foresight and courage of those fighting today for détente, disarmament and eliminating the threat of new wars.

Awareness of historical responsibility

C. Rajeswara Rao
General Secretary,
CP of India

Importance of the Congress

The 10th Congress of the Communist Party of India (CPI) held at Vijayawada from January 27 to February 2, was truly a historic Congress. It was a tremendous success. This is admitted by friends and foes alike. It has brought forth vividly the all-sided unity and growth of our Party in the last five years of turmoil and big developments in the country.

It will be recalled in this connection that a decade ago the communist movement in India was split* under the inspiration of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and the CPI had to work under very adverse and difficult conditions. Because of its principled ideological, programmatic, political and practical positions based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the struggles it conducted in the interests of the masses and the nation, the CPI has considerably advanced. It is a matter of pride for us that our Party has today emerged as an important political force on the national scene. It is because of this that Indian reactionaries and U.S. imperialists have made our Party their main target of attack, while heaping praise on the split-away CPM as a truly national party.

The 10th Congress of the Indian Communists is important from another aspect also. This is the 50th year of the foundation of our Party. The Congress has decided to celebrate this historic event in a fitting manner. The CPI was born in the wake of the salvoes of the Great October Socialist Revolution headed by immortal Lenin. We are proud of the great achievements of our Party over half a century of its heroic existence marked by many trials and tribulations and ups and downs. Its contribution to the struggle for freedom, democracy, unity and progress of our country far outweighs its mistakes. Our

* For more information about this see Rao's article, 'Left and Democratic Unity Against the Right Threat,' in *World Marxist Review*. August 1973. – *Ed.*

Party fought many a struggle and made sacrifices in defense of the interests of the toiling people. Ours was the first Party in the country to take the noble ideology of Marxism-Leninism to the people. It was also the first to take the most humane ideal of socialism on the Indian soil. We are proud that today socialism is the accepted goal of our people.

It is a happy occasion for all of us in the CPI that we held a very successful Party Congress which charted out the clear-cut path forward. Our Party Congress issued a ringing call to the Party units for mobilizing the masses in the economic and political struggles to defend democracy and people's rights and to defeat the pincer attack of internal reaction and imperialism.

Notable features

The most notable features of the Party Congress were the following:

The serious deliberations of 1,600 delegates for six days, the unanimous adoption of the political resolution and other documents and the unanimous election of the leading bodies of the Party are a conclusive expression of the ideological, political and organizational unity our Party has achieved.

This unity is born out of the bitter experience of life and death mass struggles our Party has waged in this most turbulent period in defense of democracy, unity and independence of our motherland, foiling the conspiracies of home reactionaries and U.S. imperialists. It is born out of the big struggles our Party has waged in defense of the interests of the toiling masses and against the anti-people's policies of the Government.

Another notable feature of the Congress was the spirit of genuine proletarian internationalism. The presence of delegations from 28 countries and fraternal messages of greetings from 23 parties were a unique event in the history of the CPI. The delegations and messages came from parties of the states of the socialist community, notably from the Party of the Great Lenin, from the continents of Asia, Africa, America, Latin America and Europe. It was in fact a recognition of the contribution the CPI has made as a militant and loyal detachment of the international communist movement and of the correctness of its political-tactical line. This was repeatedly expressed in the speeches by the leaders of the fraternal delegations and in the messages received from brother parties, which highly appreciated the role of the CPI in the national and international spheres.

The leader of the CPSU delegation, S.R. Rashidov, expressed these sentiments in his message in the following words:

'The CPI is a militant detachment of the international communist movement and is making a weighty contribution to the joint struggle

of the Communists against imperialism and reaction.' Further on he said, the CPI '. . . is in the van of the patriotic, anti-imperialist struggle to enhance the country's political and economic independence and promote its social and economic progress. Indian Communists are playing an active role in defending the democratic gains of the people of India against the onslaught of right-wing reaction and pro-imperialist circles.'

The militant 200,000-strong demonstration and 500,000-strong rally on the concluding day were a crowning finale to this historic Congress. It was a fitting rebuff to all the slanders poured on our Party that it is isolated from the people because of its political line. The unprecedented rally and demonstration showed conclusively that our Party has gained enormous influence and has dug deep roots among the toiling masses because of its correct ideology, program, political line and principled positions it has taken on burning issues facing our country and our people.

In the van of the people's struggle

Taking stock of the developments in the country, the political report submitted to the Congress stated that the economic situation has been rapidly deteriorating in the period since the Congress in October 1971 because of the capitalist path of development pursued by the ruling Congress Party and also because of the impact of the deepening world capitalist crisis. This has given rise to abject poverty, ever-rising unemployment and spiralling of prices, subjecting people to untold misery. Even according to official figures, 40 per cent of the population are living below subsistence level and 30 million are fully unemployed out of whom three million are educated unemployed. The wholesale price index climbed from 180.6 in March 1971 to 315.5 in January 1975. The prices of foodgrains rose still higher, from 200 to 375 in the same period.

This lies at the root of the acute discontent among the people which is bursting forth into mass political and economic struggles against the monopolists, landlords, wholesale traders and the imperialist exploiters and the compromising policies of the Congress Government towards these bloodsuckers of the people.

In fact, the three-year period since the last Congress had been one of innumerable mass political and economic struggles. Never before in the history of our Party were so many struggles fought in such a short period. The Party also conducted several movements on international issues in fulfilling its internationalist duty.

Here we mention only a few of these countrywide movements and struggles in this period. When the monopolists wanted to secure hold of the country's economy through the strategem of so-called joint

sector, it was our Party which exposed and fought against it. In the all-India struggle launched by the Communists in August 1972, about 350,000 people were arrested. Among them were Party leaders, rank and file members and militants. Ultimately, the Central Government had to declare openly that it is opposed to the scheme of the monopolists.

In March 1973, the CPI and its mass organizations organized a great march to the capital city of Delhi to submit a petition containing the most burning demands of the people to the Indian Parliament. In the march, over a half a million working people from all walks of life coming from the four corners of the country took part. The mass petition was signed by more than 15 million people. The march galvanized the people and laid the basis for further bigger struggles.

When the monopolists and wholesale traders began open loot of the people through the creating of an artificial scarcity of foodgrains and other essential goods and steeply pushing up prices, the CPI launched an all-India struggle in 1973 and 1974 against the nefarious black-market and hoarding operations. It carried on countrywide dehoarding campaigns and in a number of places distributed the dehoarded stocks of essential commodities to the people at controlled prices. The Central and State Governments were forced to take some measures, though half-hearted, against the anti-people's activities of the profiteers.

The CPI also played a leading role in the united strike struggles of the jute, textile, railway, agricultural workers and peasants in which millions took part. Some of these struggles were successful in achieving the demands of the masses.

When reactionary forces tried to drown the country in linguistic and chauvinist movements, our Party opposed their game tooth and nail. The Andhra Pradesh organization of the Party fought a bitter battle against the chauvinist separatist movement of reaction and played a leading role in defeating it in unity with left and democratic sections of the Congress.

Similarly, when the counter-revolutionary forces led by Jayaprakash Narayan* planned subversion of the secular democratic set-up of our country and installation of a dictatorship, it was again our Party which staked its all to defeat it. A crucial battle was fought in the State of Bihar on this issue. The Bihar State organization of our Party, in unity with the left and democratic sections inside the Congress, inflicted a defeat on the counter-revolutionary forces. After their

* Jayaprakash Narayan, (JP), Congress left-winger in the past, stepped down from active politics in the late 1950s, and re-emerged on the scene in 1974 as head of a reactionary movement in Bihar State. – *Ed.*

failure in Bihar, the home state of Jayaprakash Narayan, the counter-revolutionary forces are doing everything to spread the movement to other states in the country. Our Party is leaving no stone unturned in its efforts to unite the left and democratic forces and face the reactionary offensive.

Our Party has been actively conducting movements and campaigns in support of world peace, and national-liberation struggles and against imperialist maneuvers. Along with all-India peace and friendship organizations and other mass organizations it organized mass movements in support of the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people, the Arab peoples' struggle against the Zionist regime in Israel and the U.S. imperialists, the struggle of the African peoples for freedom, and the resistance of the heroic people of Chile to the fascist military junta. The Party campaigned for the establishment of full diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic and socialist Cuba and for recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam.

What has been mentioned above covers only the countrywide movements and struggles conducted by our Party or in which it played a leading role. The struggles and movements conducted by the state organizations are not mentioned here.

Because of the role played by our Party in these struggles and movements, its influence has grown considerably, and it has spread to new areas. Its membership has gone up from 225,000 to 355,000 during the three years since the Ninth Congress.

All this has given the lie to the false propaganda dished out by the reactionary press that our Party is riven with deep dissensions. The reactionaries, who consider our Party their enemy, hoped that it would emerge out of the Congress divided and ineffective. But they miscalculated.

Reactionaries launch offensive

The all-round success of the Party Congress has naturally infuriated reaction and reactionary vested interests. The big business press has intensified its slander campaign against the CPI with the object of isolating it from the progressive sections of the Congress. They know quite well that it is the CPI which has played a key role in foiling their conspiracies till now. Therefore, they consider the CPI to be their inveterate enemy whom they want to destroy by all means.

The 10th Congress assessed the present internal and international situation and formulated the tasks before the Party in the coming period. It stated that the crisis of the capitalist path of development pursued by the Congress Party leadership has reached an explosive point, giving rise to unprecedented mass discontent.

Our country has entered a stormy period of confrontation between left and democratic forces, on the one side, and forces of counter-revolution, on the other. It is faced with a situation full of opportunities for revolutionary advance even while it is confronted with the threat of counter-revolutionary reversal.

Home reactionaries and U.S. imperialists have launched a pincer attack to subvert the secular democratic set-up and install a counter-revolutionary dictatorship in its place. Thereafter they want to reverse all the progressive policies of our country like independent economic development and self-reliance, anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, anti-racialism, friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and friendship with progressive regimes in the newly independent countries, and take our country into the lap of neo-colonialism of the U.S. imperialists.

With this nefarious aim, internal reaction is using every means, including attempts at tampering with the loyalty of the armed forces, to create anarchy and chaos, while U.S. imperialists are doing everything to blackmail our country into submission through building military bases in the neighboring countries and in the Indian Ocean and re-arming Pakistan. The CIA outfit is working overtime to stir up troubles inside our country. Thereby the U.S. imperialists have already put their notorious theory of 'de-stabilization' into practice in our sub-continent.

In this connection it should be remembered that reaction has changed its slogans and tactics today. It no longer mouths openly reactionary slogans as in 1969-71. Now it talks of 'total revolution' and 'basic changes' in the socio-economic structure of the country. It is trying to don a left mask and to take up popular slogans like anti-corruption and anti-price-rise. In the person of Jayaprakash Narayan it has found a leader with a leftist background. It praises Mao and his disruptive policies and attracts Maoist groups and left opportunist parties like the Socialist Party and the CPM. It set up a candidate belonging to a left party in the presidential election. All this is being done to fool the people.

This is nothing new. History tells us that fascism uses left slogans and demagogy in its bid to capture power. Hitler also talked of socialism and ending unemployment. He called his party the National Socialist German Workers' Party! But after he came to power, he massacred everybody – Communists, Socialists, Democrats and even humanist religious preachers. A similar policy is now pursued by the Chilean reactionaries.

Naturally the question arises as to whether the offensive of the counter-revolutionary forces headed by Jayaprakash Narayan can be defeated. We say, yes. There are enough democratic forces in our

country to fight against the attempt to stage a counter-revolution, but they have to be united. The left and centrist forces inside the Congress, the ruling party of our country, are realizing the danger of counter-revolutionary forces. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has come out in a forthright way in pointing to this danger and called for a fight to avert it. The President of the Congress Party has reiterated that it will meet the challenge thrown up by Jayaprakash Narayan and counter-revolutionary forces to destroy democracy in the country by giving a fitting rebuff to them.

However, the Congress Party must realize that the JP-led counter-revolutionary forces cannot be fought by mere words. It should be remembered that JP is utilizing the mass discontent born out of the wretched conditions of the people and misleading them by demagogic propaganda.

The Congress Governments should implement their promises, expeditiously, to give relief to the masses. Congressmen should unite with other left and democratic parties to force their own governments to implement the program. That is the only way to fight the counter-revolutionary movement. It is precisely this that the CPI has been fighting for consistently.

An important factor is that the people of our country have moved to the left. The toiling sections of the people are realizing the danger posed by reaction, despite the misery heaped on them by Congress rule, because their class enemies – the monopolists, landlords and black-marketeers – are all veering round to JP. True, large sections of the middle classes and upper sections of the peasantry are carried away temporarily by the demagogy of JP because of their anger against Congress misrule. They can be won over through united struggles of the masses for their own demands and a proper exposure of the demagogy of reaction.

Another factor to be taken note of is that we have an extremely favorable international situation. The world capitalist system is today enmeshed in an insoluble crisis, while the world socialist system headed by the mighty Soviet Union is advancing from strength to strength. The world forces of peace, democracy and socialism are marching ahead successfully despite some setbacks here and there, while the forces of imperialism and world reaction are forced to retreat.

A negative factor

In this most complicated and crucial situation one serious negative factor is the opportunist role played by some of the left parties like the Socialist Party and the CPM in ganging up with reaction out of blind hatred towards the ruling Congress Party.

The Socialist Party pursuing an open opportunist line of allying with reaction has already undergone a split. One section has joined the Bharatiya Lok Dal, a party of reaction. The other faction, while going by the name of the Socialist Party, is also in the camp of reaction. It will not be surprising if this faction is also swallowed up by right-wing forces in future.

The leadership of the CPM, though it is still keeping a fig leaf of demarcation, for all practical purposes is at one with JP's counter-revolutionary movement. Though under the plea that reactionary parties are in it, the CPM leadership has not joined JP's movement, it supports its reactionary aims and launches convergent movements with it. Inside Parliament, it is working jointly with the Jana Sangh and other reactionary parties.

In order to justify their betrayal, some of the CPM leaders are trotting out the theory that the danger of fascism in our country comes through Indira Gandhi. Blind hatred of the Congress is leading them into the camp of JP-led counter-revolution. The demagogic slogans of 'total revolution,' 'partyless democracy,' 'root out corruption,' 'eradicate poverty and unemployment' and so on, raised by Jayaprakash Narayan are only an Indian variant of fascism.

The present political set-up in our country is bourgeois-democratic in character with all its inherent contradictions and limitations. But the dark forces behind Jayaprakash Narayan, though they vow fidelity to democracy, are working for a counter-revolutionary dictatorship of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie and the landlords.

Those who cannot make this distinction between bourgeois democracy and counter-revolutionary dictatorship have no right to speak in the name of Marxism-Leninism. History will not forgive them for the role they are playing in paving the way for the establishment of a counter-revolutionary dictatorship in our country.

For the left parties there is no third alternative before them as the CPM leadership is claiming. It is sheer self-deception. The alternatives are – the unity of the left and democratic forces, including progressive sections of the Congress, as enunciated by our Party, or siding with the reactionary and chauvinist forces led by Jayaprakash Narayan.

The CPM and healthy sections of the Socialist Party will have to give up their path of left opportunism as events unfold and the ugly face of counter-revolution is fully revealed.

The impact of the Tenth Congress of our Party on the ranks of the CPM and their masses has been quite big. Hence the leaders of that Party have become desperate and are trying to counteract it through booklets and leaflets, spreading wild slanders against the CPI. But the

masses and cadres of the CPM and the Socialist Party are sure to force their leadership to retract their dangerous path and join forces against reaction.

Clarion call of the Party Congress

In this most complicated and crucial situation, the 10th Congress of our Party has given a clarion call for defeating the conspiracies of reactionaries and imperialists, through channeling the acute discontent of the people into revolutionary mass struggles in defense of democracy, unity and integrity of our country and for urgent demands of the people.

It has urged upon the Party members to leave no stone unturned and work ceaselessly for the unity of left and democratic forces, including progressive sections of the Congress, to defeat reactionaries and imperialists and take the country along the road of full-fledged democracy, leading to socialism.

The Party Congress stated that the battle between reactionaries on the one hand, and left and democratic forces, on the other, will be fought on the pivotal issue of India's path of development. It emphasized that the crisis which has gripped all aspects of our national life cannot be solved by ad hoc measures or patchwork reforms but only through basic socio-economic changes: nationalize the 75 monopoly houses, take over imperialist capital, remove our country from the world capitalist division of labor, develop still closer relations with the Soviet Union as well as other friendly socialist states, abolish landlordism, distribute land to the tillers, and bring about radical democratic changes in the state structure.

It has issued a ringing call to strengthen the world forces of peace, democracy and socialism, to make détente irreversible, for the removal of U.S. military bases in the Indian Ocean and making it a zone of peace, for forging Asian collective security step by step. The Indian Communists seek to mobilize the masses for implementation of the agreements our country has signed with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and for strengthening our country's bonds of friendship with them. This will go a long way in helping the acute problems our country is facing today and in taking it forward.

While enjoining Party branches to popularize the above tasks of the national democratic revolution, the 10th Congress put forward an immediate minimum program for the mobilization of the masses into movements and struggles and for opening the path of democratic advance.

Perspective of left and democratic governments

The 10th Congress put forward before our people the perspective of

left and democratic governments in the states and at the center in the light of the rich and inspiring experience of the united front government of Kerala headed by C. Achutha Menon, one of the top leaders of the Communist Party.

India is a big country with 600 million people, a number of developed nationalities, large tribes, people belonging to all religions of the world in large numbers. Unity in diversity is the phenomenon of our country.

The system of state power is complicated with state governments as well as a central government. Hence the path of advance of the left and democratic forces and the establishment of left and democratic governments in the states and at the center is a very complex process.

'It is obvious that there cannot be a left and democratic government at the center unless the broad masses following the Congress and left and democratic Congressmen from their own experience, come to realize the urgent need for such a government,' the Party Congress resolution says. 'The Party must discharge the task of orienting the political and mass movements and bringing about the change in correlation of forces necessary to lead up to such a situation. The task cannot be discharged by shortcuts or parliamentary maneuvers. Nor can it be discharged by trying to cash in on anti-Congressism, which will only divide the democratic masses.

'As a part of realization of the above perspective, the Party will firmly fight against all anti-democratic, anti-people's policies of the present government, as well as against all attempts to replace it by a rightist combination in any form. It will fight against every attempt to shift the present government to the Right. It will fight to defend the democratic gains of the people and to shift the government policies towards the Left . . .'

About left and democratic governments in the states, the political resolution states: '. . . in the states where conditions mature for it and real possibilities emerge, the Party will press in the direction of a government consisting of left and progressive Congressmen, the CPI and other left and democratic parties which are prepared to implement a commonly-agreed program. The present Government in Kerala headed by Achutha Menon, which has already registered great successes, is the first and significant example of such governments. This can be made possible only if the left and democratic sections obtain a dominant position in the state Congress leadership, or if these sections constitute an important force and are prepared, in the course of struggle against the right inside and outside the Congress, to join hands with us and left and democratic parties to form a government and implement a commonly-agreed program. The entire issue must not, however, be viewed as a mere matter of elections and electoral

combinations. The battle for bringing about such a development in the states has to be won in the arena of the mass movement.'

Build a militant party organization

The 10th Congress has called upon the branches to continue building a militant Party capable of facing all contingencies in the coming critical and stormy period. It has also urged them to build a mass Party well-rooted in the toiling people and firmly based on the great ideology of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Concrete measures for building the Party and mass organizations are elaborated in the report on Party organization adopted by the Congress. They are: building of united leading teams in the states, expanding the system of Party education to raise the ideological and political level of the members, training the cadres through organizing permanent schools in the states, and building up powerful mass organizations. The Congress has set forth certain organizational targets to be fulfilled as part of the 50th anniversary celebrations of the foundation of the Party. The Party membership is to be increased to 500,000; a special Party fund of five million rupees to be collected; circulation of all Party journals to be increased by 50 per cent and the membership of mass organizations of the CPI to be substantially increased.

In the coming period our Party will work hard to mobilize people on the immediate program outlined in the political resolution adopted by the 10th Congress. We will continue to resolutely head the seething mass discontent against the anti-people's policies of the Government. We will organize countrywide campaigns and struggles for the implementation of the land ceiling laws, for the organization of a public distribution system to supply essential commodities to the people at controlled prices, against the aggressive activities of U.S. imperialism endangering the independence of our country and for making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, against the counter-revolutionary movement headed by Jayaprakash Narayan for subversion of the democratic set-up and reversal of the progressive policies of our country.

Only through successfully fighting the reactionaries and imperialists and foiling their conspiracies can our country be taken forward along the path of revolutionary democratic advance, finally reaching the goal of socialism.

The fight against reaction is not a fight to preserve the status quo. It will not remain confined to the political sphere. This broad popular movement is bound to invade the socio-economic base of the reactionaries and bring out a realignment of forces in the country, including inside the ruling Congress Party. The opportunist left parties

cannot remain unaffected by this process. Healthy sections of these parties and masses behind them are bound to join the current of the unity of the left and democratic forces. This process will pave the way for basic changes in the socio-economic set-up of our country and the emergence of left and democratic governments in the states and at the center.

History has placed a great responsibility on the shoulders of our Party in the most crucial period before our country and the world. The CPI will rise to the occasion to fulfil its historic duty as an important contingent of the world communist movement.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the foundation of our Party, inspired by its revolutionary traditions and thousands of its martyrs, we pledge that we will not flinch from any sacrifice in fulfilling the tasks laid down by the 10th Congress.

The Marxist-Leninist party of our time

CLOSING OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF OPINIONS

By organizing the exchange of opinions on the Marxist-Leninist Party of Our Time, the *WMR* Commission on Party Work hoped to facilitate generalization of the experience in Party development accumulated by Communists in the different conditions of different countries, to single out the qualities which enable Communist parties to direct the revolutionary activity of the working class and enhance their role in society. The 12 articles* published during the discussion combine theoretical analysis with a rendering of the specific experience of parties, and show how Marxist-Leninist ideas of party development are put into practice, extended and enriched.

The articles 'Organizer of Revolutionary Action' (A. Sobolev, USSR), 'The Force Cementing and Transforming Society' (A. Dobieszewski, Poland), and 'Fidelity to Revolutionary Principles' (O. Sanchez, Guatemala) analyze the qualities implicit in a party of revolutionary action and criticize reformist tendencies in the working-class movement inevitably reflected in party development. 'Vanguard of the Working Class, Organizer of the Masses' (R. Iscaro, Argenti-

*See *WMR*, Nos, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 1974 and Nos. 2 and 4, 1975.

na), 'The Vanguard of the Working Class and the Dynamics of Social Development' (H. Wolf, GDR), and 'Force of Circumstances and Communist Will' (L. Sanchez, Nicaragua) deal with the problem of party - class - masses. The articles 'Marxism-Leninism Is Creativity' by Gus Hall, USA, 'The Search for New Ways, Fidelity' by Ib Nørlund, Denmark, 'Theory Throws Light on the Road of Struggle' by B. Matthews, Britain, examine the parties' ideological resources, theoretical work, and cultivation of socialist consciousness among the masses. 'The Advance Guard' (T. Varela, Colombia) and 'The Party Begins with Its Basic Unit, the Nucleus' (M. Paredes, Honduras) analyze the party's basic organizational principles and their creative use in the concrete conditions of revolutionary struggle. K.H. Schröder's article, 'Organization of Internationalists' (FRG), deals with the dialectics of the national and international in a party's activity, and the present-day criteria of internationalism. This topic was also prominent in many of the other articles.

The discussion evoked response among our readers. Letters to the Editor are expressive of the wish to contribute to the analysis of the determinative features of the Marxist-Leninist party of our time. V. Savenko, of the USSR, speaks of the mass character of parties as an essential quality, of the ableness of present-day Party cadres, and the Communists' capacity for assuming responsibility for the basic objectives of national development. W. Metzger, of West Berlin, who signed his letter on behalf of the Tiergarten-Süd Party group, discusses the principle of voluntary party membership and the exactions of discipline. I. Bandov, of Bulgaria, lists the high ethical qualities of Party members, bearers of the progressive communist working-class morality, as an essential feature of the Marxist-Leninist party. N. Chimariotis, of Greece, commends Communist parties for their skill in employing varied forms of struggle, not making a fetish of just one.

The Commission requested several representatives of Communist and Workers' parties on the *WMR* to reply to the following question: Is there anything you would like to add to this exchange of opinions on the Marxist-Leninist party of our time?

Pavel Auersperg, CP of Czechoslovakia:

It would not be amiss to note that the main characteristics of the Marxist-Leninist party of our time were shaped during the development of Lenin's Bolshevik Party, constituted along fundamentally new principles as compared with the former Social-Democratic structure. The history of the CP of Czechoslovakia shows clearly that success or failure, victory or setback hinge on how consistently the

Leninist principles of party development and norms of party life are put into effect.

Our Party's development along Leninist lines dates to the 20s. As Gustav Husak noted at the 14th Congress of the CPC, 'the revolutionary working-class movement understood that to win the battle against the bourgeoisie and exploitation it must reject Social-Democratic reformism politically, ideologically and organizationally, and must create a new-type revolutionary party like the Russian Bolsheviks.' The consummation of this process in 1929, when Klement Gottwald assumed leadership, represented a qualitatively new stage in the Party's history. During the 1929-33 economic crisis and in face of the nazi peril, protesting the disgraceful Munich deal, the CPC became the real vanguard of the working people. It also performed its mission commendably in the national-liberation struggle against German fascism (almost every second member of the CPC laid down his life in this struggle), during the political and class battles of 1945-48, and during the building of socialist society.

Our experience also shows that every departure from the Leninist structural and action principles tends to diminish the Party's influence among the masses. In the period preceding 1968 there were subjectivist violations of Leninist norms of party life, democratic centralism and inner-party democracy. Right-wing and revisionist elements capitalized on this in the critical years of 1968 and 1969, when tendencies with an obvious resemblance to Social-Democratic structural principles gained currency in the Party. The revisionist model of 'democratic socialism' was borrowed lock, stock and barrel from the documents of the Socialist International. After April 1969, when Gustav Husak was elected First Secretary of the CC CPC and radical changes were made in the Party leadership, the Central Committee meeting held the following month set the cardinal task of restoring the Party's unity on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles and the Leninist principles of party development and life. This has been accomplished.

Another important point. We should bear in mind that the typical features of the Marxist-Leninist party of our time are interconnected. It is simple unthinkable for a party to negate some basic feature, say that of organization or internationalism, or to spurn the development of theory, and yet remain a truly effective vanguard of the working class. I mention this because opportunists of all kinds keep 'advising' us to limp along now on one foot and now on the other. Yet none of the features may be examined in isolation from the concrete reality, the conditions and objectives of the working-class struggle in every new stage. The Party is a living and developing organism. Though retaining its essential type of organization, it continuously acquires

new features and qualities that enable it to direct the revolutionary and transformative activities of the working class, the working masses, in the dynamic conditions of our time.

The foundation of our Party's activity lies in concrete and exhaustive scientific analysis of every fact in international and domestic affairs. In the present conditions, we attach special significance to ideological unity, the scientific approach to social development, formulation and consistent implementation of concrete solutions. The November 1974 CC CPC meeting stressed that continuous analysis of social processes, formulation of definite tasks and their consistent fulfilment, should be ever more conspicuous features of party activity in the period of building developed socialist society.

Lastly, I should like to stress the topicality of an idea projected in some of the discussion articles: the importance of enhancing the vanguard role of Communist and Workers' parties and preventing depreciation of their class positions through participation in broad democratic fronts and alliances. The experience of our Party, especially that of 1945-48, shows how important this is for the unity and effectiveness of the democratic and progressive forces, for new successes and the ultimate victory of revolutionary socialist reconstruction.

Idris Cox, CP of Great Britain:

An important and essential aspect underlined among the five main themes of the opening article was that of proletarian internationalism. This theme has been dealt with in the journal by many Communist leaders, but I would like to stress still further the importance of international solidarity.

The Communist Party was born in Britain in the midst of a gigantic 'Hands Off Russia' campaign in 1920, in which it was deeply involved with the labor and progressive movement as a whole. The campaign was directed against the plans of the reactionary imperialist government in Britain to further intensify its efforts in the counter-revolution against the new Russia. This mass pressure forced the withdrawal of these plans, though British imperialism (apart from a temporary change in its attitude during 1941-45) has still maintained its basic opposition to the first worker-peasant state.

Since it was formed 55 years ago the Communist Party in Britain has always striven to win the masses for solidarity with the Soviet Union, for close friendship between the peoples of both countries, and for peaceful coexistence.

Until 1947 Britain was the center of a vast empire which covered one-quarter of the world, and British Communists were active in organizing solidarity with the liberation struggles in India, Egypt,

Iraq, South Africa and in the Caribbean. The British Communists were firmly convinced that in all these countries, and in Britain itself, it was a common struggle against a common enemy – British imperialism.

At the same time, they were active in the struggle against U.S. imperialism, for the demands of the Black and other oppressed peoples in the USA, in the struggle for a democratic Greece, a free and united Cyprus, and for the end of fascism in Spain and Portugal. All these evoked strong solidarity actions in Britain.

However, proletarian internationalism is not only a matter of solidarity in action with the struggle of peoples in other countries, but also of fighting British imperialism on its own doorstep. Recalling Lenin's thoughts, the 1969 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stated: 'The winning of power by the working class and its allies is the greatest contribution which a Communist Party fighting under capitalist conditions can make to the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism.'*

In this respect the growing mass struggle in Britain, not only on the economic front, but in the political struggle, is a decisive factor in the international struggle of the working class and its allies. Most economic struggles take on a political aspect of opposition to the government, whether Tory or Labor. Communists are in the forefront of this rising mass movement. The struggle on a national level is intertwined with that in other countries, and in this way assists in developing the international unity of the working class and of the Communist movement.

Luis Padilla, CP of Bolivia:

The events before and after the replacement of General Torres's progressive government by the fascist regime of President Banzer (August 21, 1971) confirm our policy and the Marxist-Leninist principles of the working-class party. Among these principles is the combination of revolutionary strategy with flexible tactics suiting the actual situation and permitting us to pinpoint and resolve problems arising out of the often very abrupt and unexpected changes in political events.

Brutal repressions were heaped on Bolivia's Communists after the coup d'état. Weighing the correlation of forces with an eye on long-term objectives, the Party went on the defensive, cutting back mass actions. This was done to preserve the organization and create conditions for eventually taking the offensive. Today, Bolivia's revolutio-

*International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow 1969. Prague, Peace and Socialism Publishers, 1969, p. 37.

nary movement and Communist Party face two urgent objectives: first, to lay the foundations for united action of all social strata and political currents opposed to the dictatorship on the basis of a program reflecting the vital interests of the country and people, and second, to give impulse to anti-imperialist action and the people's struggle for vital demands by working up a revolutionary, patriotic and democratic spirit. The lessons of our recent past have confirmed the general Marxist-Leninist conclusions concerning the Party's participation in alliances, in broad democratic movements, and have also enriched us with new experience.

When a broad popular anti-imperialist front was formed a few months before the downfall of the Torres government, it had seemed that Bolivia's many left parties had finally taken the road of united anti-fascist action. But some ultra-left groups wanted to make the popular front an instrument for their own subjectivist, adventurist, anti-Communist and anti-Soviet designs. The Communist Party and other left organizations rejected this. The most obvious evidence of the ultra-left designs was the attempt to saddle the left forces with a 'military administration' in place of collective political leadership, which caused the front to break up. This practical lesson showed that it is not enough for a democratic movement seeking unity to reach a more or less broad mutual understanding concerning a *common program*. Views concerning the *ways* to the revolution should coincide in practice. There should be agreement on the *forms* and *means* of attaining the strategic objectives, the ultimate goal. The facts showed that these ways, forms and means of struggle are the result, first and foremost, of the *revolutionary experience of the Bolivian working class* (whose leading role was acknowledged and proclaimed by the members of the front). On the other hand, the events also showed that no revolutionary movement in present-day Latin America, and especially in Bolivia, can be victorious if it isolates itself from the world working-class movement, if it has hostile views concerning the role of the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, in the struggle against world imperialism.

Calling for united action by Bolivia's revolutionary, democratic and progressive forces, and orienting the masses on forming a broad anti-fascist front, the Communist Party takes account of this experience and the experience of revolutionary struggle by the working class and the Communists of other countries.

Adel Haba, Iraqi CP:

The greatest credit for founding the Bolshevik Party and elaborating the theoretical principles of its activity goes to V.I. Lenin, teacher

and leader of the proletariat. One of the main features of the party of the new type Lenin created is internationalism: 'We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 30, p. 293). This is the Bolsheviks' source of success in solving the national question, in assuring the fraternity of working people in their multinational country.

Our Party and its founder, Comrade Fahd, always followed this principle. We always opposed chauvinist and narrow nationalist tendencies. In the late 50s the ICP took a firm Leninist stand against opportunist and nationalist suggestions to create a purely Kurdish organization independent of the ICP in Iraqi Kurdistan. This was reminiscent of the old-time Bundists' position in Russia, and conflicted with the slogan of international proletarian fraternity. Our Party always condemns departures from the principle of proletarian internationalism. They are a threat to the future of the Party and the world revolutionary movement.

One more important point is the class alliances and the Marxist-Leninist Party. The ICP and its revered founder, Comrade Fahd, advanced the slogan: 'Strengthen the organization of your Party, strengthen the organization of the national movement.' History shows that no national movement can develop successfully without the active participation of the Marxist-Leninist Party. The ICP has always condemned currents and concepts that belittle the significance of such a party. Our Party knows that it must retain its ideological, political and organizational independence in alliances with other revolutionary forces. This has a positive effect on the revolutionary process as a whole and makes the alliance more effective. The Progressive National Patriotic Front in Iraq, an alliance of the Arab Socialist Revival Party (Baath) and the Iraqi Communist Party, is evidence that we are right.

Our Party contributes to the cause of the Progressive National Patriotic Front, finding correct solutions for many economic problems, helping eliminate difficulties encountered in the country's growth, and thus facilitating the battle against the aftermaths of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Among other things, we have drawn up proposals concerning the state sector in industry. They envisage planning of the national economy and ending Iraq's dependence on capitalist markets and the capitalist international division of labor. The Party demonstrates the advantages of economic ties with the socialist countries, which would enable us to avoid the effects of the crises afflicting the capitalist world.

I think the exchange of opinions on the Marxist-Leninist Party of

our time, and the fraternal experience it helped to bring out, has benefited everybody concerned, including the Iraqi Communist Party.

Vasilis Venetsanopoulos, CP of Greece:

The experience of the CP of Greece is clear evidence that Lenin's teaching on the Party of a new type is still entirely valid. This is not at all surprising, for it is based on the scientific findings of the founders of Marxism and reflects the historical conditions of our epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Experience in Greece prompts us to stress the importance of two of Lenin's propositions:

– an independent party of the working class is an objective necessity for the development of society flowing from the historical mission of the proletariat;

– another objective necessity is for the Party consistently to combat opportunist and revisionist currents, and the related deviations from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

It is absolutely clear that if no independent political working-class organization had existed in Greece, the great battles fought during the Party's 57 years for the cause of the laboring masses, liberation from the German fascist yoke, and the overthrow of the military fascist dictatorship, would all have been far less effective. Having done away with the Black Colonels last year, the nation is continuing the struggle for a Greece free from imperialist and NATO fetters, for a truly free Greece, for true democracy and socialism. These objectives, too, would be inconceivable without the CPG as an independent political organization of the working class.

It comes as no surprise that the reactionary forces are trying so hard to eliminate the CPG. For them it is an obstacle. But like the repressions of the past, the machinations of the ruling bourgeois parties of today, too, will not remove the Communists from the country's political scene. Our Party, a party of the new type, has an organizational structure, principles, and methods of work that enable it to be active in legal and illegal conditions, to overcome all possible difficulties.

The firmness and fighting capacity, the very existence of the Party would be inconceivable if it had not constantly and perseveringly combated revisionists and liquidators who try to disrupt the Party from within, alter its character, and revise such of its basic principles as democratic centralism and proletarian internationalism. Opportunists try to convert the Party of consistent and irreconcilable class struggle into a Social-Democratic type of party, a party of class cooperation. Recent experience shows how important it is to know this. The Eighth Plenary Meeting of our Central Committee (1958)

passed an erroneous decision, which was subsequently endorsed by the Party's Eighth Congress (1961), to dissolve CPG organizations due to the Communists' joining the political bloc of left and democratic forces – EDA (United Democratic Left Party of Greece). This resolution was a severe blow to the independent existence and activity of the CPG, though the Central Committee and a few other Party organizations remained intact. The Ninth Congress of the CPG (1974) pointed out in its well-reasoned assessment that the dissolution of Party organizations and the absence of the CPG in factories and government and other offices deprived us of the opportunity to act on the political scene as a powerful force, because the Central Committee and the unorganized efforts of individual Communists and a few Party organizations certainly could not fill the resulting vacuum.

The situation in the Party in 1958-69 was due to the influence of opportunist and revisionist elements, which later created their particular political and organizational platform oriented on Social-Democratic principles and akin to the platform of the liberal bourgeoisie. In 1968 the 12th Plenary Meeting of the CC CPG dealt revisionism a decisive blow. Continuing the struggle, the Party is systematically completing the ideological defeat of revisionism. The Party defends the principles of proletarian internationalism and repulses the attacks of those who treat internationalism as the original sin and describe themselves as 'internal' communists. All that the opportunist group which proclaimed itself the Communist Party of Greece (Internal) has earned by its declamatory name is the backing of home and foreign anti-Communists. Struggle against opportunism invigorates our Party and enhances the action capacity of the working class, all working people.

Hamid Safari, People's Party of Iran:

The fundamental principles of the Marxist-Leninist party of our time have been examined with scientific insight in a series of articles in *WMR*. The People's Party of Iran (Tudeh), a party of the new type with all the characteristics of the working-class vanguard, also has specific qualities traceable to the specific development of our country and, in large measure, to the clandestinity in which our organization operates.

The period of the Party's legality was very short. For a certain time it was able to operate semi-legally, but at present it is compelled to work deep underground. The Party's structure, development, style and methods are therefore highly specific.

The concrete organizational forms and the Party's work among the people are of special importance in these circumstances. Since our main purpose is to build a mass basis for the revolutionary movement,

we follow Lenin's principle: to harmonize the people's natural desire for a better life with scientific theory. But since even elementary democratic rights are lacking, it takes imagination and inventiveness to pursue this line, using all means of struggle and the entire range of methods of organizing the revolutionary forces, in order to respond to the quickly changing situation and give priority to that type of struggle and that type of organization which best promote the activity and initiative of the working people and prepare them for revolutionary battles.

Mindful of the fact that mass consciousness ripens in class battles, the Party encourages the working people to test their strength and acquire practical experience of struggle. In a country where the regime persecutes not only revolutionary, but also democratic movements, acquisition of such experience by the comparatively young and developing working class is a long process. The Party must therefore be patient, persevering and ready for collective heroism. Hence the importance of educating Communists in the finest traditions of revolutionaries, in a spirit of faith in the Party's just cause. Fidelity to principles, discipline, honesty, selflessness, sincerity, firmness in face of the enemy and a sense of responsibility for the nation's future – those are the most important qualities of a Communist. Without these qualities, the Party could not survive.

Many Communists have been tortured or executed in these long years of struggle. Yet even facing military tribunals and locked in prison cells they propagated our ideas and exposed reaction and imperialism, often at the price not only of additional torture, but death. The courage of their convictions in face of death is not merely the mark of true and firm revolutionaries. They possessed knowledge of the laws of social development, their ideas were humane, they had unshakeable faith in the triumph of Marxism-Leninism. And this was for them the main source of strength.

Our experience has shown that the example of unbending fighters makes a tremendous impact on the masses. In the final analysis, this paves the way to a broad front of struggle for a radical transformation of society.

Though the exchange of opinions has ended, the Commission does not consider the subject closed. Analysis of the development of Marxist-Leninist working-class parties in present conditions, generalization of the experience of Party development and coverage of the multifold Party activities, is one of the most important purposes of this journal.

Democracy, ideology, creativity

Jerzy Kossak
Director, Institute of Culture, Ministry of Culture and Art, Polish People's Republic

Poland's cultural policy has its sources in the ideological and theoretical tenets of scientific communism, the political practice of the international and Polish Communist movement, and the experience of People's Poland and other members of the socialist community. It is founded on the Leninist concepts of two cultures in capitalist society, proletarian and bourgeois, within the culture of each nation, and the need for an internationalist socialist culture enriched by the achievements of all nations. This concept, formed in battle with nationalism, particularly within the labor movement, is expressive of the fact that the new, socialist culture accords with the objective interests of the working class.

Of the greatest importance to us is Lenin's idea that the cultural traditions and legacy of the past must be assimilated by the working class which must direct the political, economic, social and cultural reconstruction of society as a single process.

Equally relevant is Lenin's view of the working people as the subject, the creator of culture. This idea took shape in controversy with part of the artistic vanguard and with supporters of the 19th century Kulturträger movement, which regarded the masses merely as the object of educational and aesthetic manipulation by the high priests of art.

Lastly, of undoubted topicality is Lenin's idea that there is a definite connection between the cultural level of the masses and their opportunities to share in running the country and in determining the pace of its technical development.

Taking these general principles as its premise, Poland's cultural policy is expressive of the social and cultural aspirations of the laboring masses. The policy is implemented by government, party and social organizations which stimulate and assist artistic creation,

popularize cultural values and involve the masses in cultural development.

The following are some of the main tasks in this field: development and extension of the national culture and popularization of the humanist aspects of world culture; promotion of the artist's ideological participation in defining the future of his people and strengthening the socialist system; expansion and improvement of the material and technical basis of culture; development of cultural institutions and their reorganization to keep pace with social progress.

Our policy is based on the premise that politics, economics and culture are inseparably linked. The working-class party directs development in these three areas of social life. That is the only way to assure the successful building of developed socialist and subsequently communist society.

Universal education, which is part of genuine democratic culture, plays a decisive role in the cultural revolution. For a well-organized educational system and properly functioning schools prepare our citizens not only for a professional career, but also for active participation in public and cultural life. Popularization of culture and the arts goes beyond the specific interests of narrow professional groups, for culture, in all its many implications, is part of life itself.

In building socialism, the working class, the hegemon of society, is building also the new, socialist culture in which its ideals and social aims are epitomized. The development of the new culture is a basic task of socialist construction and is expressive of the spiritual emancipation of the working class and the people, expressive also of their social, intellectual and creative growth.

In building the new culture, the working class and its vanguard do not renounce the creative heritage of past generations of their own and other peoples, but subject it to critical analysis and class interpretation. Nor do they turn their backs on exponents of the new art whose views do not accord with the Communist ideology, but rather seek to assimilate all the humanist achievements of this art, rejecting everything hostile to the ideals of the revolution and social justice.

At the same time government and public organizations cannot confine their activities merely to 'dispensing culture' by selecting works of art for popularization. Rather they should endeavor to stimulate involvement in cultural activity. This implies, in particular, development of the transformatory and educational function of art.

International cultural exchanges are part of Poland's foreign policy. The main aim is to accelerate integration processes in the socialist countries, increase support for the anti-imperialist struggle and popularize the achievements of socialism in the capitalist countries. Culture is an effective means of international contact, but it is also an

ideological battlefield. Hence, while we are interested in everything valuable and progressive in the world of capitalism, our interest must go hand in hand with an ideological and political offensive, and with representatives of socialist culture always taking a patriotic position in international contacts. Our chief goal here is to foster ideological links between the peoples of the great socialist community.

One of our main tasks is to bring the people to share in cultural activities. This entails more than fostering an interest in and appreciation of culture and the arts. We must make culture part and parcel of the social activity of the masses so that Lenin's idea of popular rule exercised through socialist democracy is extended also to the realm of culture and artistic creation. And here action centers on developing the new moral traits of the man of labor. This is directly related to the chief structural and class changes in society, notably growth of the working class and its social consciousness, changing social attitudes both in urban and rural areas, the people's cultural integration through acceptance of socialist ideas and, lastly, changing attitudes to culture.

The formation of socialist culture is a purposefully directed process designed to facilitate transition from passive to active assimilation of socialist culture and active participation in its development. We stimulate the transition from individual contacts with culture (through entertainment, say) to conscious responsibility for the type, character, quality, form and content of cultural phenomena, to cooperation with cultural institutions and organizations, participation in diverse forms of the socio-cultural movement and in amateur art, both in its traditional and modern forms. The democratization of culture should produce a new type of personality, the consumer and creator of knowledge and culture.

Reviewing the 30 years of People's Poland, we can say that we have laid a firm foundation for a culture corresponding to developed socialist society, a firm foundation also for alliance of the working class and the creative intelligentsia.

The new perspectives opened up by the building of developed socialist society and by the scientific and technological revolution make it possible to impart to modern industrial civilization the humanistic values and ideas of socialism. Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party Central Committee, has said; 'We are building socialism on two fronts – the socio-economic and ideological. A dynamically implemented socio-economic program is the foundation for our Marxist-Leninist ideological work, and the strengthening and popularization of socialist ideology directly influences our socio-economic development.' This entails a new, socialist integration of technology and humanism, and a

new pattern of contacts between the creative intelligentsia and the people.

Socialist culture must assure the all-round development of the personality against the background of accelerated technical and economic growth. It must facilitate society's adaptation to the new type of life and work, accelerate the development of higher requirements, collective and individual. The development of culture invigorates and enriches society's constructive ability and stimulates initiative in all fields of public life.

On this 30th anniversary of the Polish People's Republic we can proudly look back on processes that have changed the mentality of the masses and the image of our society. We can speak not only of a democratic national culture, but also of its ideological reorientation on the values and ideas that are part of the Polish Communists' social theory and program. The result has been wide popularization of past achievements of Polish and world culture and their new evaluation in keeping with the world outlook of the working-class vanguard.

This is why we should not reduce our achievements in the propagation of art to the one indisputable fact that great works once accessible to just a narrow elite have been placed within the reach of all people. Our achievements amount to something substantially greater: the ideology of the working class has begun to penetrate the sphere of the cultural heritage. Formerly scorned currents of national art associated with the life of the masses, their struggle for social progress, have been rediscovered and revived. Humanist art traditions hold a secure and guaranteed place in society.

The democratization of culture has spurred progressive changes in the thinking of our people. The reassessment of traditions has forged new ideas about the past, in which the old is stripped of the aura of lost ideals and sanctity. It has provided a closer insight into modernity and helped set goals for the future.

The knowledge that the arts exercise a strong influence on political life took deep root back in the years of the war and the occupation. Subsequently, big changes took place. The fact that the Soviet Union was the guarantor of victory over fascism and also the guarantor of peaceful development became the cardinal and most important factor in the great remaking of the social psychology, in the political reorientation and, later, the establishment of cultural ties based on the community of ideas and social aims. This began to break down the traditional mental stereotypes, complexes and myths.

The socio-economic reconstruction, which assured the social growth of the working masses and was the basis for the social revolution in Poland under working-class hegemony, provided the people with real opportunities for participating in the creation of a qualita-

tively new, socialist culture. As a result, the social basis for cultural élitism and the exclusiveness of the artistic intellectual crumbled into dust.

The élitism of culture in bourgeois Poland was due to a loosening of ties between the artistic intelligentsia and the working people, the classes producing the social wealth. This loss of contact compelled the arts to adapt to the snobbish tastes and demands, ideals and morality of the propertied élite. Also, the cultural apathy of the masses – the result of social stagnation, hardship and lack of educational opportunities – precluded a dialogue between the world of art and the world of material production.

Now, the creative forces are delivered from their élitist-intellectual ghetto. For the first time in history, the awakened masses have begun to set their own great artistic and spiritual criteria. By changing the country's social map and assuring real revolutionary enlightenment, the socio-economic reconstruction provided favorable conditions for the artistic maturing and aesthetic awakening of the masses. Such reconstruction is a real, and not merely potential, source of change in the people's culture.

The artistic intelligentsia had never known such a situation. Almost from the first day of People's Poland, the creative intellectual was able to shake off dependence on the private dealer for whom works of art were just another commodity. The individual expression of talent and creative energy – the work of art – could now achieve its true social realization. For the first time in Polish history, it truly belonged to the whole people. The artist became aware that he could work as a free man, unfettered by the laws of commercialism. He became aware that he worked in the midst of millions of people, that he worked for them, that they understood him, respected his work and assessed its results with civic pride.

This new fusion of the creative workers with the masses born of the revolutionary social changes, is an important source of artistic inspiration. New ties began to shape between the artist and the people – a model suited to the period of developed socialism. New stimuli came from it for the growth of socialist art. They harmonize the wealth of the new means of expression with keenness of civic perception, with active involvement in resolving the crucial problems of our times.

Polish culture, which had suffered tremendous losses in the nationwide war against the nazi occupation, has revived in a new quality. The liberative war against fascism, the revolution that liberated the masses socially, and the restoration of the lands on the Oder and the Baltic shore, gave powerful spiritual impulse to a new art and to the cultural activity of society. Poland's new, socialist culture, built upon the foundation of social reconstruction, takes in new riches

through the synthesis of the progressive national cultural traditions and the modern artistic, scientific and technical advances. The ideals of socialist humanism, human dignity, social justice and constructive peaceful labor exercise an ever greater influence. The new culture is imbued with the new, socialist patriotism, is hostile to all nationalism, oppression and imperialist war, which imperil the very foundations of human existence. It is hostile to philistine egoism, nihilism and lack of faith in man's struggle for progress. It gives vigor to the new models of morality based on collectivism, respect for public property, and readiness to defend the gains of the working masses.

This orientation closes avenue after avenue for the penetration of any philistine cosmopolitan ideas of artistic snobbery. Culture is more and more open for works of art fathered by the unity of socialist aspirations forming the enduring basis for the fraternal cooperation of Poland, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the cultural field.

The present and immediate future *necessitates* a rapid intensification of cultural cooperation between countries of the socialist community, and offers new *opportunities*. The potential for intensifying cultural cooperation flows from the community of the socialist countries' aims and ideology, their class unity and the identity of their political system. Common processes of socialist construction under the guidance of the Communist parties serve as the foundation for similar basic processes and features expressing the common laws in socialist cultural development. This opens the way to the spread of the priceless artistic achievements of different national cultures. We witnessed it first in the multinational Soviet Union, and now also in the countries of the socialist community.

In the socialist countries the development of the functions of the state and public institutions to suit the rapidly changing political consciousness of the members of society, stemming from economic and cultural changes in the setting of the scientific and technological revolution, also follows the same direction. The same way of development and the same requirements tend to approximate the forms and methods of cultural activity. This is a good basis for the consolidation of the cultures of our peoples. The continuous consolidation of political unity and the technico-economic integration in the CMEA framework should, therefore, be accompanied by cultural consolidation.

The need to accelerate this consolidation also derives from the international situation. The long period of peace and peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist systems has made culture a particularly important battlefield of the two class ideologies and

it is our joint objective to align with these conditions the model of cultural exchanges with the capitalist world.

The prospect of a long period of peaceful coexistence, and especially the prospect of a peaceful solution for all the disputed European questions, have created new conditions for cultural exchanges, contacts between groups of artists, exchanges of cultural ideas, and greater exchanges of works of art. What we want are cultural exchanges serving the cause of world peace and progress. But we also have to reckon with the fact that imperialist psychological warfare centers will try to use them for their nefarious ends, for acts of ideological diversion among the creative strata and the entire population through so-called artistic works and theoretical concepts. There is also, doubtlessly, a tendency to smuggle in conceptions related to the notorious theory of convergence.

The current bourgeois propaganda campaign against the absence of a 'free flow of ideas and information' to the socialist countries, is wholly false. As we know, it is in the capitalist countries that the spread of works foreign to bourgeois ideology is impeded by the hostile bourgeois 'cultural' market. So, the absence of outright government interference (though that, too, is quite frequent) does not mean there is a free flow of ideas. For one thing, the spread of cultural works from socialist countries is far less extensive in bourgeois states than are our cultural imports from the capitalist world. For this reason we regard the talk about 'free exchanges' as an attempt to gain unilateral advantages in the ideological struggle. The socialist countries see eye to eye on this score.

That is why cultural exchanges necessitate thorough selection of the works reaching us from the capitalist world. The methods of this selection, the contacts between creative strata of the socialist and capitalist countries, and the substance of the cultural policy should be an object of consultation by the socialist countries' cultural institutions. This is also necessitated by the greater technological potential of disseminating cultural values (satellite television, video-casettes, etc.).

But the cultural consolidation of socialist countries centers mainly on cooperation in creating and popularizing their own cultural values, bilateral and multilateral centers of culture, joint television programs, joint undertakings in art and literature. We must shape more effective ideological and artistic ties between our writers', artists' and other creative unions, on the one hand, and assure conditions for the rapid growth of a new, multinational, socialist cultural audience, on the other. This audience provides unequalled opportunities for popularizing the priceless treasures of the various national cultures, giving added impetus to artistic endeavor within the socialist community. As

we see it, television can be tremendously useful if its resources are appropriately employed.

The present and future role of culture in the life of our peoples and the ideological struggle call for more intensive research in the processes of cultural development. It is already under way in all the countries of the socialist community, and timely mutual information concerning its results would be highly useful.

In 'The Working Class and the National Question,' which he wrote in 1913, Lenin said: 'The workers of all nations together, concertedly, uphold full freedom and complete equality of rights in organizations common to all – and that is the guarantee of genuine culture.

'The workers of the whole world are building up their own internationalist culture, which the champions of freedom and the enemies of oppression have for long been preparing. To the old world, the world of national oppression, national bickering, and national isolation the workers counterpose a new world, a world of the unity of the working people of all nations, a world in which there is no place for any privileges or for the slightest degree of oppression of man by man' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 19, p. 92).

What was once a part of the ideology of the fighting proletariat, has now become an essential element of the cultural policy and cooperation of the worker-peasant cultures of the countries of the socialist community. The independent development of national cultures and the process of cultural exchanges, mutual enrichment and assimilation of the achievements of the fraternal cultures help the further consolidation of the community of socialist countries.

The distinctive traditions and histories, the unique works of art, the special features of folklore, and the specific development of modern art are brought together by the identity of ideology and social aims, because the bonds between the national cultures derive from the same socialist transformations, the same ideals of social justice, and the singleness of the aim – the building of communist society.

---

theory

The old and new in anti-communism

Hans Adamo
Associate of the Board,
German CP

Fighting anti-communism is no novel assignment for Marxists. But its changing face necessitates continuous study of its 'theory' and practice. Exposure of current anti-communist concepts is an important part of the Communists' fight against it.

For 20 years the FRG was the epicentre of the cold war in Europe. In those years, during the CDU/CSU administration, West German anti-communism, personifying the idea of revenge and imperialist hatred of the German Democratic Republic, the socialist state on German soil, was particularly bellicose. World imperialism's shock force against socialism in Europe, it was an instrument of blackmail and 'positions from strength' policy, an ingredient of the 'roll-back' strategy, and a menace to European peace.

On the domestic scene anti-communism resulted in the banning in August 1956 of the CPG, the party that had fought selflessly against Hitler, and after his defeat – in keeping with the spirit of the Potsdam agreement – for democratic and anti-fascist development in the Federal Republic. Today, too, reactionary quarters and especially the CDU/CSU exert continuous pressure on the German Communist Party and other democratic organizations, and enforce a scandalous 'ban on employment' of Communists, Socialists and other democrats.

With the collapse of the imperialist cold war policy and the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, anti-communism, like bourgeois ideology in general, encounters ever greater difficulties and is compelled to change its tactics and image, to adapt to the new correlation of forces, the new conditions of the class struggle. The successes of the socialist community on the international scene and in social-economic development, coupled with the growing influence of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, are augmenting the potential of the Party's struggle against anti-communism in our country.

One of the lessons of the victory over fascism, the Board of the German CP noted at its plenary meeting in February 1975, is that there must be 'joint struggle of all democrats against anti-communism

and anti-Sovietism, against the remnants of fascist ideology and hatred of other peoples, against all revanchist falsifications of history in education and other areas of society, and for the freedom and victory of democratic and social progress.'

In the past, imperialist policy was aimed at destroying socialism by force and war, and anti-communism was meant to justify these designs. Its lie of a war threat from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries facilitated the arms race and stoked up fear and a permanent nuclear psychosis. Its other function was to 'prove' that hunger, poverty and oppression reigned in socialist countries, and that their people expected 'liberation.' This variant of anti-Communism was in great demand among reactionaries for many years. But the situation changed. With the obvious achievements and constructive peace policy of the socialist community, reaction could not get the desired results with crude and bellicose anti-communism.

Communism's future has always been a central question for its critics. When the *Communist Manifesto* appeared, anti-Communists wrote: 'Communism is a misconception, the enemy of any society. Absolutely false subjectively and objectively, communist ideas are a matter for the police and have no future.'* History has long since passed its judgment on this prophecy. Nowadays, bourgeois ideologists cannot get far with the version they had peddled for more than 100 years that Communist ideas are barren and doomed.

Anti-communism is compelled to back up its propaganda with diverse inventions by renegades and revisionists usually posing as 'improvers' of the existing socialism. Socialism, they say, might possibly have a future if it acquires a 'human face'. They clamor for its 'liberalization' and suggest new 'models', and the anti-Communists are blithely unaware that by backing up their contentions they acknowledge the collapse of one of the pillars of anti-Communist propaganda – the denial of a future to communism.

At the end of 1973 and in early 1974 the accent in anti-Communist propaganda shifted from the future to the past. Socialism, first and foremost the Soviet Union, it now contends, 'has not overcome its past.' There is a definite pattern in the anti-Communists' present behavior. The more significant the achievements of socialism become, the more assiduously they try to exploit the difficulties and problems socialist society faced in the course of its growth.

The bourgeois propaganda lie that 'socialism has not overcome its past,' has assumed a particularly malicious character in the writings of Solzhenytsin. Now it has taken on the proportions of an anti-Communist campaign engulfing the entire capitalist world. Clearly, it

* Wermuth Stieber. *Die Kommunisten Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Berlin, 1853, Part I, p. 3.

is aimed at diverting public attention, first of all the attention of working people, from the problems and consequences of the general crisis of capitalism, the difficulties of the capitalist world, and today's socialist reality. It is not the past difficulties of socialist society but its present achievements and successes that have triggered the malicious anti-Communist attacks on the socialist countries.

This variant of anti-Sovietism, like the carping on Soviet 'aggressiveness' to vindicate militarization and acts of imperialist aggression, is mainly designed for a diversionary function. The tactic of 'diversion' is part of anti-communism's present-day propaganda arsenal. It reflects the crisis of bourgeois ideology, which is finding it ever more difficult to endear the capitalist system to the masses.

Imperialism launched the campaign because the contrast between the stable economic development and continuously rising living standard in the socialist countries, their successes on the international scene, on the one hand, and the instability and crisis phenomena in the capitalist world, on the other, has never been so striking. To meet this situation, anti-communism is going out of its way to dampen sympathy for socialism and the mass orientation on Marxism-Leninism. Herbert Mies, the Chairman of our Party, said at the Hamburg Congress of the GCP (1973): 'This new wave of shameless anti-Soviet slander engulfing our country merely shows what difficulties socialism's offensive creates for big capital. This lie campaign, which certainly will not stop socialism's advance, is designed to prevent the working people from recognizing their own interests, and to slow up progressive development. In the interests of the entire people it is our duty firmly to counteract these intentions.'

Holding forth about socialism's 'unovercome past,' bourgeois ideologists and anti-Communists are trying to create the impression that socialism is generally incapable of resolving the basic social problems. A few negative aspects in the development of socialism, the difficulties of its complex and rapid ascent, mistakes already rectified or in the act of being overcome, are deliberately magnified as something characteristic of socialism in general. And when this fails, since all 'proofs' of its alleged imperfections cannot write off the achievements of socialism, the anti-Communists portray the achievements as something beyond the pale of the socialist mode of production, and divorce them from the social environment.

Socialist society is not devoid of problems. A frank discussion of the contradictions under socialism and their causes is under way in socialist countries. Precisely this the bourgeois ideologists are trying to deny or distort. That Communists do not conceal their difficulties and shortcomings, that they criticize and work to eliminate them, is glossed over in silence. Yet the fact that the Communists in socialist

countries analyze all aspects of their society, and that the results of their analyses are mirrored in the resolutions of Party congresses, in Party documents and government decisions, is evidence of their strength and confidence, and of the resources they possess to assure the further successful development of socialism.

All the same, anti-Communist propaganda spares no effort to portray the history of socialist society as a succession of setbacks and miscalculations, as a 'failure' of communist policy. All this to 'demonstrate' its impotence, and to try and impose a discussion about 'problems' of socialism and its 'negative' experience, primarily that of the Soviet Union, on the Communist parties in capitalist countries and thereby divide the Communists, drive a wedge between the various contingents of the world Communist movement. There are also those who like to discourse on socialism in general, to pretend that there is no such thing as real socialism. Naturally, anti-Communists could not be more pleased. That being so, tolerance of malicious anti-Communist attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, of abstract speculation, would be a token not of a party's independence, but of a departure from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Now and then someone will say that the socialist countries should be treated with 'critical solidarity.' This attitude can only cause misunderstanding, because what it really amounts to is not solidarity with the socialist countries, but ideological and political dissent. Not 'critical solidarity,' but ever closer and unassailable unity with the community of socialist countries expresses the essence of our internationalist position. The concept of solidarity is deep-rooted in the revolutionary working-class movement and has clear criteria. It is impermissible, therefore, to give it any anti-socialist or anti-Soviet overtones. That would be a concession to anti-communism. Yet this is exactly what is done sometimes by the exponents of 'critical solidarity,' whose idealized notions about the conditions and laws of the class struggle are, moreover, worlds removed from the real problems of building the socialist society.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have always been loyal to the principles of internationalist solidarity with their class brothers, have always acted selflessly, and have never tied their assistance to the revolutionary struggle of the peoples to any preliminary conditions or reservations. The concept of solidarity has a distinct class context and cannot be ambiguously applied.

The call for 'improving' socialism, diligently exploited by anti-Communists, has a specific twist in the FRG, being used mainly against the GDR, the socialist state on German soil. For years anti-Communists denied the GDR the slightest chance of independent

development. It was an anti-Communist cliche that the GDR would hardly survive another winter. But towards the beginning of the 1970s the tack was changed in face of the country's successful development, the growth of its international influence, and its contribution to European peace. An attempt was made to prove that the socialism of the GDR did not accord with Marxist principles. And resort to 'systemic-immanent observation and analysis'* was evidence of yet another change. There appeared admissions of socialism's 'chances of success' in the GDR, and even advice on its 'harmonization.' Anti-Communists began to say that socialism in the GDR could be more 'effective' if the Communists revised their Party theories and laid the emphasis not on 'conquest and consolidation of power, but on administration and development of a modern industrial state.'**

It does not surprise us that the exponents of this concept target their attacks primarily on democratic centralism and the leading role of Marxist-Leninist parties in socialist countries. To believe their theory, socialism will improve if Communists admit defeat and dissolve their parties.

Distortions of the foreign policy of socialist countries, mainly the Soviet Union, are extremely widespread these days as a variant of anti-communism. And since this foreign policy has, in effect, become the mainstay for the world's peace-loving forces and is designed to support the working-class and national-liberation movements, to provide favorable conditions for building socialist and communist society, to cement the unity of socialist countries, it is a special object of our class enemies' hate and malice.

One way of distorting Soviet foreign policy is to spread the wholly false allegation that 'rapprochement' between Moscow and Washington 'threatens' the West. Latterly this version has been propagated by the reactionary CDU/CSU leaders, notably Franz Josef Strauss. The point and purpose of initiatives by the USSR and other socialist countries are falsified, the objectives of Soviet-American negotiations are distorted and presented as a 'compact' of the two powers.

Another widely used technique is to present Soviet foreign policy as 'imperial' or 'imperialistic.' That piece of slander has in recent years been used more intensively as more and more people come to see that imperialism bears the main responsibility for the suffering and hardship of hundreds of millions.

And that is precisely why the anti-Communist ideologists are at such pains to ascribe to socialism international policies and actions

* See Hans Adamo. Das Fiasko der bürgerlichen 'DDR-Forschung.' In *Marxistische Blätter*, 1974, No. 5, p. 56.

** See *ibid.*, p. 57.

that are characteristic of imperialism. For it is imperialism that brought into being expansionism and the drive for world domination and plunged mankind into two destructive wars. This type of propaganda has had a definite impact by instilling the idea that every big power is committed to expansionist and imperialist policies.

Such prejudices are exploited by the anti-Communists. And they get substantial help from the Maoist chauvinists, who have elevated these prejudices to a 'theory of the superpowers' spearheaded against Soviet foreign policy. The aim behind this anti-communism is not only to malign the Soviet Union and the peace policy of the socialist community, but also to prevent people from distinguishing between the social forces and states that are on their side and the enemies of peace, security, disarmament and détente.

In the FRG, the aggressive and reactionary big business elements are the prime movers behind all the distortions of Soviet foreign policy. Their aim is to halt the détente process and torpedo the treaties that are normalizing international relations and formalizing postwar frontiers. Leading CDU/CSU personalities are not at all happy about the lessening of tension in relations between the socialist and capitalist countries. They cannot accept the fact that the GDR is a sovereign and internationally recognized state. For them, the imperialist system in the FRG is a model to be copied in the GDR. What they want is 'free exchange' of information and ideas, in other words, dissemination of imperialist ideology in the GDR and other socialist countries.

The reactionary big business elements are making increasing use of the Maoist anti-détente policy. In Peking, Strauss thanked his hosts for their 'support' of 'unity of the German nation' and its 'natural vital rights.' It should not be difficult to see that this is the traditional German revanchism with its old demands of Lebensraum and 'vital rights.' Advanced, allegedly, in the name of the nation, they were always meant to veil aggression. The German Communist Party holds that unity of the German nation was destroyed by imperialism. There is not, nor can there be, unity of the nation in the Federal Republic itself, for the workers and capitalists are divided by a deep chasm. As for relations between the GDR and FRG, after the Moscow, Warsaw and Berlin treaties, which reaffirmed the inviolability of the existing frontiers, and with the two German states now UN members, no one can question the existence of two independent states, and this pattern will remain for all time.

The Communists do not need to be taught how to uphold national interests, Herbert Mies told the Hamburg Party Congress. And least of all do they require instruction from those who, for years, have been mouthing the word 'nation' while concerned only for their power and

superprofits. Those who today speak of 'unity of the nation and of the people' are encouraging and aiding the penetration of U.S. capital. They are sacrificing our agriculture to the Common Market, subjecting the interests of the Federal Republic to the aggressive interests of NATO. The only purpose of their nationalist slogans is to mute the class struggle and activize anti-communism directed against the GDR. The German Communist Party, acting in the spirit of its Hamburg Congress, demands an independent policy for the FRG based on good relations with all countries, and in keeping with our genuine national interests. And these require, above all, restricting the power of the monopolies, especially the international concerns that dominate Western Europe.

The growing difficulties of the anti-Communist strategists and the crisis of bourgeois ideology are evidenced also by the fact that anti-communism absorbs everything anti-Soviet and more frequently resorts to the services of the far left. In recent years anarcho-Trotskyist and Maoist groups have been playing a bigger role in anti-communism; now they are an integral part of it. Nor are the reactionaries upset by the fact that some of them use 'left' phraseology, denouncing socialist society as 'revisionist,' while others brand it 'totalitarian.' Both attack the socialist community and both are linked with the reactionaries. The Maoist groups and anarchists are supported by the FRG ruling faction.

The induced anarchist hysteria of the past few months is clearly directed against the Communists. The anti-Communists and bourgeois politicians know only too well that the actions of these anarchist and Maoist groups hold out no danger for the capitalist system, though they can be used to divert attention from such very real problems as inflation and unemployment and provide a pretext for witch-hunting democrats, justifying curtailment of democratic rights and freedoms and falsifying Communist views. One example: when a small group of anarchists decided to call itself the 'Red Army Faction,' the reactionaries were quick to use this in an attempt to discredit the Soviet armed forces. Reactionary propaganda was larded with such terms as 'terror Marxists,' 'gang socialism,' etc. The tactic of the CDU/CSU leaders is to use the anarchist terror to justify an offensive against all the progressive forces, holding *them* responsible for the anarchism. In this context, the Communist Party believes it especially important to combat petty-bourgeois radicalism, the Maoist splitters, expose all anarchist action as militating against the FRG working-class movement and playing into the hands of the monopolies.

Forced to maneuver, the anti-Communists draw on the assistance also of the right-wing Social-Democrats, who are being integrated in

the system of anti-Communist ideology, for, objectively, their function is to defend the capitalist system. On the one hand, the Social-Democratic leaders try to pursue a realistic foreign policy, on the other, however, the right-wing opportunists are distorting scientific socialism, the class nature of socialist society and the activity of the Marxist parties.

The importance of revisionism and opportunism in ruling-class ideology always increases with every advance of the working-class movement and socialism. Today, the bourgeoisie relies more heavily on the idea of the Social-Democratic right wing. With socialism registering fresh achievements and with Marxism-Leninism increasing its power of attraction, bourgeois ideologists do not venture openly to defend capitalism for fear of losing their influence among the masses. More and more they find themselves obliged to draw on Marxism (as interpreted by the Social-Democrats) to camouflage the coercion and exploitation mechanisms of capitalism. This Social-Democratic variant of anti-communism is so widely used because frontal attacks on socialism have failed and because of the growing resentment, especially among the youth, caused by the results of capitalism's general crisis. In fact, even the CDU youth organization, Junge Union, at its last congress came out against 'capitalist tendencies' and demagogically suggested a 'third way between liberal capitalism and Marxist socialism.'

Of course, in past years too, in the days of primitive anti-communism, there were plenty of suggestions for a 'third way' between socialism and capitalism. Today it is part and parcel of anti-Communist propaganda, and it has gained popularity following the collapse of the Social-Democratic de-ideologization policy.

The 'third way' concept appeals especially to those who are losing confidence in the capitalist system but are not prepared to accept socialism. The purpose and content of the concept, however, is manifestly anti-Communist. The 'third way' orientation does not represent an integral ideological or political trend. Its supporters can be found among the revisionists, militant opponents of the socialist community, anti-capitalist liberals, etc. In the FRG they are all united in the Permanent Third-Way Congress.

In the past bourgeois ideology tried to prevent all discussions of Marxism or direct them towards examination of its 'historical obsolescence.' Today the anti-Communists find that they have to adapt to the discussion of problems which they had so studiously avoided. Anti-communism, and bourgeois ideology as a whole, are faced with the need to integrate 'left' and right opportunist trends so as to have more maneuvering opportunities and a better chance of maintaining their influence on the masses. But even with this new tactic anti-

communism cannot make its propaganda more effective.

All its attempts to achieve stable success through readjustment to the new conditions of the class struggle and the changed strength-balance are doomed to failure. The crisis of anti-communism will continue to deepen with the deepening of the crisis of capitalism and with the growing strength, role and influence of the socialist community.

But we Communists have no illusions: the crisis of anti-communism does not mean that it is entirely ineffective or that anti-Communist propaganda is declining. On the contrary, as the contradictions of capitalism become sharper the bourgeoisie will make fresh attempts to prolong its economic domination. And we can safely predict that the bourgeois ideologists in the FRG will use anti-Communist propaganda on a bigger scale and more subtly. This will create additional difficulties for the working class and its Communist Party. But nothing can stop our fight for social progress in the FRG. Anti-communism is still effective, but it is losing its appeal. We are mindful of that in our struggle against it. The dialectics of the situation are such that activization of anti-communism and the incitement of enmity against the Communists and the socialist community will bring bourgeois ideology into a still sharper contradiction with the demands and needs of the masses.

Some problems of the revolutionary movement

Rubens Iscaro
Member of Executive
and Secretariat,
CP of Argentina

The liberation struggle in Latin America is rapidly gaining momentum and is extending to ever wider sections of society. The political map of the continent is changing, new social forces are joining the battle against imperialism and the oligarchy, for profound political, social and economic change. The balance of forces has changed in favor of the working class, the popular masses, peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism. The influence of the socialist community has markedly increased. Socialist ideas are winning mass support.

The beneficial influence of the Cuban revolution is felt throughout Latin America and stimulates the liberation struggle. In short, the liberation fight is gaining in strength and scope, with events succeeding one another with incredible speed. All this calls for an in-depth study of the continent's problems.

There are two contrasting features today in the political panorama of Latin America. First, there is the struggle of the working class and popular masses which is changing the correlation of forces, stimulating the process of national liberation and to a certain degree changing socio-economic structures. There is, too, the immense revolutionary significance of Cuba, the first Latin American country to become socialist and which since 1959 has been advancing from progress to progress. Nor should we disregard the three-year experience of the Popular Unity government in Chile, the genuine progressive changes in Peru, and the reluctance of the governments of Panama, Ecuador, Argentina and other countries to follow policies laid down by the Yankee monopolies. People of different social groups, civilians and servicemen, are joining the anti-imperialist struggle. Today it includes not only the people but, in a number of countries, also governments, a new development that is causing imperialism much anxiety.

The other feature of the politcal panorama is the counter-offensive launched by the imperialists and their stooges in an attempt to cancel out the gains of our peoples. Unable to check the upsurge of the working-class and the popular struggle, and reluctant to resign themselves to the democratic gains, the monopolies began to finance and engineer reactionary coups d'état and to install military juntas. The 1964 coup in Brazil was followed by moves to turn the country into a capitalist showpiece, make it a model for the rest of the continent. Then there was the intervention against the Dominican Republic, the overthrow of the Bolivian government, elimination of what remained of the republican system in Uruguay. The process was topped by the 'Pinochetaso' in Chile: the overthrow of a government whose progressive changes were, after Cuba, becoming the antipode to the Brazilian 'model' and a chart for Latin America's path into the future.

Though it wants a capitalist 'model' for the continent's development, imperialism does not want honest confrontation, or an anti-imperialist alternative that holds out the prospect of socialism. The 'revolution in freedom' slogan and the Alliance For Progress are dead and buried, along with the celebrated Brazilian 'miracle.' Imperialism has nothing to oppose to the political concept of social progress. That is why it is using the most unscrupulous means, from corruption and subversion to outright terror and brutality, in a bid to maintain its domination.

To the list of dictatorships in the Caribbean area have now been

added dictatorships in the South of the continent. They are using pressure tactics against Peru and Argentina to frustrate the liberation processes in the two countries.[1] Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay and Paraguay have become important operational bases for Yankee imperialism in its offensive in the southern cone of the continent.

There are ample facts to show that imperialism has an overall plan to stop the liberation process, mount an offensive and overthrow governments. The anti-imperialist forces, and notably the Communists, realize that this overall plan must be countered by a broad and firm program of united action which would take into account the differing conditions in the various countries, the specifics of political development in each region. We must make it our aim to frustrate this imperialist plan.

Imperialism has a wide-ranging apparatus to maintain its domination in Latin America and to uphold its interests. And these are great indeed: the USA accounts for more than 80 per cent of all foreign investment in Latin America. At first investment was concentrated in mining, plantations and raw materials. Unable to prevent industrialization, the monopolies began to invest in manufacturing. This is a relatively new development, dating back some 20 years: between 1950 and 1968 U.S. investments in oil increased from $1.2 to $2.9 billion and from $600 million to $1.4 billion in mining, but the increase in manufacturing over the same period was from $700 million to $3.6 billion. In the more industrially developed countries – Argentina, Brazil and Mexico (which between them account for 37 per cent of all U.S. investments in Latin America) – 70 per cent of American investments are in the manufacturing industries.

There are 3,000 U.S. companies in Latin America employing 1,500,000 people. Half of all investments come from approximately 300 corporations controlled by the Morgan, Rockefeller, Dupont and Mellon groups. Together they control a substantial part of the continent's extractive industries and a huge share of manufacturing – 80 per cent of Brazil's automobile industry, 70 per cent in electrical engineering, 50 in aluminum, 85 in rubber and 90 in meat packing.

The North American monopolies appropriate one-fifth of the continent's GNP and a third of its export revenue. In the 60s their profit from industry, investments and credit amounted to $1-1.6 billion, and beginning with 1970 annual profits have been in excess of $2 billion. In other words, the U.S. monopolies make from four to five dollars on every invested dollar, and 80 per cent of the profit is 'repatriated' to the United States. Only an insignificant part is reinvested in Latin America. This means that more is pumped out of Latin America than is brought in in the form of direct investment.

The outflow is aggravated by the unequal trade pattern: the

monopolies are paying less for our raw materials and charging more for the manufactured goods we have to import. These and other factors have combined to produce a permanent balance-of-payments deficit. The recent U.S. trade reform law is typical of the methods used to exploit our nations and impede their development. In short, aided and abetted by the landed oligarchy and the middlemen bourgeoisie, the monopolies are draining the lifeblood of Latin America. That is why our countries are so backward and the people so poor.

The crisis of capitalism, the burden of which the monopolies are trying to shift to the people and to the developing countries, is aggravating Latin America's economic and social problems. The monetary and energy crises in developed capitalist countries are disastrous for countries with monopoly-controlled economies. Imperialist domination is, one could say, a transmission belt of crisis. People are coming to see that, far from stimulating Latin American development, the monopolies are actually hampering it. And as long as they hold sway, our peoples will be faced with mounting difficulties and progress will be impossible.

The understanding of that is bringing into the struggle against imperialism – already being waged by the working class, peasantry, students and progressive intellectuals – the middle strata, the national bourgeoisie, even those remote from the non-capitalist path of development. And though the reforms being introduced in some Latin American countries are anything but revolutionary, they are often of a clearly anti-imperialist character.

The 1969 Andes Pact of five Latin American countries regulates foreign investments so that they don't clash with national interests, reduces the amount of profit taken out of the country, establishes control over the movement of foreign capital and sets limits on foreign investment in key industries. The anti-imperialist sentiment of our peoples was clearly demonstrated at the recent session of the Organization of American States, when 12 votes were cast for the repeal of sanctions against Cuba (with three against and six abstentions).

Latin Americans are coming to see the present crisis as part of the general crisis of capitalism. There is no crisis in the socialist countries, and no unemployment, inflation, financial troubles. Hence, economic relations with the socialist states hold out no crisis dangers. No socialist country is interested in oppressing the developing countries, in extracting surplus value, in profiting from unequal trade arrangements, in imposing usurious loans. All this is part of imperialism and has absolutely nothing in common with the foreign economic and trade policies of countries where power is in the hands of the working class and the people.[2] It is with the assistance of the

socialist community that Cuba has been transformed from a one-crop agrarian country into a powerful and prosperous agrarian-industrial country.

The purpose of all the talk about 'Soviet' or 'Communist' imperialism is to mislead the people, prevent them from realizing who their real friends are. This is what Fidel Castro told the Fourth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries: 'How can one call the Soviet Union an imperialist power? Does it have any share in multinational companies? Does it own factories, mines, oil wells in developing countries? Does it exploit workers in Asia, Africa or Latin America?

'The Soviet Union's economic cooperation with Cuba and other countries reposes not on the sweat and sacrifice of the exploited workers of other peoples, but on the sweat and efforts of Soviet working people.' And Castro amplified: 'Any attempt to drive a wedge between the non-aligned countries and the socialist camp is profoundly counter-revolutionary and serves none but imperialist interests. Inventing a false enemy has only one aim: to conceal the real enemy.'

In Argentina, for example, certain people are trying to make the theory of 'two imperialisms' an official foreign-policy doctrine. But the country is benefiting greatly from agreements with socialist states. They facilitate independent development, growth of the national economy, reduction of unemployment, invigoration of the internal market, firmness against imperialism and monopoly domination, and consolidation of national freedom.[3]

Many Latin American governments have defied monopoly pressure and veiled CIA and U.S. State Department threats, and established economic relations with socialist countries. Not all of them, it is true, acknowledge the benefits this yields for independent development. Some pursue only transient aims. But irrespective of the reasons why they maintain these ties, all of them are aware that the socialist world is a dependable ally of the developing countries and that relations with it add to the potential of national liberation.

The conflicting nature of Latin America's political development, as we see it, is traceable to the many-faceted and complicated alignment of forces. It is also traceable to the fact that the national bourgeoisie and landed oligarchy are in power in most of our countries. The oligarchy wants agriculture and livestock breeding to retain their weight in the economy. It wants our countries to be no more than suppliers of raw materials, to be dependent on monopolies with which it has commercial ties. The national bourgeoisie, for its part, wants industrialization, economic growth, and education (to train a skilled labor force). It wants a sound internal market where it could sell the products of its factories. Concentrated mainly in the cities, it prom-

otes urbanization, etc. By doing so, it enters into an unequal contest with foreign monopolies, which are determined to prevent any and all manifestations of independence.

In spite of its contradictions with imperialism the national bourgeoisie is burdened with many commitments (debts, licences, and the like). It is therefore compelled to maneuver and search for a status quo acceptable to both sides. Furthermore, it is in a state of continuous conflict with the expanding working class, which demands higher wages, better working conditions, social security, and labor legislation. To meet these demands, the bourgeoisie must cut into its profits, and thus reduce the funds for investment. Reluctant to do so, it falls back on repressions. And wherever the working-class movement presents a real threat to its political hegemony, it usually prefers to range itself wholly on imperialism's side, give in to imperialism's demands, in order to avoid concessions to the working class in the political domain.

This bourgeoisie is between the hammer and the anvil: imperialism and monopoly, foreign and local, bear down on it from above, seeking to subordinate it, to turn it into a junior partner, and saddle it with its own terms, while the working class is putting on pressure from below in a bid not only for a better life, but also for the place that is its due in the social and political spheres.

Industrialization has had the effect of forging a strong working class, mostly in recent years.[4] Its growing numbers, greater concentration and mounting class consciousness tend to increase its political weight, fighting capacity, and the influence of its organizations. The impact of its influence on the political situation through powerful unions and political parties, first and foremost the Communist parties, is recognized by the realistic-minded sections of the bourgeoisie. Most working people's rights are formalized in laws and in the Constitution. Working-class parties that had been persecuted and banned for years, have now become legal in many countries. The people vote for working-class candidates, who champion their cause in parliaments. Even governments frequently turn to the working people for advice. Recognition of the workers' power is no gift from heaven. The workers are extending their place and building up influence on the political scene of the continent by strenuous struggle and painstaking organizational and educational work among the masses.

In the past 10 years the continental total of strikers was 150 million. In most cases the strikes were for vital social-economic demands. But it has also begun to sink in among working people that satisfaction of their demands depends on winning democratic freedoms, sovereignty, and national independence. This fact is gaining ever greater recognition among workers in trade unions of different orientations.

The hardships of the working people today are traceable mainly to the outdated system based on imperialist dependence and the latifundia. Even the most optimistic forecasts fall short of the high level of development our countries will reach once they shake off imperialist oppression and distribute the land to its tillers.[5]

The initiative in deep-going economic structural changes must belong to the working class. Due to its intermediate position and propensity to compromise with monopoly and the landlords, its dread of the revolutionary working class, the national bourgeoisie is incapable of deep enough changes. But, as we have said, this does not rule out alliance of its more progressive section with the proletariat and peasants, nor readiness to work with more or less determination for certain changes.

The main thing for the working-class movement, we hold, is to crush the chief enemy – imperialism and its oligarchic allies. The first step in this direction is to restrict their capacity for maneuver, strip them of their privileges, and expropriate their unlawfully appropriated wealth. Not the workers alone, but also the peasants, students, democratic intelligentsia, shopkeepers and traders, small and medium industrialists, and part of the national bourgeoisie not associated with monopoly, have a stake in this.

In our opinion, the core of working-class strategy is to coordinate the action of all these classes and strata, to unite them on the basis of an advanced jointly-elaborated program, form and consolidate a national front capable of fighting for political power and taking over the main levers of guidance in the country's life. Those are the necessary preconditions for the genuine liberation sought by our peoples.

In Argentina, the classes and strata listed above have contradictions with imperialism and the oligarchy, and regard them as the main enemy. There are coinciding points in their view of the struggle for a national-liberation, anti-imperialist, agrarian and democratic revolution. In face of profound contradictions, they express their aspirations to change, to patriotic goals, through political parties, trade unions, student centers, peasant leagues, housing associations, and cooperatives. They constitute a political majority in all the Latin American countries. But their weakness lies in their dispersal, disunity, internal strife, the absence of a common program and of the wish to elaborate one jointly. Anti-communist prejudices, too, though fickle and speculative, are doing considerable harm. Cultivated by imperialism, they are still widespread.

The unitarian strategy of the working-cass movement includes struggle with those extremist conceptions that proclaim it 'opportunist' and 'conciliatory,' a departure from class principles, socialist aims, and Marxism-Leninism. The working class, we are told by our

critics, should occupy itself solely with the immediate conquest of power in order to build socialism. Alliance with other social classes and strata, we are told, diverts the workers from this aim, while the bourgeoisie, in collusion with imperialism, has abolished the rule of law and all chances of democracy. The guerrilla movement and insurrection, we are told, are the only revolutionary means of struggle. Even trade union activity is harmful, because it cultivates reformism and is inevitably stamped with corruption. Since the Communist parties are alleged to have abandoned struggle for socialism, the working class of every country needs 'a party of its own' to direct and coordinate the armed units.

The fallacy of these ideas has been proved in practice. Guerrilla struggle 'at any price' has suffered defeat. Its participants, most of them young people who did not hesitate to stake their lives in the name of what they considered a just cause, are isolated from the masses and divorced from the social-political reality. Purely and simply, they were not prepared for the revolutionary role they so passionately wanted to play.

Recent experience shows the error of the abstract approach to the transition to socialism, the winning of working-class power in the absence of alliance with other classes and strata on the bais of a joint program of social-economic reconstruction. In those countries where popular unity had been achieved, as in Chile, for example, ultra-revolutionary demands had in effect impeded the revolution and deprived the popular government of the support of the middle strata. On the other hand, certain erroneous steps of the government made the position of popular power vulnerable in face of a desperate fascist military assault.

Contrary to the contentions of the ultras, popular unity has nothing in common with class reconciliation. The latter leads to the country's still greater dependence, turns the working-class movement into a supporter of the bourgeoisie, helps it exploit workers. Popular unity, on the other hand, places the proletariat at the head of the liberation struggle, helps to coordinate the actions of all anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic forces against the main enemy, and assures reconstruction of the social-economic structures. While class conciliation dooms the workers to integration in the capitalist system, to acceptance of exploitation and poverty, popular unity stands for transformations that improve the condition of the working class, open and bring nearer the socialist perspective.

We are convinced that to organize and unite all the forces of progress, we must first organize and unite the working class, and help it understand its historic mission. It is also necessary to unite and strengthen the Communist parties, its vanguard. The future of the

working-class movement and its effective participation in the alliance of forces that will bring closer the historical reconstruction of Latin America depend on their clear platform, firmness, courage and skill in mobilizing the masses.

The Communist and Workers' parties of the continent analyze Latin American realities and set the common directions in coordinated anti-imperialist action. As we have said, imperialism has worked out and set in motion its global counter-revolutionary plans. And we repeat that in these circumstances the peoples must be provided a broad alternative of unity that will enter their social thinking, arousing their consciousness and summoning them to struggle.

We are aware of the different conditions and the peculiar political development of every country. We study and use our accumulated experience. We must tell the masses of our point of view concerning imperialist strategy on the continent, coordinate action and strengthen solidarity. This will frustrate imperialist designs and, in concert with other democratic social and political forces, pave the way to the second liberation of the continent – the national liberation of our peoples with the socialist perspective.

1. The press continues its sensational exposures of CIA operations in our continent. The evidence is overwhelming. It began with documents made public by Jack Anderson and ended with frank admissions by CIA agents about their subversion missions. The CIA stands fully exposed and discredited. Attempts to put all the blame on some of its agents carry no credibility. The CIA is an agency of the government and acts with its consent or connivance. No one is likely to believe that 30 CIA agents could overthrow a government or engineer a plot without huge financial support from the monopolies' 'reptile fund,' or without the assistance of high-placed elements in the countries concerned, whose interests are linked with those of imperialism.

2. The U.S. Export Import Bank charges 6-8 per cent on loans, the socialist countries charge about half that figure. Enterprises built with imperialist capital remain its property, and it also pockets all the profits. Enterprises built with the help of socialist countries are the property of the country in which they are built. Imperialist firms employ a minimum of local skilled labor and only foreign supervisory personnel. Projects carried out with the help of socialist countries employ local workers and provide maximum training so that the country is left with a cadre of supervisory personnel.

3. On receiving Soviet credits of $600 million for a 10-year term (at 4.5 per cent) to develop and equip oil fields and to build hydropower stations, metallurgical and other industrial enterprises, Argentina concluded no less favorable agreements with other socialist countries. If sabotage by reactionary elements in the government and ruling party, as well as outside pressure are suppressed, the people of Argentina, as estimates even by bourgeois economists show, will gain tremendously.

4. The work force was 53 million in 1970. Forty million were in industry, commerce and the services, and 13 million in farming. In Mexico, Uruguay, Chile, Argentina and Brazil the majority of working people are wage and salary earners. In the latter two countries more than 35 per cent of the work force is employed in enterprises with over 500 workers.

5. In Argentina 120 large enterprises yield 40 per cent of national production, set prices and control supplies. At least 80 of them belong to foreign capital. In agriculture five per cent of the proprietors own 74 per cent of the cultivated land. Nationalization of these large enterprises and an agrarian reform (expropriation of latifundia and distribution of the land among peasants and farm workers) would do away with the plunder of the country's wealth by a privileged minority and enable the people to enjoy the fruits of their labor. If the same were done in other countries, there would be no poor people in rich lands.

Scientific socialism in Africa

Marien Ngouabi
Chairman of CC,
Congolese Party of Labor,
President of People's
Republic of the Congo

Congo Problems, Views and Experience

All the peoples of Africa, especially the Negro peoples, languished under the colonial yoke for a long time. In fact, the indigenous population of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa still live under the shadow of foreign domination, a colonial regime and fascist repression.

The peoples fought heroically for freedom and human dignity. Hundreds of thousands, men and women, joined the battle for independence and national sovereignty. Generation after generation staked their lives, the blessings of life, for liberty, and did not fear hardships and suffering, because the aims of the struggle were consonant with their cherished dream. It is natural, therefore, that the 60s – the years when independence came to most of the countries of Africa – are impregnated in the minds of our peoples as years of renewal, a fount of creativity and constructive inspiration.

Independence and sovereignty are essential for the new life. The idea of independence implies a drive for progress and growth, and the flowering of the human personality. Independence is that definite phase in which these aims are attained. And the bitterness prevailing among our peoples today, their concern for the future, have their roots in the fact that proclamation of independence has not yielded relief or changed their condition.

Real independence is still to be achieved. Most of the African countries are still economically, politically and culturally dependent. The state structures the colonialists had created to suppress the masses continue to stand, and many of the conditions needed for progress are lacking.

The African peoples expose and reject the new forms of colonialism, just as they had rejected the previous forms. The struggle continues. *And the national question is linked with the social question.*

In colonial times, and especially since liberation, the African countries had to choose the kind of society they were going to build in order to fulfil the hopes of their peoples – a society in keeping with their historical features and the present-day achievements of human civilization.

What type of society, what type of governmental and economic organization, would deliver our peoples from the many centuries of abject poverty in a reasonable space of time? What would have to be done to overcome the social backwardness of our young states? What orders should be given our army, the popular masses, on its historic march? What pace should be set, and what goal?

The period ushered in by independence has been a period of reappraisal and negation:

– reappraisal of our traditional society, because going back to it would be tantamount to suicide for the African peoples;

– negation of all forms of colonialism, which is trying to delude the African peoples about the source of their misery;

– negation of capitalism, the social system that spawned colonialism and imperialism.

Instead of capitalism we shall build a *socialist society,* the only type of society that guarantees independence and social progress.

The first socialist state, Soviet Russia, came into the world with the 1917 October Revolution. Since then the new system has spread to other countries of Europe, to Asia and America.

But nowhere did so many questions arise over this as have arisen in Africa. Yet the European peoples that have attained socialism had also practised religion, and possessed traditions and customs, and a long history. The new social system made the most of all the good elements in the old heritage and absorbed that which may be described as the 'soul of the people.' Is it right to say, therefore, as some do, that socialism is not suited for Africa?

To begin with, there is only one socialism – *scientific socialism,* the foundations of which were laid by Marx and Engels. It studies diverse and broad questions of practically unlimited scope. Like any other science it takes in new knowledge. But this does not annul it. On the

contrary, it grows richer. Marx's science is *not a dogma, but an open book*. Unfortunately, this correct thought is often used to negate Marx and his science, to produce harmful and artificial constructions contrary to Marx's scientific theory.

The African is the same as all other people, and the society in which he lives is subject to the same universal laws. Our various peoples lived and labored in dissimilar conditions. Relying on the universal laws, we must therefore study the concrete phenomena in time and space, that is, apply the scientific approach. It is just as unscientific to ignore the specific situation as it is to negate science in general. This is why we, the peoples of Black Africa, can also contribute to human knowledge, enriching rather than negating science.

Recognition of the universal laws helps determine whether the attitude to science is negative or positive. Just think how incongruous it is to accept one or two principles, reject everything else, and yet profess fidelity to science.

We maintain that the future of the world, and of Africa, is associated with socialism. As we see it, therefore, the option today is not, in effect, between types of society, but between the ways and means of building a socialist society.

One can speak of African ways to socialism, but certainly not of an African socialism. Then socialism will retain its scientific character and at the same time take account of the specific conditions (i.e., history, morality and customs, geography). This is no novel discovery. It was Lenin who said that all peoples will come to socialism – each in its own way and in different forms.

By fighting dogmatism within our Party, we do not therefore quest for the singular, but try to enrich the general. And there is no doubt in our minds that this is the approach Africa, like the rest of the world, needs.

Yet we often encounter specific political theories based on specifically African realities. They are especially constructed to differ from the ideology of capitalism and also from that of scientific socialism. But what are the realities they are built upon? Are these realities immutable?

One of the tendencies, influenced by the idealistic currents dominant in bourgeois sociology and ethnography, is to infer the social organization from the people's religious beliefs. But this approach is a total failure, for the many 'theories' it has produced do not even attempt to generalize, which reduces them to a mere recital of facts.

Even a cursory glance at the history of our country will show that the Congolese society of 1975 is not what it was in 1960, and certainly not what it was in, say, the 15th century. Nor, we think, does this apply to the Congo alone.

In his 'Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State,' Frederick Engels offers what we hold to be the right approach to the problem, presenting African society in a new light. Certainly, Engels' general explanation of the evolution of human society from the primitive commune to the inception of states has remained valid within the bounds of the material he had examined. But we hold that the evolution of society in Africa is subject to the same general laws as in other regions of the world, though it takes distinctive and highly original forms. Even a brief study of the history of Congolese society will suffice to illustrate this point.

The economic system imposed on our country by the colonialists (company concessions) has proletarianized the Congolese people, while most of the social structures of the precolonial period remained intact. Colonialism gradually produced an intellectual 'elite' to serve its needs, consisting of petty employees and civil servants, the so-called 'evolué.' Following the Second World War and then as a result of the 'Loi-cadre,'* Congolese were also admitted to responsible political posts. This created a new social stratum, which lined its pockets through political activity (emergence of the parliamentary bourgeoisie) and used its position to grant privileges enabling individuals to run their businesses more profitably (emergence of Congolese businessmen and inception of a compradore bourgeoisie).

Following independence (1960) and the installation in political and administrative posts of people specially trained to promote colonialist interests, the social antagonisms became still sharper.

In sum, colonialism created an urban and rural proletariat (through the policy of concessions) and at the same time spawned privileged classes – the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie (bureaucratic, compradore and parliamentary) – connected with the old social strata and classes. This connection and resemblance is, among other things, clear evidence that pre-colonial society, too, had a class essence. So, as we see, Congolese society consists of classes, with some classes exploiting others, and the contradictions between them are antagonistic.

But unlike many other African countries, the Congolese proletariat is conscious of being an exploited class and is therefore highly active on the political scene in order to change this state of affairs.

Due to the weakness of the national bourgeoisie, many African states are compelled to intervene in the economy, lest it should fall completely under the sway of foreigners. But frequently this is connected with an orientation on state capitalism. In the Congo, on the

* Among other things, this law envisaged internal autonomy for the French colonies in Africa (1956). – *Ed.*

other hand, the political consciousness of the proletariat has risen to a level where the only possible solution leads to socialization of the means of production. It is precisely the proletariat's knowledge of its mission that predicated the founding in 1969 of the vanguard party representing the standpoint of the working class.

The parties that sprang up after the war had a chiefly tribal basis, though also associated with the political structures of the colonial regime.

Tribal feelings were cultivated for political purposes as a basis for unity. This reduced elections to collisions between different ethnic groups. The culmination point came with the 1959 elections, when there was violence and bloodshed. Tribalists headed by Abbot Youlou took power at first in the independent Congo.

But the Congolese masses were quick to see that independence administered by lackeys of the colonialists, even though in clerical attire, was a total fraud. On August 13-15, 1963, the people went into the streets. They stormed the palace of the head of the neo-colonialist administration, and conquered despite the French army units which had then occupied Brazzaville. Youlou's overthrow became an example for the peoples of other African countries that had gained independence in the same conditions as the Congo.

Caught unawares by the August 13-15 events, the imperialists and their local agents began trying to regain their privileges by force and corruption.

Faced with this threat to the revolutionary movement, the trade unions, youth and women's organizations and the political parties decided to set up a single mass party, the National Revolutionary Movement (NRM). Its constituent congress was held in Brazzaville in 1964.

The party came out in favor of scientific socialism, but there was a wide spectrum of views – from socialist to capitalist – within its ranks of how to carry forward the revolution and develop the country. The party failed to provide adequate leadership. More, it tried to eliminate the progressive forces in order to emasculate the revolutionary movement and place the country under a neo-colonial regime. This led to the revolutionary rising of July 31, 1968, in which progressive servicemen, the youth, the trade unions – the entire population in fact – joined together to save the revolution. Clearly, the country needed a single, united class-vanguard Marxist-Leninist party.

Our analysis is always premised on historical materialism, the basis of which is the law of class struggle, the motive force of history. At every stage of history, at every stage of the development of society, the decisive role belongs to a definite class. In the Congo the most exploited classes, in the framework of the confrontation between the

people and imperialism, are the working class and its ally, the peasantry. That is why they are more interested than any other class in winning independence and refashioning society.

Colonialism proletarianized the whole nation, but it is the working class, created by colonialism, that has been most irreconcilable to exploitation. And the working class has displayed the strongest urge for change, for it is the most interested in change. The other classes and social strata long for change, too, but they must fight for it under the banner of the working-class party.

The Congolese Party of Labor (CPL)* is a working-class party standing at the head of our people's fight against imperialism and for a socialist society.

The CPL is a vanguard party. It draws its strength from the masses, and is guided in all its activities by Marxism-Leninism. Its slogan is: 'Everything for the people, only for the people.'

What are our basic principles?

– *Our world outlook is materialist*, and we consider religious or other idealistic world outlooks to be wrong.

For us man is not only the product of nature and matter, but, above all, the product of society, of which he is the creator and organizer. Man, consciousness, cannot exist outside of society.

– *We recognize the existence of classes and conduct our struggle from working-class positions*. Though too general and incomplete, our analysis of classes in Congolese society has disclosed the existence, both in the past and now, of antagonistic social classes.

The main contradiction in our country as explained in the Party program is between:

'The revolutionary forces, including the working class which though numerically small and ideologically immature is the pillar of the revolution; its ally, the peasantry, comprising a large but still unorganized group; and the still vacillating intermediate strata (petty bourgeoisie, the youth and students) . . .

and

'The reactionary forces, including international, and particularly French, imperialism, and its Congolese allies, the bureaucratic and compradore bourgeoisie and the feudal element.'

Hence, our struggle against imperialism, the principal enemy of the Congolese people, must not overshadow the struggle against the exploiter classes within the country.

– *For democratic government*. We believe that the state is, above all, an instrument of dictatorship. It is not the 'father of the family' because relations between antagonistic classes are based on force, not

* Founded on December 31, 1969.

on love and attachment. It is thus perfectly clear that in countries influenced by neo-colonialism the machinery of government is a weapon of repression and dictatorship. We must demolish it and build up in its stead a new government apparatus committed to the anti-imperialist struggle, serving the African masses and controlled by them. Towards that end, the CPL, together with the working people (workers and peasants), the youth, the intellectuals, the armed forces, is campaigning for thorough democratization. We have begun by reorganizing the police, the army and the courts.

– *We are working towards public ownership of the means of production*. Under the Constitution, the land is the property of the people and land tenure is regulated by the state.

The Party program envisages nationalization of all property that can serve society. First the main, and subsequently all means of production will gradually be turned over to the state and the working people.

Foreigners are now allowed to invest only in mixed companies, that is, in companies with state capital. At the socialist stage, private property will, in the main, be abolished to give way to public ownership of the means of production.

– *We consider it necessary to unite all the progressive forces,* the working people in the first place. Proletarian internationalism can accelerate the building of socialism in Africa and throughout the world.

African unity, solidarity with liberation movements, sincere friendship and cooperation with the socialist countries, solidarity with all embattled peoples will help put an end to the capitalist system, imperialism and colonialism. Unity of the oppressed nations must be founded not on sentiments or geo-political considerations, but on their real interests.

Beginning with the memorable days of August 13-15, 1963, our revolution has been advancing towards Congo's fundamental transformation by abolishing the exploitation of man by man and creating a just and prosperous society.

The revolutionary institutions and laws needed to achieve this were established as a result of the mass pressure following the July 1968 rising.

Unfortunately, there were still advocates of leftist and adventuristic policies in the party. Their anarchistic proclivities were clearly demonstrated during the abortive coup of February 22, 1972. These elements prevented a clear definition of the present stage of the revolution. It was only after these deplorable developments that the special Party congress in December 1972 clearly stated that Congo

was passing through the stage of national, democratic and people's revolution.

This clarification was very timely, for it enabled us to dispel the dangerous misconceptions assiduously cultivated by leftist groups. They argued that once we had accepted Marxism-Leninism as our ideology and guide to action, Congo was already a socialist country.

Now the confusion was resolved: revolution means one class overthrowing another and assuming power, but it also means that revolutionary change is a long process. In the People's Republic of the Congo we shall have to resolve the main contradiction, between the people and imperialism, before we can advance to the next stage, socialism.

There will have to be an all-out offensive against imperialism, in particular French imperialism. And there will have to be an all-out offensive against imperialism's allies in Congo to win and consolidate full independence. Such are our tasks at the present stage, the stage of national, democratic and people's revolution.

National, because our goal is an end to domination by French imperialism which, by controlling the national economy, factually controls also the political situation. Another goal is to create the objective and subjective preconditions for the formation of the Congolese nation and to rid the country of tribalism and regionalism.

Democratic, because it replaces minority by majority rule, and because it draws its support from the masses, the workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary intellectuals.

People's, because it strives to lay the economic, social and cultural foundations for the next stage, socialist revolution, and prepare the objective, subjective and psychological prerequisites for this by mobilizing and uniting the broad mass of the dispossessed under the banner of the proletariat and its vanguard, the Congolese Party of Labor.

In other words, at the present stage of the national-liberation struggle, at the stage of national, democratic and people's revolution, all our activities must rest on alliance of the revolutionary classes and patriotic forces within a united anti-imperialist front. Its purpose is to mobilize the broad masses on the basis of their interests, and unite, under the leadership of the working-class party, the CPL, the women, youth, peasants, small tradesmen and artisans, as well as trade unions, religious groups and cultural associations.

The workers join this united front, in alliance with the peasantry and the revolutionary intelligentsia, because the revolution is in the interests of the exploited classes. The national middle bourgeoisie, small tradesmen and artisans suffer from the impact of foreign capital; they want to control the economy and are therefore against im-

perialism. The religious groups, too, have good reason to oppose imperialism, for they want freedom of worship. Consequently, the vital interests of all classes and social strata dictate opposition to imperialism. The CPL must therefore unite these classes and strata and give them leadership in the fight for national liberation.

The Party's biggest success in democratization came with the democratic elections to the Peoples' Assemblies, composed of representatives of workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and other patriots. Their job is to manage the affairs of the community and safeguard the interests and wealth of the people through a simple but effective administrative structure.

Our people in every part of the country have a direct part in administration. However, it has to be said that this experiment with the People's Assemblies, usually referred to as people's government, has raised many problems due to the lack of experienced leaders and money.

Much still remains to be done to complete the edifice of the future. We must give these local government bodies a clear class orientation. We can do that only if the peasants are organized, drawn into the country's economic endeavors, and if peasant representatives are brought into the administration.

Lastly, the building of socialism requires a government apparatus attuned to the interests of the people. We are now building such an apparatus. In particular, we are strengthening the army under the slogan: 'A people without its own army is powerless.' We have proclaimed the National People's Army the right hand of the Party, and a while ago the CPL worked out the basic principles of political and economic work and professional training in the army.

Our policy of democratizing all aspects of national life, plus demolition of the neo-colonialist government apparatus, has given the working class and the people a full share in the management of state enterprises and offices in accordance with the 'crucial triad' principle, i.e., all questions pertaining to the operation of the given enterprises are decided by representatives of the Party, trade unions and management. Planning has also been democratized.

In line with the democratization policy, we are extending Party control, in conformity with the Party program, to all major sectors and entrusting their administration to the working people. In the agrarian sector, which enjoys top priority, we are concentrating on setting up cooperatives as the forerunners of collective farming and the peasants' changeover to proletarian and socialist positions.

Nationalization is going ahead steadily and methodically, accelerated from time to time by the needs of the moment or by mass pressure. The state has taken over, partially or entirely, such big

enterprises as SIA-Congo, SNE, ATC, banking and insurance, SOTEXCO, the liquid fuel company, telecommunications, civil aviation, etc. The timber industry was made a state monopoly on January 1, 1975.

Beginning with 1963 Congo has been administered by Congolese. Education has been fully democratized since its nationalization in 1965 and, it should be emphasized, all children attend school. This poses many problems, especially financial, but we hope to solve them with the development of our oil industry.

Our experience is added proof that a party that upholds the interests of the working class and its ally, the peasantry, is the most consistent leader of the liberation struggle of the oppressed classes. We are firmly convinced in the correctness of our policy.

SELECTED PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS
GEORGI PLEKHANOV
FIVE VOLUME EDITION

Plekhanov's great contribution was his defence of scientific socialism at a time when Marxism was relatively new and when attempts to discredit Marx were rife. In his criticism of the various forms of idealism which developed in pre-revolutionary Russia, Plekhanov developed Marxist thought and gave concrete expression to basic Marxist concepts. His work to explain that Marxism was applicable to historical conditions in Russia provide us with clear expositions of historical and dialectical materialism and its applications to all aspects of life. These volumes give us an insight to some of the most important debates in the development of Marxism, for example, articles on Hegel, Darwin, Blanqui and Bakunin. Plekhanov's opposition to philosophical reaction and obscurantism and his loyalty to the emancipation of all people make Lenin's insistence that Plekhanov be included in a "series of obligatory textbooks on communism" a viable recommendation for today.

Second Revised Edition 1974
Volume One now available. Cloth $8.95

Order From:

PROGRESS BOOKS, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto

☐ Please send Vol I ☐ Please reserve the following volumes

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

political panorama

Political changes in the British student movement

Dave Cook
Member Executive Committee,
CP of Great Britain

Over the last ten years the number of full-time students in higher and further education in Britain has more than doubled, and in 1971, according to official figures, it totalled 673,935. The membership of the National Union of Students is now approximately 650,000. However, over this period the political changes among the student population and in their mass organizations have been as striking as their numerical expansion.

This article attempts to assess the causes of these social and political changes, and to consider some of the problems and the potential that arise from them.

The fact of being a student, and being a member of a student union, *in no way* constitutes this significant section of the population as a social class. The careless and incorrect allocation of students in this way ('students are workers/bourgeois/petty bourgeois/classless, a new class') must be rejected in favor of a more rigorous approach.

Changing relationship to the working class

Before the Second World War the social background of the student population in Britain was *relatively* homogeneous, with a clear majority drawn from the ruling class, and the social strata which nestled against it. Although this element remains as an important constituent of the student population today, increasingly the intake into post-school education draws upon students from middle strata and, to a lesser extent, working-class backgrounds. There are two main reasons why this social base has been broadened. Firstly, and most important, society's expanding requirements for skilled technical and intellectual labor could not be satisfied unless recruits from new social

* Before his appointment as the Party's national organizer in March this year, Dave Cook was for a number of years the Party's national election agent and, earlier, national student organizer.

strata were drawn upon. Secondly, political pressure both from the Labor Party and the Communist Party and from among educational opinion forced significant expansions in the provision of places – even though new ways of continuing social selection were built into the new structure.

Of course, working-class students are virtually excluded from many high prestige institutions, such as Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and to a great extent from courses of a non-vocational nature. Also, although many more students from a working-class background now go to college, their proportion of the greatly expanded total number of students, has grown much more slowly.

More marked than these changes in social origin have been changes in the social *destination* of very large numbers of students. In sharp contrast to the situation before the Second World War when degree qualifications conferred a high income and social status, the majority of students now find employment in jobs which can no longer be considered 'privileged': in teaching, in scientific work, administration, the professions, the public services, the civil service, social work and the media. These occupations can conveniently be grouped under the heading 'middle strata.' What has changed so markedly is not so much the list of jobs, all of which would certainly have featured prominently in any estimate of student employment between the First and Second World Wars, but the *role and character* of these jobs in state monopoly, capitalist Britain. In place of relatively small professional élites, as they were in the 1930s, they are now massive employers of work forces, many hundreds of thousands strong, whose interests increasingly coincide with those of the industrial working class.

Now this change in social direction triggers off political results of great importance in the colleges. Students, whose job expectations lie within these areas feel the impact of the buffeting these middle strata sections of the population are receiving, and all the accompanying political views that stem from the growth of trade union consciousness among them; albeit an impact which is one degree removed.

Traditionally, these workers have regarded themselves, and have been regarded, as 'the middle classes.' Clearly, their attitudes to their work, their experiences and organizations differ significantly from those of industrial workers. Nonetheless, this huge section of salary earners must be considered to have the potential to become the closest allies of the industrial working class.

Because they play no part in the productive process, and are in fact in a transitional state, students as a group in society *cannot* be part of the working class. What is true, however, is that social changes in their composition and destination on completion of study, relate

them, as a group, to that section of society which stands opposed to the interest of monopoly power – namely, the working class and its allies. Increasingly these changes are severing those social connections which tie students to the bourgeoisie.

It must never be forgotten that although higher and further education increasingly produces people who are near to the working class, they also provide those who will be the mandarins of big business, and who will staff the highest levels of state-monopoly capitalism – who will in fact be the mortal enemies of the working class. Clearly students are not a homogeneous block. Social and political differentiation among them reveals both the contradictions of their origins and their destinations as a group in society. However, the *dominant* tendency is for the interests of the majority of students to increasingly coincide with those of the working class.

Attacks on the students

Students also feel a more direct jolt from the attacks that successive Tory and Labor Governments have made upon the student population as part of their attempts to switch the burden of the present crisis on to the working population as a whole. This attack has taken an economic form, as student grants have been held back while costs and fees rocket. It takes on an anti-democratic form with the attempt by the last Conservative Government in 1971-72 to destroy the relatively high degree of autonomy student unions enjoy. It also takes on an ideological form as sections of the media have lost no opportunity to pillory student political action.

These attacks on students as a group in society have mounted over the last few years. The response that student unions have made to these attacks, at both a national and local level, through such actions as the 18-month-long Grants Campaign of 1973/74, have strengthened the unity of the student movement. Their reaction has paralleled the enormously more powerful defense by the trade union movement against attacks from the last Tory Government.

The academic year that began in October 1974 has seen these attacks on students take a qualitatively new form. The worsening crisis of British and world imperialism is driving the right-wing leaders of the Labor Government to implement cutbacks in expenditure on education on a scale so drastic that some university vice-chancellors have spoken of impending bankruptcy for their institutions.

Thus, the relationship of students to the working class has been transformed in two main ways. Firstly, social changes in their composition, and destination on completion of study *begin* to connect them to categories of employment where trade union organization and militant struggle are becoming more important. Secondly, their ex-

perience under the hammer of Government policy links the reaction of the student movement and working-class organizations in a relationship of alliance against a common enemy.

This change is more than one of positional relationship. The mass organizations of the working class themselves are changing as the left militant trends within them grow stronger. This means that the political impact exerted by working-class organizations on students is correspondingly greater than in the mid-1960s, when the right-wing trend was much more securely in the ascendant.

The position of education in monopoly capitalism

A further cluster of politicizing influences upon sections of the student population stems from the contradiction between what the ruling class require of post-school education and what many students want. The big monopolies and the state have continually sought to restructure the educational system so that it corresponds more closely to *their* needs for skilled personnel. This has not always been so. The old élitist system of university education, typified by the dominance of Oxford and Cambridge, had as its main function the training and cultural adornment of the sons, and much more latterly, the daughters, of the ruling class.

During the 19th century, however, this form of education came increasingly into conflict with the demands of capitalism for technically and scientifically qualified personnel, and a number of historic 'restructurings' of the education system, attempted to, and largely succeeded, in resolving this contradiction.

Since the end of the Second World War the state has played a much more active role in post-school education. In 1943 the President of the Board of Trade had said: 'More and more in the future it will be necessary to rely on the quality of our industrial and commercial personnel .... Much closer collaboration between industry and commerce and the education system is essential if the country is to develop a national system (of education) and the personnel with the training and knowledge adequate to the needs of the future.' However, it was only in the 1960s that higher education expansion really got under way, officially sanctioned by the Robbins Report in 1963.

A significant feature of this expansion, and a trend expressed generally throughout all sections of post-school education as the state played a more direct role, was the centralization of administration and decision-making within these institutions. This concentration of power highlighted their undemocratic character – indeed it reflected in some ways the power divisions within society as a whole. At times opposition to these developments, and the way big business interests

have often been able to exploit them, became explosive issues – areas of intense local struggles at college level.

We have referred to the growing links between the academic institution and industry, especially at the level of research. Both the state, and the big monopolies, which in the present era increasingly merge, continually drive to increase their influence and control over post-school education as an area of crucial importance for both the development of the productive process and, as we shall see, for the consolidation of the social system.

Through representation on Governing Boards and the financing of research big business exerts a continual pressure to restructure higher and further education to make it correspond more closely to the *needs* of the monopolies and the government, and to increase their *control* over the content and organization of education. This pressure runs completely counter to the interests of the students, the majority of the teaching staff, and the working class, and is resisted at every step.

Education and ideology

There is another function that education fulfils within capitalist society that must be examined if we are correctly to locate the causes of student thinking and action. Not only must Britain's requirements for highly skilled personnel be satisfied at an ever more complex level, but each generation plays a crucial role for the ruling class in consolidating the acceptance of the status quo.

Although the British ruling class has resort to the repressive power of the state – the police, the judiciary and the armed forces, more generally the realities of the system are concealed, legitimized, and made acceptable through the prevailing ideology of the 'British way of life' which permeates the thinking of the people in an extemely subtle way. Education plays a central part in the generation of these ideological assumptions – no less in higher and further education than in the primary and secondary sectors.

No matter how 'vocational' the subject, no matter how 'neutral' the science, no matter how well constructed the 'ivory tower,' the basic orientation of education in college and university is impregnated with the values of the class that dominates society.

The class struggle which lies at the heart of capitalist Britain finds expression in every area of life – be it cultural, ideological, philosophical or scientific. A major feature of the education system is to transmit the *ideological* assertions of the ruling class – and therefore at the level of ideology the class struggle rages in education.

We British Communists reject the idea that this ideological confrontation is the exclusive concern of 'intellectuals' in society, and that the role of the working class is to fight 'economic' battles. The

central battle which faces the Communist Party among the working class is to win the recognition that trade union militancy is not enough – that out of militant struggles must be developed the understanding of the need for socialist revolution.

Very many students find their expectations contradicted by what greets them at college. The overwhelming majority are subjected to compartmentalized, unrelated chunks of knowledge; in some subjects pure apologetics for capitalism and neo-colonialism; in others the trendy illusion of 'looking at all points of view.' Almost everywhere a gulf exists between their expectations of free debate and critical thought; of being offered a chance to understand the world – and the realities of boring, often irrelevant rote learning. Within the faculties and departments an authoritarian 'lecturer and lectured at' relationship, and hanging over everything the spectre of unjust and inefficient methods of assessment.

Examinations face almost every student at some time or another. They determine, and sometimes destroy, the life styles of many, and are a central feature of the control mechanism of the authorities. How to assess, and whether to assess are complex questions to which there are no easy answers – but progressive educational and student opinion is almost unanimous in denouncing the distortions of syllabi and teaching that stem from exam-orientated courses.

Not only is there a contrast between expectations and reality on arrival at college. Many students are motivated to varying degrees by feelings of idealism about the uses to which they wish to put their knowledge on completion of study. In every subject the contradiction rearing in front of them as their final exams approach is: instead of a rational and creative utilization of their talents, all too often monopoly capitalism will distort and prostitute them.

These two drives – one structural, the other ideological – to make post-school education able to more effectively serve the class that dominates society have come into conflict with the aspirations of many students for education more orientated to social relevance, education which takes a critical stance to the realities of the crisis. Important mass struggles over recent years, around issues like big business involvement in the institution, democracy in the faculty and over the nature of assessment, suggest an undercurrent of student resentment that stems from these contradictions and which in the future may assume an explosive potential.

'Alternative' study groups have become active in many faculties, and increasingly younger members of the teaching staff associate themselves with these attempts. As yet they involve only a small proportion of students, but the success of the annual 'Communist University of London,' organized by the Communist Party for six

successive years, and attracting in 1974 over 600 students for nine days of intensive study of Marxism-Leninism applied to their subjects, illustrates how great is the potential for work of this kind.

From such interest some of the ultra-left have gone on to incorrectly argue that 'liberated faculties' can be established within the capitalist university or college, within a capitalist state. All the 'counter-teaching' projects based on this utopian dream, that emerged in the late 1960s throughout the capitalist world, rapidly folded – for example, in Germany the 'critical university,' in Paris the 'summer university' and in Britain the 'free universities.' These failures, most of them inevitable because of the student vanguardist illusions on which they were built, should not obscure the fact that a growing number of students are attempting to confront bourgeois ideology at the level of their subject. Alternative seminars and radical scholars' groupings with their participants free from such illusions and beginning to recognize the contradictions in education in all their complexity, are now developing.

No account of these political influences can ignore the effect of the profound disenchantment felt by many socialist students towards the Labour Party. At every level in student politics the organizational and political weakness of the Labour Party in college and university, testify to the extent to which Labour Party leaders stand exposed for their continuing commitment to reformism.

The crisis of imperialism

These developments within the educational system have taken place against a background of intensifying crisis for world imperialism, which has detonated a succession of political charges into the student population, as they have into all sections of society. The heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people made a particularly deep impact.

For the first time young people began to see a national liberation struggle, not just in terms of peace, which was still a tendency during the Cuban 'missile' crisis for example; not just in terms simply of the barbarity of imperialism (although the revulsion at atrocities like the My Lai massacre should not be underestimated) but also as demanding a commitment to the National Liberation Front, and all that its victory would represent. It clearly demonstrated that the biggest imperial power could be pushed back and defeated. Unquestionably it was responsible for changing the international outlook of large numbers of students, at least in their view of imperialism and the third world – if not as yet in their view of the socialist world. Increasingly now the movements of solidarity with Chile and the Southern African Liberation struggles reinforce this internationalist orientation.

It is important to recognize the unique features of student life which

can magnify, and sometimes distort, the impact made by these political pressures. Because they are a section of the population in social movement and are not a social class, students in their consciousness draw upon a greater variety of pressures and influences, social, economic, political and cultural, than those more embedded in the social structure of society. The one area their consciousness draws upon most weakly is working class experience.

Because they are removed from the direct process of production, the pressures and rhythms of their lives are determined by the educational institution and its demands. Although these differ greatly between different colleges and different courses, in general students have a much 'freer' allocation of their time open to them than do workers, and are much less subject to discipline.

Students are, above all, young. Nowhere else in capitalist society are young men and women separated off and grouped together in the same way. There are no factories containing only young workers; yet increasingly the development of education concentrates growing numbers of students into relative closed communities, isolated from the rest of the population. The isolation enables them to adopt a 'life style,' a morality and political attitude to an extent independent of norms their parents and social background may wish them to abide by.

Now, these 'peculiar conditions of student existence' can have contradictory results. One one side, they can wipe clean previously restricting attitudes and release enormous enthusiasm and lack of inhibition in adopting new political views and enable rapid progression to conclusions others may take longer to reach. On the other hand, they can lead to adventurism, élitist arrogance, and the most dangerous forms of anarchism and ultra-leftism.

Thus in student mobilization we have sometimes seen a passionate and spontaneous embracement of the slogans of revolution before the development of any theoretical conclusions as to the nature of that revolution. We have seen a very intellectualized view of the struggle as existing only in the realms of the consciousness. We have seen a sort of fetishism made of revolutionary 'purity.' We have seen the development of an anti-imperialist consciousness, sometimes devoid of class consciousness, for example, in a down-grading of the role that the Soviet Union played in the fight against fascism, and an underestimation of the role the socialist countries play today in support for national liberation movements. Most often of all we see contempt for the organizations of the working class.

The student movement

Over the last decade the British student population has been affected

by the social changes and the political and ideological pressures which the first part of this article has so far described. These pressures have not borne down equally on all students and, at different times, have drawn very different responses from different sectors. Furthermore, the sharpening economic and political crisis leads to a left-right polarization in all sections of society, and students are no exception. Large numbers of students still come from backgrounds likely to be activated in an anti-working class direction from this polarization. However, bearing in mind that the potential for right-wing politics among students may recently have been enlarged, the fact remains that over recent years, and including the last year when the polarizing results of the crisis have been at their sharpest, very many students have been won to take militant collective action both on the issues that confront them in college and in solidarity with the working class. It is in this that the real significance of these pressures so far described lies. They have created the conditions out of which the student movement has been built, and the National Union of Students transformed.

From 1948 until 1970, the NUS had a right-wing careerist leadership. National conferences were castrated of political discussion by a 'no politics' rule, and its international alignment closely bound in with CIA-financed student fronts and U.S. cold-war policies.

NUS was affiliated to the 'International Students Conference,' an organization that was clearly designed to be a political counter-force to the International Union of Students, which in the cold-war terminology of NUS leaders then, was described as 'the Red menace.' In 1967 the American magazine *Ramparts* produced evidence that confirmed beyond doubt that the ISC was financed through Central Intelligence Agency fronts.

From that time Communist Party students have played a major part in the Broad Left, an alliance of left-wing Labour, Communist and non-affiliated socialist students which first spearheaded the defeat of the right wing in NUS, and which since 1970 has received majority support in the student movement. The Broad Left has consistently opposed attempts by the ultra left to commit the student movement to adventurist policies which would divide its unity, and fragment its links with working-class organizations. Today the Broad Left faces a much more serious challenge from the right wing, which is re-forming in the thinly disguised form of 'moderates' and 'democrats.'

In the process of leftward movement of many thousands of students over recent years, the events of 1968, christened by the media as 'the student revolt,' can now be seen in a balanced perspective.

On the one hand we saw political immaturity, ultra-leftist ideas of a 'revolutionary student vanguard,' fanned predictably enough by the

mass media. These ideas arose from a rejection of the trade unions as 'bourgeoisified' and reactionary. This writing off of the revolutionary potential of the working class, and the elevation of the role of students, often went hand in hand with a disregard for the real problems and struggles of the mass of students. Student Unions and NUS were rejected as hopelessly bureaucratic, and action on union reform, grants, and students' living and working conditions was dubbed 'reformist' and useless. It was argued, for example, that students unions were a 'dead weight' on the development of the student movement. Although the reactionaries were under no illusions about the danger to them from powerful democratic students unions, Sir Sydney Caine, a recent Director of London School of Economics, wrote: 'I have no doubt that the creation of the modern type of student union was a mistake. The concentration within that single organization of so many functions has inevitably led to its becoming to a significant degree, a rival to the university or college in the loyalty of the students.' ('The British Universities,' p. 144).

On the other hand, solidarity with Vietnam, and the impact of Latin American struggles, led whole sections of students to adopt anti-imperialist positions, and to look anew at the prospects for revolution in the West. Numerically and qualitatively, this shift to the left was a powerful and enduring reinforcement, that has played an important part in strengthening progressive change in both the consciousness of very large numbers of students and their mass organizations.

By firm and principled political argument the Communist Party has been able to win numbers of ultra-left influenced students towards a Marxist-Leninist position.

Differing levels of struggle

Of course, having listed the various social, economic and political pressures which have bombarded the student population over the last decade, it is easy to fall into crude determinism. Capitalism attacks the students and – hey presto! – into existence springs the student movement and brigades of socialist activists ready to fight capitalism. It certainly is the case that capitalism attacks students, as it attacks the whole working population – but people fight back against these attacks at enormously different levels of understanding. They fight the effects of capitalism on them *long before* they are ready to fight against capitalism itself; before they clearly recognize the need for an alternative social system.

Two examples, one from the 1930s and one from today, illustrate this. In British colleges during the Spanish Civil War, very many students were prepared to donate to medical aid funds for Republican Spain; a much smaller number were prepared to campaign for a

change in the policy of the British Government from 'non-intervention' to support for the Republicans; a small minority were prepared to go and fight in Spain, and some did so in the International Brigade. Today, very many students would totally condemn racialism. Large numbers gave active support to a campaign on an ideologically relatively 'simple' issue like the Stop the '70s Tour (of the racist South African cricket team). Fewer have penetrated the 'free speech' minefield to recognize the need for mass action against emerging fascist organizations.

People have different levels of rebellion against capitalism, against different aspects of its oppression.

Communists want socialist revolution, and their aim is to convince others of its necessity – but Communists are not indifferent to 'lower' levels of struggle. Lenin took time out to condemn those in the revolutionary movement who declared themselves contemptuous of individuals and organizations concerned with limited objectives.

Therefore, Communists passionately support such struggles, and their mass organizations, helping them to win victories which they believe are worthwhile and important in their own right, and not as some political maneuver to 'capture' them, or to gain positions. Of course, Communists recognize that limited gains are no solution to the exploitation of capitalism, and try to convince those with whom they work of the need for revolutionary change. But this is completely different from an approach to work in mass organizations which is contemptuous of their 'limited' objectives, and seeks only to use them to benefit the 'revolutionary' objectives of another organization.

Communists argue for left unity as the best way – indeed, as the only way – to win victories on these limited objectives, and to maintain the leftward direction of the student movement, and its alliance with working class organizations.

Why is it so important that both the leftward political direction and the unity of the student movement are maintained at the present time? Firstly, without the strength of a united campaigning NUS students will lose. They will lose against the attacks on the democratic functioning of their unions. They will be unable to campaign to improve the quality of education. Although NUS does not wield power in any way comparable to that of the trade unions, its campaigns have contributed to important victories in recent years.

Secondly, a left united NUS, based on powerful democratic local unions, is able to concretely reinforce the trade union movement in its struggles now. A fragmented movement would be unable to provide such solidarity, and some of its 'fragments' could provide an organizational basis for the sort of scabbing carried out by many students during the General Strike.

Most importantly, a militant united NUS will mean that new generations of students will pass through experiences of campaigning action, of organization, of unity, of politics that can build their consciousness toward the left. This can exert incalculable influences on the political future of middle strata sections of the population, who now are many millions strong and are of great numerical, ideological and strategic significance for the working class and the anti-monopoly alliance that must be built around it.

If that political direction can be confirmed as one of alliance, it will make possible much more than numerical additions to the working class movement. A reinforcement of this nature will bring to the socialist movement specialists and intellectuals who can enrich both the working class and its ideology, Marxism-Leninism, and who will be of inestimable importance in actually constructing socialism after the revolution.

Unlike the ultra-left organizations, the Communist Party does not see its advance being built upon the ruins of the mass organization in which it participates. Its perspective is that this organization should be strengthened, made more democratic, made better able to defend the interests of students. If this happens the mass organization will both win victories now, and also create the conditions within which the political consciousness of many students can be transformed.

For a broad front against fascist dictatorships

'MIRACLE' PROPPED UP BY BAYONETS

Carlos Braga,
Member of Leadership,
Brazilian CP

A new wave of terror has engulfed my country[1]. Since last December brutal repressions have been mounting to the accompaniment of a vicious anti-communist campaign. Sweeping military-political operations were mounted in the country's principal cities. In January of this year two printing presses which produced the Communist Party newspaper *Voz Operaria* were raided. Hundreds of people were

arrested, among them Central Committee member Marco Antonio Tavares Coelho, Communists Elson Costa, Jaime Amorim de Miranda, Iran Pereira, and many other democrats and patriots.[2] On March 2, the commercial director of the Editorial Abril magazines was kidnapped.

The Ministry of Justice has ordered an investigation of publications printing reports about torture and repression. The dictatorship has also declared its intention to ban the setting up of a parliamentary commission to study the daily violations of human rights. In the atmosphere of rampant anti-communism crude provocations are being staged against the clandestine Communist Party and the Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB)[3].

As BCP General Secretary Luis Carlos Prestes pointed out, the main reason for the mounting terror is that the much-vaunted 'Brazilian miracle,' sustained by super-exploitation of the working class and the people as a whole and based on the nation's plunder by foreign monopolies, the U.S. in the first place, has run into growing economic and financial difficulties. At the same time, working-class action is on the increase. Last year saw a doubling of the number of strikes for higher pay. Peasants are organizing in the struggle for their rights and agrarian reform. Intellectuals are exposing the lawlessness of the regime and demanding an end to censorship. Students are coming out against 'cultural terror.' The church has resolutely denounced the torture, kidnappines and indiscriminate arrests and has taken a stand for human dignity. Politicians demand the restoration of the rule of law. Although the powers of the National Congress have been reduced virtually to naught, the elections held in November 1974 were a vivid manifestation of anti-dictatorial sentiment.[4] The BCP played an important part in the election campaign. It called upon the people to use the ballot as a means of voicing their protest and helped create conditions for the development of a broad anti-fascist patriotic front that would isolate and overthrow the dictatorship.

Several days after Minister Falcao's statement about the liquidation of the *Voz Operaria* printing presses and arrest of 20 Party activists the February issue (No. 120) appeared. It marked the 10th anniversary of the uninterrupted clandestine publication of *Voz Operaria*. 'Our voice,' the paper writes, 'cannot be smothered. We are continuing our resistance, our struggle, we are advancing in the vanguard of the working people, and together with the people we are fighting for democracy.'

An appeal of the BCP Executive Committee to the people says that Minister Falcao fears the truth and is trying to mislead public opinion. The fascist regime's provocations against the Communist Party and its press are designed to mislead public opinion. The story is spread

about democrats who had been arrested, tortured or murdered that they had 'gone into hiding,' 'fled abroad' or simply 'disappeared.'

It is obvious to all that the blame lies with the Geisel administration. The dictatorship is trying to conceal its dismay at its defeat in the elections and the failure of its financial and economic policies by suppressing anti-dictatorial forces (the Communists in the first place), insisting on rigid application of Institutional Act No. 5, which restricts the already circumscribed freedoms, depriving recently elected Deputies and Senators of their mandates, and sentencing democrats opposed to the regime.

The BCP again calls upon all those suffering under the military-fascist dictatorship to fight for unity, strengthen ties with the broad masses of the people, the working class in the first place, and come together in a broad anti-fascist patriotic front. For this it is necessary to strengthen the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally and correctly pursue its political line of mass struggle.

Communists attach tremendous importance to international solidarity. The Brazilian people and the BCP, says Comrade Prestes, highly appreciate the concrete steps of fraternal parties, international organizations and prominent figures protesting against the lawlessness of the dictatorship and demanding an end to the new wave of violence against the workers and people of Brazil. We are convinced that joint action can force an end to the repressions and the release of patriots held in fascist dungeons in our and other countries of the continent.

THE DARK NIGHT WILL END

Hugo Fazio
Representative of CP Chile
on the Journal

Chilean fascism is, above all, one of the most extreme forms of domination by imperialist finance capital. The junta is pursuing a policy of encouraging foreign investments, concentrating economic control in a few oligarchic groups and assuring them high profits. That policy, of course, runs counter to the interests of the Chilean people.

The junta is rapidly losing ground, becoming more and more isolated at home and abroad. It has proved incapable of carrying out the plans of the U.S. and local monopolies and creating a stable regime that would guarantee their interests for a long time to come. The country is in a state of profound economic crisis the scale and implications of which the junta can no longer conceal: even its representatives are now more frank on the subject.

In its December 1974 Manifesto to the Party and the people, the

Communist Party of Chile declared: 'The great majority of Chileans are opposed to fascism. The foundations are being laid for broad national anti-fascist unity which will expel the usurpers, bring about democratic renewal and re-introduce the social changes essential to the country's progress.'

The monopolies, Chilean and foreign, are extending their positions. Industries converted to public property by the Popular Unity government are being reconverted to private ownership. Javier Palacios, Vice-President of the Development Corporation, has announced that 276 of 480 enterprises under its control have already been handed over to private firms and transfer of the rest is being negotiated, for the state 'will retain shares, on a temporary or permanent basis, in only 20 enterprises.'

State shares of commercial banks are being sold to private groups, too. Together with foreign capital they are starting 'development banks' to handle long-term and medium-term credits, hitherto issued by government banks. Private capital is reaching out for more economic power; no wonder *El Mercurio* (Jan. 15) says that 1975 is the 'year of denationalization.'

The main target of the international monopolies is control of Chile's natural wealth, notably copper and oil. The junta admits it is negotiating with monopoly concerns in the USA, Britain, Japan and Canada on at least four copper projects.[5]

As for oil, it is generally accepted that deposits are appreciable. In 1947 the Videla government of national betrayal concluded an agreement with the Inter-American Geodetic Service for an aerial survey of most of Chile. The maps never reached the Chilean government or the geodesists. This anti-national project was completed in October-November 1974 with the permission of the military junta, by a survey of the remaining parts of the country. The U.S. monopolies have very definite objectives and the fascist regime, contrary to all its propaganda, is helping achieve them.

The regime's economic model is meant to build up capital reserves, chiefly through more exploitation of labor and more foreign investments.

How the 'model' works can be seen from these figures: real wages at the close of September 1974 were 35.71 per cent below the January 1973 figure. Industrial output in the first nine months of 1974 was seven per cent down on the comparable period of 1972. There are huge stocks of unsold goods. Business activity has declined. Industrialists. merchants and farmers not connected with the monopolies find the going especially hard: in the first eight months of last year they incurred more debts than in the whole of 1973. Private investments do not amount to much: last year 433 businesses were started

with a total personnel of 2,800, or an average of six workers per firm.[6] At the same time, according to official data, the number of unemployed in Greater Santiago increased by 50,000.

Foreign investments which the junta hoped would spur national development, have declined despite all the inducements. In the second half of 1974 they amounted to a meagre $4 million. Today even those who financed and organized the fascist coup are very cautious when it comes to investment. There is the widespread belief that the regime cannot assure stability for any length of time, and, besides, it is being increasingly isolated internationally.

The economic situation is deteriorating also because of the general crisis of capitalism. Chile's one-sided economy reacts immediately and painfully to all fluctuations in the capitalist world. The present recession has adversely affected Chile's main export, copper, which last year accounted for 80 per cent of foreign exchange earnings. Economic Coordination Minister Raul Saez says copper exports are down 20 per cent.[7]

The gravity of the crisis is measurable by the balance-of-payments deficit. According to the World Bank, the 1975 deficit will amount to $985 million if copper continues to fetch 80 cents a pound. But copper is already down to 55 cents, and the regime is already calling for 'new sacrifices.'[8]

That will not solve the economic crisis. A substantial increase in purchasing power would help. And the sacrifices should come from big business and the foreign monopolies, who are benefiting from junta policy. Speculation has kept their profits high even with runaway inflation.

The junta has been compelled to admit the failure also of its foreign policy, based on anti-communism. Its dream of leading the anti-communist and anti-Soviet struggle faded with the new world balance resulting from the growing influence of the Soviet Union and the socialist community, the success of détente, the steadily growing role of the proletariat, the progressive forces in developed capitalist countries and the positive changes in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The universal condemnation of the junta found expression in the resolutions of the last UN General Assembly. The regime has been forced to apply new tactics in an attempt to change the situation. There was this piece of advice in *El Mercurio* late last year: the regime should not 'strive to become the leader of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, nor try to convince the great powers that détente is a wrong policy. Ours is a frankly anti-communist government, but its representatives have a wide area of activity .... Our international strategy should not rest on cold war anti-communism.... We could meet with understanding in the third world and deal with its countries

in the language of a modest nation. . . .' This is a far cry indeed from the junta's early claims to be the 'vanguard of anti-communism.'

From the very outset the military dictatorship met with opposition from Chile's progressive forces, notably the working class. These forces are fighting not only for their own particular interests but for fundamental change, for a democratic, revolutionary solution of the problems confronting the nation. And the opposition is rapidly growing in scope and strength. It is being joined, out of diverse motives, by those who resent the denial of elementary human rights, reject the junta's economic policy, and want democracy and freedom.

Discontent is rapidly spreading among the middle strata which, by and large, supported the fascist coup. Towards the end of 1974 many merchants, small and middle businessmen and artisans publicly protested against the price rises, which increase big business profits and drastically decrease the purchasing power of the population.

Criticism of the regime comes from widely different quarters. The head of the Catholic Church, Cardinal Raul Silva Henriquez, declared in one of his sermons that one cannot remain neutral or irresolute in this decisive hour of history. He demanded respect of human rights flagrantly violated in our day as a result of the widespread use of torture and force against innocent victims. Millions face starvation; economic, social and political rights have been repealed. People are denied the right to decide their future; they are denied access to information, the right to legal defense. They pay for their convictions with torture and imprisonment. The Cardinal was applauded by his huge audience.[9]

Nor has the junta been able to unite the armed forces. Arrests of servicemen continue. Early in January, for instance, officers who refused to take part in punitive operations were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. Three months before that there was the assassination of General Prats, known for his democratic views and popular in the army. These and other facts show that though the fascists are in command, there are democratic elements within the army.

The junta's growing isolation is reflected also in the attitude of the Christian Democratic Party. It will be recalled that its leaders, supported by the right-wing and with the membership remaining largely passive, at first actually helped the junta. Now they are publicly condemning it. This strengthens the position of the progressives within the party, those who from the very outset rejected the regime. The CDP is representative of diverse classes, with their diverse, often conflicting, interests. But among the rank and file there is a distinct and growing trend towards active struggle against the dictatorship and for joint action with the left parties. And this opposition grows with

every step the regime takes to destroy the CDP. Many of its members are now in prison and some of its prominent leaders have been deported.

The Chilean events are added proof that, having begun with the persecution and murder of Communists and working-class leaders, fascism directs its next blows at all the democratic forces. Despite the terror, however, protest and discontent continue to grow and are becoming more organized.[10]

With the fascist regime rapidly losing credibility, imperialism and the Chilean reactionaries are looking for ways and means of instituting some other form of government. But, as the Communist Party Manifesto points out, 'the only genuine patriotic, people's alternative is a coalition much broader than the Popular Unity, to include all political, social, religious and military organizations and personalities that want an end to the dictatorship. That is the key task and it is the duty of every patriot to help accomplish it.'

The Communist Party has immense experience of united action. In the 1930s it made an important contribution to the Popular Front that came to power in 1938. In 1970 it formed the core, together with the Socialists, of the powerful alliance of popular forces that brought Salvador Allende to the presidency.

This experience has a special relevance today. Working-class unity is expressed in the mutual understanding between Socialists and Communists. The Popular Unity brought together the more politically aware sections of the people. The present phase of the struggle calls for unity of all sections of the people, of every one opposed to the dictatorship. The lessons of the Chilean revolutionary movement are plain: once there is unity of the majority of the people, there are immense opportunities for revolutionary change; disunity plays into the hands of the most reactionary forces.

The Communist Party has publicly suggested to the CDP that it join the anti-fascist front with the same rights and obligations as its other members. This would be a decisive step towards the new unity. Fascism cannot be overthrown automatically. Its defeat (as the defeat of its attempts to find some other solution in the interests of foreign capital) will depend on the people's unity and struggle. The working class has set an example by stepping up its actions.

'We Communists are optimistic,' the Communist Party Manifesto declares, 'for we are convinced that victory will come. Together with our allies we shall act as a reliable vanguard in the fight against the dictatorship, in the search for a solution that accords with the interests of the people and the revolution. We are convinced that the Chilean people will form the widest coalition in their history to end the dark night of fascist rule.'

1. In March and April 1974 the security police kidnapped David Capistrano da Costa, a veteran of the International Brigados in Spain and the French Resistance, Walter de Souza Ribeiro, Joao Massena de Melo, Luis Inacio Maranhao Filho (all members of the BCP Central Committee), Jose Roman and other patriots. There is reason to believe that many of them have since died. Hundreds of people have been arrested and subjected to torture since Geisel assumed the presidency in March 1974. Their 'crime' is that they protested against soaring prices and low wages and demanded democratic rights. 'The most shameful event in the history of national political institutions,' was how the labor press called the Supreme Tribunal's sentence of deputy Francisco Pinto for denouncing the presence of the head of the Chilean fascist junta Pinochet at Geisel's inauguration ceremony.

2. *O Etado de Sao Paolo* published a letter from Coelho's wife Terezinha Tavares to General Geisel in which she wrote that her husband was being tortured and that during a 10-minute meeting she saw that he was in a terrible state.

3. It is alleged that 'Jewish circles' in the BCP had financed the election of two MDB deputies (who received the largest number of votes in the November elections in Sao Paolo).

4. Despite obstacles, overt and covert threats and intimidation, arrests and murder, repression and provocations, the opposition won more than 60 per cent of the votes, and 80-90 per cent in the large industrial centers.

5. According to U.S. estimates, Chile's prospected copper deposits, computed in pure copper, amount to 100 million tons, or 25 per cent of world reserves (*El Mercurio,* Oct. 12, 1974).

6. The non-monopoly industries are hit not only by the decline in consumer purchasing power, but also by the government's 'free import' policy: low customs duty and other privileges on a wide range of imports, coupled with repeal of taxes that helped the small manufacturers most of which were retained by the Popular Unity government. Credits are now restricted and issued at high interest rates.

7. Of the copper bought by developed capitalist countries, 18 per cent goes into housing construction and 8-9 per cent into the automobile industry. Both industries are now in a state of recession.

8. Statement by Minister of Finance, reported in *El Mercurio,* Jan. 9.

9. The sermon was read on the occasion of the annual procession to the Maipu Cathedral, one of the biggest mass demonstrations since the military coup.

10. The junta has stepped up the repression. Persecution of democrats has become part of its "political and economic model". Pinochet has promulgated a new law, harsher even than the military code. It bans all protest demonstrations. This is evidence of weakness, not of strength.

Fighting the crisis: the pressing task

K.P. Silva
Political Bureau member
and Secretary, of CP of Sri Lanka

In recent years a severe economic crisis, unprecedented in nature, has been gripping the economy of Sri Lanka. Its effects point to the emergence of a political crisis of new dimensions. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka, at its Plenary Meeting held in October 1974, unanimously adopted a political resolution, reviewing the situation in the country and pointing out the ways to solving the problems confronting her.

The government of the United Front* consisting of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP), Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP) and the Communist Party has indubitable achievements to its credit. The government has taken over 90 per cent of the import trade. The share of the state in the export trade has been steadily expanded. Public ownership in the plantation sector is enlarging. The cooperative sector has been widened. The ceiling on ownership of lands, residential houses and incomes has been fixed. Far-reaching legislation, such as the Agricultural Productivity Act and Business Acquisition Act, is being implemented. Our independence and sovereignty have been consolidated with the declaration of the Republic.

However, since the United Front came to power in 1970, it has had to face numerous difficulties inherited from the past as well as the new problems arising from the aggravating crisis of the world capitalist economy.

The main source of the economic crisis is the semi-colonial, raw material oriented economy and its trade nexus tied to the imperialist countries. Sri Lanka's population of nearly 13 million principally depends on the products of her plantations of tea, rubber and coconut. Their exports account for 90 per cent of the total foreign exchange earnings, tea alone bringing 60 per cent. The share of industrial production accounts for only 14 per cent of the Gross

* See S.A. Wickremasinghe, 'Sri Lanka United Front Program,' *WMR*, No. 7, 1973.

National Product, even though 27 years have elapsed since the achievement of political independence. The raw materials and capital equipment needed for industrial manufactures, fertilizers, fuel, and essential foods are all imported and met out of the income earned in the main from exports.

Year after year there was a huge foreign trade gap, and it has been worsening gradually. In 1968, the gap was Rs. 649 million and in 1974, Rs. 2,132 million.* In 1975, the estimated gap will be, according to the Minister of Finance, Rs. 3,112 million, despite sharp cuts in imports projected for this year. But these measures can no longer yield the desired effect since prices on the world capitalist market are steadily growing. For instance, although the country imported 283,000 tons of sugar in 1971 and the quantity estimated for import in 1975 is 52,000 tons, the cost of import rises. The government's past actions along these lines were also reduced to nought by growing prices. Between 1969 and 1973, the volume index establishes that imports were restricted by 27 per cent. The price index shows that average prices rose by approximately 56 per cent in the same period.

The situation is further aggravated by the huge foreign debt incurred largely during the compradore bourgeoisie (UNP) rule from 1965-1970 and which amounted to Rs. 2,795 million at the end of 1973. One-third of the total export earnings are paid for in settlement of loans obtained from the imperialist states on long-term and short-term and on commodity loan basis.

The National Budget is unbalanced too. The net budget deficit the government had in 1973/74 was Rs. 981 million and the estimated gross deficit for 1974/75 is Rs. 2,159 million. This deficit has to be financed by increased taxation, borrowings from banks and foreign sources. And this means another increase of the state debt.

In consequence of these and other factors, the Five-Year Plan could not take off the ground. All this lays a heavy burden on the people and negatively affects the country's political situation.

The sharp cost of living rise, despite many government efforts to ward it off, can be gauged from the following: a meal of rice in 1974 cost nearly three times over that in 1970, a cup of tea five times over, a pound of bread twice and sugar ten. As well, the government has curtailed expenditure on social amenities and relief subsidies, including those on food items.

The economic crisis has affected primarily the working class and the peasantry. Though there have been increases in allowances paid to workers, their real wages have dropped by about 20-30 per cent. The problem of unemployment has not been solved. The decline in industrial production for want of raw materials has prevented any

* Rs. 6.2 = $1 — Ed.

increase in employment, although this was planned. Of a labor force of five million, more than one million remains unemployed. Of this number, one-fourth constitutes the youth with a secondary education. The annual birth rate of 250,000 adds to the population all the time. The high cost of tractor hire, fertilizer and other inputs as well as high prices of manufactured consumer goods weigh down heavily on the peasants, despite government efforts to increase production subsidies.

The industrial bourgeoisie suffers seriously from lack of foreign exchange. Although there has been a recent shift of emphasis to export-oriented industries, there is still uncertainty on markets abroad.

In these circumstances, the question of overcoming the difficulties acquires particular urgency.

Right-wing circles see the only way out in seeking more foreign aid, long-term and short-term credits in order to bridge the huge trade and budget deficits. The national bourgeoisie circles are hoping for collaboration with foreign firms to assure themselves of markets and are making fresh attempts to attract foreign investors. The representatives of the government rushed for aid from Western and new-rich Arab sources. Although an increase in foreign aid is capable of making temporary adjustments, in the present situation substantial foreign resources sufficient to pull the country out of the crisis cannot be expected. Moreover it should not be forgotten that the imperialists, taking advantage of the foreign exchange crisis, are exerting pressures to prevent the government from adopting measures harmful to the interests of foreign capital.

The activization of right-wing sections within the government in favor of private foreign investments derives its strength largely from the new-rich industrial bourgeoisie which has assumed a concentrated economic power in the country. It is most revealing to note from the 1974 budget speech of the Minister of Finance that 40 family groups own a total investment of Rs. 273.2 million of which 11 family groups own Rs. 205 million. The right-wing sections of the bourgeoisie are plugging a line of unrestrained freedom for the private sector and market economy. The political corollary of this line is isolation of the left, and its culmination may result in a hoisting of a fascist regime, which is precisely the ultimate aim of the compradore bourgeoisie. In April 1974 it made an attempt to launch a campaign for civil disobedience to forcibly overthrow the government. This reactionary sally was frustrated by the masses who stood by the government and demonstrated their readiness to defend the gains of the United Front.

The forces of the compradore bourgeoisie are not strong enough for a direct confrontation with the government on their own, and there-

fore their recent moves have been directed at strengthening the right-wing sections of the national bourgeoisie and undermining the unity within the United Front.

While the economic crisis is intensifying the dissatisfaction of the masses, the working class and other anti-imperialist forces still remain disarmed without a common policy or program of action. On the other hand, the present weakness of the left itself contributes negatively to the vacillation of the national bourgeoisie.

The absence within the left of a clear and consistent policy towards the current economic crisis is a major obstacle to the strengthening of the left and democratic forces. Until recently, certain sections of the left underestimated the developing crisis of world capitalism and did not expect such devastating effects on the country's economy and development plans. However, a redeeming feature of the situation is the developing activity in search of a new course within the rank and file of the United Front. It has found concrete expression in the recently-worked-out joint program of the three youth organizations of the United Front parties, which is significantly of a marked anti-imperialist and democratic character. As early as July 1973 the Joint Committee of Trade Unions representing all the progressive trade union centers in the country presented 28 demands to the government which are objectively directed against the positions of the right-wing sections and the reactionary forces. Recently, the Socialist Party (LSSP) submitted certain proposals to the government demanding concrete radical measures.

The present situation calls for revision of the 1968 common program of the United Front. The task of our Party is to organize the diverse efforts for the search for a new course in order to evolve a coherent and consistent anti-imperialist program of action with non-capitalist perspectives. Our Party which has strengthened its ranks after its re-unification can look forward to discharging these responsibilities with confidence. The immediate task of the Party is to move and rally the left and progressive forces which are presently in disarray. For this it is necessary to step up their activity, direct their combined efforts against the imperialists and their local collaborators, isolate the right wing inside the government, and counter the vacillations of the national bourgeoisie.

While supporting the just demands and suggestions put forward by the Joint Committee of Trade Unions and the youth organizations of the government coalition parties, the Communist Party at its Plenary Meeting in October 1974 adopted a short-term program for implementation by the government. Its purpose is to update and expand the proposals in the United Front's common program in the light of the

political developments over the past four years and the new realities of the deepening economic crisis.

The short-term program suggests that state and private enterprises should not be allowed to fix prices without prior reference to a special control agency, which must be set up immediately. State trading organizations should purchase at controlled prices the entire output of essential industrial and other goods.

The Party stressed the need to increase state interference in the economy. The government should implement its election pledge to nationalize the foreign commercial banks. The big paddy mills, as well as the consumer goods manufacturing companies and industries, should be taken over by the state. To ensure correct distribution, trade in essential consumer goods in short supply should be made a monopoly of state and cooperative trading institutions. The retail network of this trade should be expanded; products of state manufacturing corporations, especially textiles, should be distributed through the state and cooperative network. People's committees should be set up in all wards of all local bodies to supervise distribution and to fight hoarding and corruption.

The short-term program envisages lower ceilings in respect of ownership of rice paddies, incentives to persons who open up new lands for this crop, and aid to state-owned farms. The government should take vigorous steps to increase the production of sugar, fish, milk and meat, and organize state tractor hire stations to be available to the peasants at moderate charges.

The program points to the need to meet the demands of the Joint Council of Trade Unions, notably, its demand for Rs. 75 a month increase in the wages of all employees earning below Rs. 800 a month. The existing system of workers' participation in running state enterprises and institutions should be revised. The defense committees, formed by the trade unions at enterprises in response to the Prime Minister's 1974 May Day call, should receive official recognition. Their task should be to defend the United Front government and state property against the intrigues of reactionaries and saboteurs. Joint committees of the three United Front parties should be established in each district to advise and assist the district political authorities. The goodwill created among the Tamil-speaking minorities* by recent government actions should be strengthened and consolidated.

The short-range program has generated much interest and enthusiasm among the rank and file of the United Front. The Communists' proposals are supported by all who sincerely want the economic crisis to be overcome as soon as possible. This is only too clear, since the program offers realistic ways of solving the existing difficulties.

* See 'South Asia: Peace and Cooperation,' *WMR*, No. 7, 1974, p. 21.

CMEA and raw materials prices

SCANNING THE PRESS OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance is changing its method of price calculation in trade between its members. New prices are being fixed for a number of commodities. The press of the socialist countries has carried detailed comments on this decision. A point made in the GDR, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries is that the CMEA market is one of the most dynamic sectors of world trade and is steadily and rapidly expanding. Prices on this market are determined by the level of world prices and by the socialist principles of cooperation, mutual aid and economic planning. The coordinated trade policy of the CMEA countries makes for mutually advantageous solutions of the problems posed by the far-reaching changes on the world market. Among these is the steep rise in world prices of fuel and other raw materials. The Prague *Rude Pravo* says this cannot be attributed merely to short-term fluctuations, and has to be seen as a long-term trend. Besides facilitating closer economic ties CMEA foreign-trade policy helps foster economic relations with non-socialist countries and thus contributes to a détente trade structure.

The Hungarian *Magyar Nemzet* recalls that for over 15 years prices in trade between CMEA members were based on world prices discounting of conjunctural fluctuations and speculative factors. The procedure was to set prices for a five-year period in advance, taking as the basis average world prices for the preceding five years. That procedure is being continued in setting prices for one year in advance. This will make it possible for CMEA gradually to absorb the change in world prices, thus protecting it from sharp fluctuations. One example is the coordinated 1975 oil and raw materials prices. They are higher than the preceding ones, but are considerably below the prices on the world capitalist market, for the five-year base period includes both inflation years and years of relatively low prices.

Hungary will be paying more for energy and raw materials, but the prices of her manufactured goods, which make up the bulk of her exports, will be higher too. Writes the *Magyar Nemzet:* 'The new raw material prices are much more favorable for us than those on the capitalist world market. For instance, we are paying less than half the capitalist market price for crude oil.'

The Polish *Trybuna Ludu* says the CMEA economy is not isolated from the world market, where oil prices are up 300 per cent, coal 250, sulphur 150 and steel 130 per cent. The Warsaw weekly *Politika* cites these figures: in 1973 the USSR earned about the same amount from selling 12 million tons of oil and oil products to Poland as from selling slightly less than six million tons to the FRG. In 1974 the USSR earned slightly more than one billion roubles from its sale of 50 million tons of oil and oil products to CMEA countries, and about four billion roubles from the sale of 70 million tons to other countries. The same comparison can be made in relation to some Polish export goods – coal, coke, sulphur and copper. *Politika* remarks in this context that a too wide gap between CMEA and world prices could hamper cooperation of the socialist countries, since prices would no longer serve as the basis of economic exchange, or as the starting point in formulating foreign-trade policy. The old formula of so-called 'stop prices' was eminently suitable when there were only moderate, speculative fluctuations in world prices. But now with long-term changes this system no longer applies, especially in coordinating long-range plans. A too wide gap between CMEA and world prices also militates against cost accounting in socialist industry, and can produce a distorted picture of the effectiveness of new investment. All these undesirable developments can be avoided by the new system of mobile prices.

Rude Pravo notes that for a long time the big capitalist monopolies artificially maintained the imbalance between the prices of the raw materials and fuel they bought from developing countries and the manufactured goods they sold to them. The developing countries hit back. The social consequences of this restructuring of world prices are different in capitalist and socialist countries. The monopolies are shifting the burden on to the working people and inflation and unemployment are rife. In contrast, socialist Czechoslovakia decided, at the CC Plenum in November 1974, not only to maintain present living standards, but to raise them. A key factor in this is cooperation with other socialist countries, particularly the USSR, from which Czechoslovakia obtains all her imported gas, 95 per cent of imported oil and about 85 per cent of iron ore. And since prices on these items have not changed since 1971, Czechoslovakia has saved billions of crowns. The new prices are higher but, *Rude Pravo* emphasizes, are more favorable for us than prices on the capitalist market.

Neues Deutschland (GDR) comments on the 'explosive price rises' on raw materials and fuel: 'Taking raw materials prices on the capitalist market in 1952-56 as 100, we find that in December 1972 they stood at 199, at the end of 1973 at 226 and in December 1974 at 309. The rise is steeper still on some goods – oil, for instance, costs four or five times as much. This is the biggest price rise since the war, but it did not affect CMEA prices in 1973 or 1974. In both years our trade was conducted on the basis of average world prices for 1965-69. The GDR buys a large part of its raw materials and fuel from the USSR and other CMEA members. This means that we saved hundreds of millions of marks by not having to buy on the capitalist market.'

The fundamental difference between price formation in capitalist and CMEA countries has been commented upon by the bourgeois press. U.S. papers say that the price of oil the USSR sells other CMEA countries is 'incredibly low,' $20 a ton as against the world price of $100. The new price is also substantially below the world level. However, the bourgeois press says that Soviet oil deliveries are not likely to expand, so that the CMEA countries will either have to slow down their growth rate or import more oil at world-market prices. The best answer to that was given in a *Trybuna Ludu* report of the signing in Moscow of Poland's biggest one-year trade contract, providing for huge deliveries of Soviet oil and oil products. This and other facts show that there has been no decline in economic exchanges between CMEA members, nor is any expected. Relations between them are developing according to plan and rest on a durable economic and political foundation.

O. Behr

Book reviews

NO ISLAND OF UTOPIA

The author of *Socialist Democracy,* Georgi Shakhnazarov,* LL.D., justly remarks that in analyzing a subject it should be treated, firstly, as an evolving system and not a conglomerate of preordained forms and, secondly, in all its diversity, taking into account different

* G. Kh. Shakhnazarov. *Sotsialisticheskaya demokratia. Nyekotoriye voprosy teorii* (Socialist Democracy. Some Questions of Theory). Second (Revised) Edition. Moscow. 1974.

concepts and the experience of socialist countries. Another principle he employs is that of facing difficult issues head-on, whether they are complex problems of socialist construction or speculations of bourgeois propaganda. This approach enables the author to refute the anti-socialist cliches which bourgeois political writers consider irrefutable. One of them is that without 'political pluralism' and opposition parties it is impossible to take the interests of all sections of society, especially minority interests, into account. But Shakhnazarov shows that it is precisely the 'free play of political forces' that precludes even formal recognition of minority interests, that is, of those whose party happens to be in opposition. Actually, of course, bourgeois democracy completely ignores the interests of the working majority. In contradistinction, the ruling Communist parties in the socialist countries take the interests of all sections of the society into account.

Another pet stereotype is that the Communist parties' opposition to factional struggle within their ranks is evidence of the lack of inner-party democracy. The author shows convincingly, with many examples from the history of the CPSU, that it is precisely factional activity that harms inner-party democracy.

The book also examines Maoist distortions of democracy and the harm they do to the cause of socialism.

Shakhnazarov makes no attempt to gloss over mistakes and setbacks along the long and complex road of the development of socialist democracy which bourgeois propaganda likes to make so much of in its efforts to present them as the rule of socialism rather than the exception.

'If socialism were being built on the dream island of Utopia,' he writes, 'everything could be arranged according to cut-and-dried schemes. But it grew out of the old society, and in far from idyllic circumstances: newly born, it was forced to fight against intervention, blockade, hunger and war. Besides, not being of "noble birth", it had no governesses to rear it and had to build a home for itself, work to exhaustion and master the summits of science on its own. It is hardly surprising that the new system did not immediately take the shape of the social ideal.

'The foregoing imagery is meant to help towards a better understanding of the extremely serious, fundamental idea that, in analyzing socialist reality in general and socialist democracy in particular, the main thing is to clearly differentiate between the inherent qualities of the new system and the extraneous hindering its development, and the essentially transient.'

The main thing in the book, however, is its constructive investigation of present-day problems of democracy. The achievements of

socialism, which has given the working people real rights and freedoms that capitalism lacks and can never have, are well known. But for socialism, the author stresses, democracy is not an end in itself but a means of achieving its goals. An exploiter state can perform its functions in democratic, undemocratic or partially democratic forms, depending on circumstances. Socialism, however, cannot achieve its objectives without the consistent development of democracy, which is one of the main conditions of its progress.

In his study Shakhazarov proceeds from the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and draws on a wealth of other material, from antique and modern philosophy to fiction, coupled with abundant facts of contemporary politics and information about the experience of the existing socialism, the achievements of socialist democracy and the problems of its development. And this review would be incomplete without mentioning the author's excellent style, skill in polemics and logic in presentation.

O.L.

SHORT HISTORY OF THE WORLD

Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the USSR

TWO VOLUMES

Survey of world history from the ancient world, the Middle Ages, to the present era and the building of socialism. This work is more than the story of kings and great men — the main thrust is to expose the factors underlying successive stages, to analyze the reasons for the rise and fall of states and civilizations and to examine what we mean by 'man's progress'

Volume One $7.95 Cloth bound
Volume Two $5.95 Index, Maps
Set of 2 volumes $12.95

ORDER FROM:

Progress Books

487 ADELAIDE ST. W., TORONTO

Name _____

Address _____

New Pamphlets From New Outlook

IN THE HANDS OF CHILE'S HANGMEN

The Prison Experiences of Rodrigo Rojas, with Foreword by Volodia Teitelboim

A narrative, by the Editor of the Chilean CP's newspaper, of four months of imprisonment and torture by the fascists, the inspiration and support of comrades and friends, the importance of unity and international support, the role of the USSR in solidarity with the people of Chile, how anti-fascist pressure finally won his release and enabled him to go abroad to continue the struggle. Four-page foreword by Chilean Communist Senator Volodia Teitelboim.

64 pages 50c

WORKING CLASS UNITY — Phil Bart

The Role of Communists in the Chicago Federation of Labor, 1919-1923

Formative period of the CPUSA, ideological struggles, birth of the Party in Chicago, the labor movement in Chicago; activity and leadership of Communists in militant strikes, in organizing the unorganized, in rank-and-file struggles for unity of all workers and against class collaborationism and racism; effects of the Russian Revolution, ruling-class repression, united-front relations between Communists and progressive union leaders in Chicago in the years following World War I.

32 pages 40c

STRATEGY FOR A PEOPLE'S ALTERNATIVE — Henry Winston

A Critique of New Theories on the Working Class, Lberation Movements and Social Strata

A critical evalutation of the "Open Letter" issued by the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People. Points out the "Open Letter" 's self-defeating confusion between immediate objectives and the transition to socialism. Shows how its rejection of working-class leadership is based on Roger Garaudy's "revision" of Marxism which claims that new technology has made the industrial working class non-revolutionary. Criticizes its classless approach to Black liberation, its adoption of the false "internal colony" theory. Shows its anti-Marxist confusion on state power and on electoral policy. Condemns its anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, its rejection of international anti-imperialist solidarity, its neglect of the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

48 pages 80c

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

205 West 19 Street — 9th Floor — New York, NY 10011

INCLUDE 20c POSTAGE ON ORDERS UNDER $2.00
ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID IN U.S. DOLLARS.

Write For Complete Catalog

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM' 1975

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd., 37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C. 1, England.

Progress Subscription Service, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, M5V1T4, Canada.

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism, 5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi, India.

FRENCH EDITIONS:
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale):
Société d'Edition et d'Information, 9 Boulevard des Italiens, Paris (2e), France.

Librairie Rousseau, 36 rue J. J. Rousseau, Genève, Suisse.

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières, 96 ouest, rue Sherbrooke, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

Librairie du Monde, Entier 162, Rue du Midi, Bruxelles, Belgique.

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

Dar Hilal, 16 Mohamed Iz Al-Arab Street, Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt.

ETH-Thagafa el-Jadida, Al-Tahrir Square, Bagdad, Iraq.

BENGALI EDITION: Manisha Granthalay Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee St., Calcutta — 12, India.

BULGARIAN EDITION: "Russki" 6, "Hemus," Sofia, Bulgaria.

CZECH EDITION: Artia, Praha 2, Nové Mesto, Ve smeckách 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden, Dr. Tvaergade 3, 1302, Kobenhavn K., Denmark.

FINNISH EDITION:
Aikakauslehti Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

GERMAN EDITIONS:
Deutscher Buch-Export und-Import GmbH, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, GDR.

"Globus," Vertrieb susländischer Zeitschriften, 1200 Wien, Höchstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldtstrasse 46, Switzerland.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literatur-Vertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITION: Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI, Ajay Bhawan, Patna-4, India.

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura, Konyv-és Hirlap külkereskedelmi Vallalat, Budapest 1., Fö u 32, Hungary.

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4, Roma, Italy.

JAPANESE EDITION: Nauka Ltd. 2, Kanda-Zinbocho 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

MONGOLIAN EDITION:
Ulan-Bator, Sukhebaataryn talbay 2, Mongol ardyn Khusgalt namyn tov namyn Khoroo "Enkh tajvan, socialismyn asuudal" setguuliyn mongol khevlelijn gazar.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715, Oslo, Norway.

PERSIAN EDITION: P.B. 49034, 10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden.

POLISH EDITION: RSW, "Prasa-ksiazka-ruch" BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Av. António Serpa, 26-2°, esq. Lisboa - 1, Portugal

RUMANIAN EDITION: I.C.E. "Libri," Calea Victoriei 126, Bucuresti, Rumania.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya kniga, Moscow C-200, USSR.

EDITIONS IN SPANISH:
Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Nacional 1253, Bogota, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular, San Juan de Letran, 37 — 4° piso Mexico 1, D.F.

Ideologia y Politica, jr. Moquegua 718-203, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracas, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Editorial "Anteo," Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panama, Rep. de Panama.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o' xuât nhap khâu sách báo 32, Hai Bá Tru'ng, Hà-nôi.