

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

NEO-COLONIALISM
— U.S. STYLE

Gus Hall

Page 13



THE NEW OVER
THE OLD

THE NEW IN
THE OLD

THE NEW
THE OLD

THE NEW
THE OLD

THE NEW
THE OLD

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

VOLUME 13 / 1970

**Lenin is with us,
immortal and great.
Across the world
the floodtide rises
of Lenin's thoughts,
words
and deeds.**

V. Mayakovsky



Lenin year highlights

The Lenin Centenary year saw the growth of Communist parties all over the world. Here are some facts and figures to illustrate this.

The Communist Party of Argentina announced a Lenin Enrolment with a target of 15,000 new members to the Party and YCL. By the deadline of 22 April, 11,567 joined the Party and 5,748 young people the Young Communist League. Most of them are workers.

The Lenin jubilee year was also the 50th anniversary year of the French Communist Party. Its growing prestige among the working people is indicated by its growing ranks: by 15 September 37,000 workers and representatives of other strata had joined it, and by the end of the year the number is expected to reach 40,000; there will be 19,500 Party cells.

In a Lenin Centenary card exchange drive the membership of the Indian Communist Party rose from 171,386 to 242,968, a 41 per cent increase. More than half the membership are industrial and farm workers and poor peasants.

The Italian Communist Party exchanges membership cards every year. By October 1970, new cards, which bear a picture of Lenin in honor of his birth centenary, were issued to more than 1,492,000 people, 100,000 of them new members.

This year the Communist Party of Uruguay celebrated two jubilees, the Lenin Centenary and its own 50 years. The occasions were marked by a membership increase of almost 9,000.

V. I. LENIN'S WORKS HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED IN MORE THAN 150 COUNTRIES

They have appeared in 118 languages, including:

BENGALI	16	times	MALAY	3	times
BULGARIAN	193	"	MARATHI	8	"
CZECH	190	"	MONGOLIAN	99	"
DANISH	20	"	NORWEGIAN	25	"
DUTCH	53	"	POLISH	265	"
ENGLISH	378	"	PORTUGUESE	25	"
FINNISH	15	"	RUMANIAN	241	"
FRENCH	161	"	SERBO-CROATIAN	116	"
GERMAN	548	"	SLOVAK	116	"
GREEK	43	"	SPANISH	204	"
HUNGARIAN	209	"	SWEDISH	45	"
INDONESIAN	30	"	TAMILI	4	"
ITALIAN	158	"	TELUGU	5	"
JAPANESE	202	"	TURKISH	21	"
KOREAN	95	"	URDU	6	"
MACEDONIAN	5	"	VIETNAMESE	109	"

In the Soviet Union total printings of Lenin's works exceed 367,000,000 copies.

Many of Lenin's most important works have been printed more than a hundred times. For example, in the Soviet Union "Left-Wing' Communism—an Infantile Disorder" appeared in 176 printings in different languages, aggregating some six million copies. It has also seen more than a hundred editions in capitalist countries, among them Austria, Australia, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Greece, Denmark and India.

**WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!**

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

**DECEMBER, 1970
VOLUME 13
NUMBER 12**

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. The North
American edition is
published by Progress
Books, 487 Adelaide St.
West, Toronto 133, Ont.,
Canada.
Copyright © 1968 by
Progress Books, Canada.
All Rights Reserved.
Microfilm edition
available through
University Microfilms
Library Service.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
\$3.50 a year. Single
copies 35 cents. Bundle
of five or more, 25 cents
per copy. Outside
Canada, add 15 cents
exchange.
**PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM** is also
published in French,
Russian, Bulgarian,
Czech, Dutch, German,
Greek, Hungarian,
Italian, Japanese,
Mongolian, Polish,
Rumanian, Spanish,
Swedish and Vietnamese.
Subscriptions to these
may be obtained through
Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, or in the USA
from New Outlook
Publishers, 32 Union Sq.
East, Rm. 801, New York,
N.Y. 10003.

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



WMR

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | 3 | The Lenin Year |
| L. CORVALAN | 5 | Chile: the people take over |
| GUS HALL | 13 | New directions of development,
new problems of imperialism |
| A. YATA | 20 | For a genuine national, anti-
imperialist and democratic front |
| H. ALVARADO | 26 | The Guatemalan revolution and
Lenin's ideas |
| Ch. JAGAN
G. BATAL
J. MARAVILLA | 32 | In the communist and workers' parties
NEW STAGE IN THE PEOPLE'S PROGRESSIVE PARTY
GREAT VICTORY FOR LEBANESE COMMUNISTS
PHILIPPINES: RESULTS, DIFFICULTIES, PROSPECTS
IN BRIEF |
| | 46 | Our round table
SOCIALISM'S PLACE IN HISTORY, STAGES
AND CRITERIA OF ITS DEVELOPMENT |
| I. ABAJIYEV | 76 | The socialist world today
AGRARIAN-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEXES—NEW STAGE
IN DEVELOPMENT OF BULGARIAN AGRICULTURE |
| A.B.
M. WARNENSKA
A. FANTIS | 82 | On frontline of battle against
imperialism
TEN EMBATTLED YEARS
THE WAR COMES TO CAMBODIA
NATO AGAINST CYPRIOT INDEPENDENCE |
| Jan PRAZSKY | 91 | Political commentary
BLACKPOOL, 1970 |
| A. GEDO | 96 | Battle of ideologies
PHILOSOPHICAL RELEVANCE OF LENINISM |
| A. MASYAGIN
A. KAMBAKSH
S. USTUNGEL | 104 | Pages from history
AT THE SOURCES OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY
IRANIAN COMMUNIST TRADITIONS
BREAKING THROUGH THE DARKNESS |
| T. VARELA | 113 | Books and journals
SHORT NOTICES
DOCUMENTOS POLITICOS
DIARY |
| | 121 | WMR CONTENTS for 1970 |

WMR

among our contributors

LUIS CORVALAN	General Secretary, CC Communist Party of Chile
GUS HALL	General Secretary, Communist Party USA
CHEDDI JAGAN	General Secretary, People's Progressive Party of Guyana
ANDREAS FANTIS	Deputy General Secretary, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus
HUBERTO ALVARADO	Member of Political Commission, Secretary CC, Guatemalan Party of Labor
IVAN ABAJIYEV	Alternate Member Political Bureau, CC Bulgarian Communist Party; First Secretary Vratsa Regional Committee of BCP
ABDULSAMAD KAMBAKSH	Member Executive Bureau and Secretariat, CC People's Party of Iran (Tudeh)
TEODOSIO VARELA	Member, CC Communist Party of Colombia
JORGE MARAVILLA	Philippines, journalist

The Lenin Year

Nineteen seventy, the Lenin Centenary year, is ending.

The great continuer of the cause of Marx and Engels, and one of the founders of the teaching that became the ideological foundation for the revolutionary reconstruction of society, Lenin lives on in the daily constructive labor of building the new, socialist civilization, in the heroic struggle of the international working class and its Communist vanguard, in the victories of the national-liberation and anti-imperialist movement. His genius is imprinted on the development of man in the 20th century, and the impact of Leninism will, more and more fully, reflect on each new stage in the revolutionary reshaping of the world.

Naturally, it is difficult to produce a complete picture of Leninism's significance for the modern world on the evidence of just one year, no matter how filled with meaningful events and even though a jubilee year.

Just as true is it, however, that the jubilee year has been an important milestone in the development of the Communist movement, the liberation movement as a whole, and in the ideological life of all mankind.

To begin with, this year has produced *quintessential proof of Leninism's enormous influence and has itself given impulse for the further growth of this influence*. No other teaching has exercised so powerful an impact on men's minds or inspired the activity of such powerful political organizations and trends, and such a broad and farflung popular movement.

Titanic work was launched in compliance with the Address of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties to prepare for and hold Lenin Centenary celebrations. The material results are at hand: the Lenin Centenary went a long way in impelling the further consolidation of the countries of the socialist world sys-

tem and cementing the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and fostering joint anti-imperialist action. By celebrating the Centenary, the Communists reaffirmed their determination to follow Lenin's teaching, to creatively develop and apply Lenin's ideas in revolutionary practice and combat without compromise all Right and "Left" opportunism and all distortion of the theory of scientific communism.

The Lenin Centenary was a meaningful event for all quarters, not the Communist movement alone. It impelled fresh interest in the Marxist-Leninist teaching among members of all progressive political trends. It was a sign of the times that even those not associated with scientific communism but opposed to imperialism and colonial slavery, aspiring to democracy and peace, turned to Lenin for the answers to the topical problems of our epoch. Could there be more convincing proof than this that the contentions of our class adversaries, who claim that Leninism is outdated and falls short of the needs of society in the age of scientific and technical revolution, are totally groundless?

Bourgeois propaganda tried to exploit the Lenin Centenary to revive long since refuted notions that Leninism is a purely Russian phenomenon, that it departs from Marxism, and the like. But that was only to be expected from our class adversaries. Much more impressive is the fact that, though trying to undermine the influence of Leninism, they did not venture to deny Lenin's greatness, the vastness of the work he had performed for mankind.

It is another sign of the times that the leader of the Great October Socialist Revolution, hounded and persecuted in his lifetime like Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, is now officially honored in the United Nations Organization, while his role in his-

tory has become the subject of international conferences, symposia, meetings, etc.

The April celebrations in Moscow were a truly world-wide occasion for the followers of Lenin, the fighters for national liberation and social progress, testifying to the international character of Lenin's teaching. They were attended by delegates of the socialist countries and the young progressive states, Communist and Workers' parties and Left Socialist and national-democratic parties and movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Another point to be stressed as the Lenin Year runs out is the *considerable expansion of the theoretical and organizational activity of the Communist and Workers' parties.*

Colossal work has been accomplished in publishing the works of Lenin. In many countries publication of his Complete Works has already been concluded or is approaching the final stage. His most important works have been put out in new, large printings. Widely circulated and well read, they are helping millions of people to learn how to live and fight.

Eminent figures of the world Communist movement, leaders of the fraternal parties and the socialist states, and Marxist scholars of different countries have written books and articles, and have made public reports and speeches about Lenin and Leninism. Numerous international conferences of Marxists have been devoted to Lenin's legacy and various topical problems of Leninism. Our journal, too, has made its modest contribution, holding a conference, "Leninism and Our Time", in which Party functionaries and scholars of 40 countries participated. We have put out two jubilee

issues (the April and May numbers) containing articles by prominent leaders of the fraternal parties; several dozen articles examining the topical problems of our day in the light of Leninism; remembrances of V. I. Lenin by veterans of the Communist movement, and other pertinent materials.

Beyond question, the cumulative creative results of the Lenin Centenary year contribute to the propaganda and development of Marxism-Leninism, to the analysis of the concrete activity of fraternal parties, and to a more profound, meaningful criticism of Right and "Left" opportunism. Deeper now is our knowledge of the life and activity of Lenin, of the historic path travelled by Marxism-Leninism, of the laws governing the development of the world revolutionary process, the socialist revolution and the building of socialism, communism. This is indubitably of the utmost significance for all further theoretical work, for the education of our cadres, and for the success of their propaganda work.

The politico-ideological effort launched in connection with the Lenin Centenary has helped the Communist and Workers' parties to increase their membership, to strengthen their ties with the masses, to add to their prestige among the various social strata. That is another tangible practical result of the Lenin Year.

The Lenin Year—was the title of the editorial in the January 1970 issue of our journal. And we gave the same title—The Lenin Year—to the editorial of this, the last issue in 1970. The year has run its course, but the Lenin age continues. It is Lenin's age, because man's progress is yielding fresh proof of the impact and correctness of his revolutionary teaching.

Chile: the people take over

LUIS CORVALAN

After a prolonged struggle, with its alternating periods of partial success and temporary setbacks, Chile's consistent anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic forces have taken over the reins of government. Headed by the Socialist Salvador Allende, the new President, and sworn in on November 3, it includes representatives of all the parties of the Popular Unity alliance.

A new chapter has thus been opened in Chile's history, one that will radically change the country's destinies. The land of O'Higgins and Recabarren is launching out on deep-going revolutionary change, national and social emancipation, true democracy and socialism.

HISTORICAL LANDMARK

The victory of the Cuban revolution generated a powerful rise of the national liberation movement throughout the continent. The imperialists and the oligarchy retaliated by a fresh offensive of the stick-and-carrot type. There was the mercenaries' landing in the Bay of Pigs, the blockade of Cuba, guerrilla coups in Brazil and Argentina, intervention in the Dominican Republic, a wave of repression in Uruguay and other countries. They went hand in hand with the carrot tactic—the celebrated Alliance for Progress program. Its point and purpose was to shore up the positions of certain bourgeois groups which, while favoring reform, are the mainstay of imperialist interests. But in the changed Latin American climate this wave of reaction quickly petered out and the initiative was again in the hands of the people.

The victory in Chile is not an isolated incident; it is part and parcel of the new rise of the fight for independence and pro-

gress. The progressive course steered by the government of General Velasco Alvarado in Peru, the failure of the reactionary coup and the advent to power of a left-of-center government in Bolivia, the powerful workers' demonstrations in Uruguay and Argentina in support of economic demands and civil rights, legalization of the Communist Party in Venezuela—these, along with the election of Dr. Allende, are indications of the very meaningful, and very welcome, changes now taking place in Latin America.

U.S. imperialism's plans to isolate Cuba and prevent other Latin American nations from pursuing their fight for liberation have ended in dismal failure.

The Cuban revolution began a new stage in the Latin American struggle for independence and the advance to socialism. And despite economic difficulties, for which U.S. imperialism is mainly responsible, the Cuban revolution is gaining in strength, demonstrating to all the Western Hemisphere peoples that their problems can be solved only by economic liberation from the imperialist monopolies, full political independence, elimination of the oligarchical structure, introduction of much needed revolutionary reforms, and, in the final analysis, the building of socialism. That history is moving along these lines is fully borne out by what is happening in Chile.

The progressive forces that have taken over in that country have done so against the will and resistance of the U.S. imperialists and the reactionary faction at home. U.S. imperialism could not resort to intervention as it did against the Dominican Republic in 1965. Nor is it likely to find anyone willing to do its dirty work. For even under the Christian Democrats, Chile

maintained good-neighbor relations with Peru, and now, under the Allende government, we can anticipate still better, more active and friendly relations.

Much the same can be said of relations with Bolivia, though diplomatic ties have been broken off. Now, with political changes in both countries, we can hope for closer understanding and for an exchange of ambassadors between Santiago and La Paz.

As for Argentina, there have been statements, particularly from Isaac Rojas and his ilk, about the menace of "contagion" from across the Cordilleras. Nevertheless, we can count on the intrinsic democracy and friendship of the Argentine people. They prevented the dispatch of Argentine troops to Korea and the Dominican Republic, and now they will come out, with equal success, in defense of Chile against possible aggression. It is probably true to say that President Livingston was mindful of this public mood when he stated, in a recent press interview: "Salvador Allende's victory concerns only Chile, and therefore comes solely within the competence of the Chilean people."

There have been voices of reason even in the United States. Some political leaders and newspapers there maintain that the U.S. has no choice but to accept the changes in Chile, whether it approves of them or not. And there is also the view that the frontal attack on Cuba greatly damaged America's image in Latin America. We should not, of course, disregard such factors as U.S. imperialism's difficulties in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, or the growth of the democratic forces in the United States itself.

The results of the September 4 Presidential elections in Chile and the coming to power of a Left coalition were enthusiastically welcomed by all Latin American peoples. There were mass demonstrations in Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina and other countries. Spokesmen of diverse political trends — Social-Democrats, Radicals, Nationalists, Christian-Democrats and, naturally, Communists, hailed Allende's election as a major victory.

This atmosphere of approval and solidarity, plus the legitimacy of the election victory which no one can challenge, as well as the powerful impact of world socialism, explain why U.S. imperialism and Latin American reaction will find themselves compelled to accept the situation in Chile.

The formation of a popular government

there is the culmination of a powerful mass movement, marked by numerous major and minor battles on every front of the class struggle.

Salvador Allende polled a relative majority and his election had to be approved by the National Congress. The Popular Unity alliance demonstrated its firmness and political maturity, its fidelity to principle and tactical flexibility. While mobilizing the people, it worked for agreement with the Christian Democrats, whose presidential candidate, Radomiro Tomic, advanced a program in many respects identical with Allende's. This made it possible to isolate the more reactionary circles and thwart moves to nullify the people's victory. It has to be said that the Christian Democrats, too, showed a high sense of political responsibility. All this assured Allende's endorsement by Congress, by a three-quarters majority.

The Chilean example shows that the revolutionary process follows specific paths and forms in each given country. It provides confirmation also for the proposition, formulated by the 20th CPSU Congress and adopted by the Communist movement at its 1960 Conference, that the working class and other forces fighting for socialism do not inevitably have to follow the armed path of capturing power and carrying out revolutionary transformations. Naturally, only the revolutionaries in each given country can decide whether or not such a non-armed possibility exists, whether it could arise and if so, in what specific form. That is precisely why the Chilean Communists do not presume to hold up their experience as a model applicable to all countries.

The Left parties have formed a government, are in control, that is, of part of political power, but the part that carries most of the attributes of administration of the state. The oligarchy still holds strong positions in the legislative and judicial branches, controls the communications media and, as the partner of U.S. imperialism, dominates the economy. The outlook, therefore, is for a series of clashes between the people and their government, on the one hand, and imperialism and the oligarchy, on the other. The Right has already reacted, instantly and sharply, to President Allende's first steps in implementing his election promises. There have been attempts—doubtlessly with more to come—to block normal development. We should not, therefore, preclude the possibility of

the people having to resort to one or another form of armed struggle. To ward off any such situation the popular forces must immobilize the enemy, straitjacket him, drive him into a corner and thus spare the country the civil war the opponents of reform would so gleefully welcome.

But whatever the dangers ahead, and whatever the menace of foreign aggression, it can safely be said that the people and the army will faithfully defend the country. The Chilean people can be relied upon to rebuff any attempt at subversion from within.

Regardless of all the difficulties and of the outcome of impending conflicts, the people's victory at the polls and the advent of Chile's first consistent anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchical government pledged to build socialism, will go down in history as one of the greatest events in Latin America.

UNITY—THE EARNEST OF VICTORY

The Communist Party played a conspicuous part in welding the unity that made the September 4 victory possible. And decisive in the Party's activity was its unremitting effort for cohesion of the working class and the people based on its concept of the Chilean revolution. This was backed by firmness, tactical versatility and sustained mass activity.

Of particular importance in this respect was the policy, adopted at the two last Party Congresses, of promoting closer understanding between Socialists and Communists, and organizing a Popular Unity front meant to bring together all progressive forces in the opposition and in the government against the reactionary forces in both.

And here the Communist Party and the Young Communist League had to contend with numerous overt and covert enemies, from double-dyed reactionaries to ultra-“Left” groups with their slogan of “Rifles Instead of Ballots.” These phoney Lefts denounced Communists as “Sybarites,” “reformists,” “conservatives,” “traditionalists,” “bourgeoisified,” “parliamentary time-servers,” “status quo defenders.” The North American pseudo-Marxist Miles Wolpin and other “Leftists” went to great pains in an effort to prove that the Chilean Left stood no chance at the polls. Neither this nor the torrent of invective shook Communist conviction in the correctness of their policy: the Party and YCL remained firm, united and active.

However, the victory was not only the result of the policy and effort of the Communist or any other party. All the Popular Unity parties contributed, and each contribution was essential—the absence of any one party would have proved fatal.

The Chilean people's victory reaffirms something other peoples have learned from their own experience, namely, that regardless of what revolutionary path is chosen, it must always accord with reality, the country's pressing needs. And also this: once a correct path has been chosen the key to victory lies in the united struggle of the working class and all the people.

The Popular Unity alliance has brought together Chile's democratic forces—Communists, Socialists, former Christian-Democrats, Radicals, Social-Democrats, and independent Left groups, all of them closely associated with the people's life and interests. Marxists, Catholics and Freemasons, men and women from all walks of life and of widely differing political philosophies were able to reach understanding. For the Popular Unity alliance is an amalgam of the social diversity and political pluralism that is part of Chile. Without such an amalgam victory would have been inconceivable.

And victory was forged in the crucible of joint action that cut across political and religious boundaries. Joint action continues to be the watchword everywhere, in factories, farms, offices, universities and residential areas and centers on immediate demands and, more important, on assuring political power by the people.

That is why our struggle was much more than an election campaign. It was waged on every front, often in the form of joint actions. Some of these were of major importance, for instance, the general strike called by the United Trade Union Center. In short, the Popular Unity alliance is not just a result of agreement between party leaders, but of mass struggle and mass determination; the result, primarily, of numerous joint actions and the closer understanding and cohesion they produced.

The election campaign brought into being 14,800 Popular Unity committees with hundreds of thousands of members, many of them with no party affiliation. The committees will continue in the factories and residential areas. Though short of funds and technical means, they conducted an effective campaign that helped to raise the political understanding of the masses,

popularize the Popular Unity program, organize and stimulate the fight for the people's vital demands. Under the new government these committees will remain the motive force of the social struggle.

Another factor in cementing democratic unity is the fight against bourgeois ideological subversion, particularly manifestations of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, and also sectarian and Right-wing tendencies.

Relations within the alliance play a big part. There is full equality in expressing viewpoints and formulating policy and unanimity in adopting decisions. Without stringent observance of this procedure, cooperation of the Left parties would remain no more than a pious wish.

It is also important to avoid name-calling in political discussions and concentrate on fostering fraternal and frank relations between leaders and members of Popular Unity parties and organizations, to understand the psychology, ideology and reaction of individuals and groups, their approach to problems. In fact, mastery of the art of inter-party relations is very important in achieving mutual understanding, flexibility and agreement.

The elections have altered the political balance in favor of the new government. The Christian Democrats, though in opposition, have not come out against the Allende administration. Most of their members are inclined to support some of its reform projects, but more important still is the fact that many Christian-Democrat voters are now rallying around the Left parties. Even some who had voted for Alessandri are having second thoughts. All this furnishes opportunities for strengthening and extending unity of all anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchical forces.

The priority task now is to strengthen the unity of the people, which could and should become an invincible force in advancing the Chilean revolution and the interests of various classes and sections of the population, isolating reaction, thwarting its subversive plans, preventing foreign interference, rebuffing imperialist pressure and building up wide support for the new government.

That is a crucial task, and it has to be accomplished in the very near future.

PROGRAM FOR REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE

As President Allende has said, his was

not the victory of an individual, but of the whole people. That is no exaggeration, for his election was the result of far-reaching unity of social and political forces around the alliance program of deep-going revolutionary transformations. It envisages nationalization of the country's natural resources now controlled by foreign monopolies and the financial oligarchy, private banking and insurance, foreign and major domestic trading enterprises, the big industrial monopolies and all other enterprises that have a bearing on Chile's economic and social development. It calls for acceleration and extension of the agrarian reform begun by the Christian-Democrat government.

There will now be three economic sectors: public ownership (nationalized enterprises and those scheduled for nationalization), private ownership (handicrafts, small and medium businesses and farms), mixed ownership (enterprises in which the state and private capital are partners).

The program says: "Economic policy will be implemented within the framework of national planning through the mechanism of control, orientation, crediting, technical assistance, taxes and foreign trade, and with the help of the public sector." The object is to "assure rapid and decentralized growth of the economy towards comprehensive development of the productive forces, optimal use of available manpower, natural, financial and technical resources to raise productivity and satisfy the requirements of independent development and the people's urge for better conditions."

The program calls for a series of measures in the social and cultural fields, specifically in public health, housing and education, to meet pressing needs. The country will be administered by a uniform system of national, regional and local authorities, with supreme power vested in the National Assembly, a one-chamber parliament based on sovereignty of the people. Its functions will include appointment of the Supreme Tribunal which, in turn, will appoint judges and courts.

Popular representation at all levels will be based on universal suffrage through direct vote and secret ballot. The program contains this proviso: "Public organizations with specific functions shall be set up at all levels to share responsibility and promote initiative in their respective sphere and to examine and solve problems coming within their jurisdiction."

The fundamentals of foreign policy set out in the program stress the need for contacts with all countries, the principles of self-determination and non-interference, and the qualified objectives of reviewing, denouncing and annulling treaties and agreements prejudicial to the country's sovereignty; censuring colonialism and neo-colonialism, racial segregation and anti-Semitism; supporting the people of Vietnam, the Arab peoples and those fighting against aggression or imperialist oppression.

In the Latin American context, the program envisages the exposure of the Organization of American States (OAS) as a tool and agent of North American imperialism, opposition to pan-Americanism; the establishment of a new representative continental body, building up Latin American prestige, integration based on an economy freed from imperialist dependence and exploitation; an active policy of bilateral agreements beneficial to Chile's development, and settlement of contested border issues by negotiation.

This harmonious program is meant to deliver Chile from imperialist domination, elbow out the oligarchy from command positions, end the country's backwardness, build up an independent modern economy, lay new juridical foundations for the state and ensure broader democracy and socialist construction.

The program ministers to the vital needs posed by Chile's past development and to the imperatives of transition from capitalism to socialism. The projected changes and concrete measures have been drawn from an objective analysis of Chile's realities, its problems and the sentiments and consciousness of the people. The nation knows from past experience that its problems and hopes for a better life require urgent social changes, popular participation in running the country and implementation of the Popular Unity program.

The Popular Unity parties are fully committed to this program of constitutional revolutionary change under already existing laws or legislation still to be put into effect on a democratic basis.

The Constitution and pertinent legislation endows the Executive with important attributes and extensive powers. But nationalization and changes in the political structure must have the support of parliament. The Popular Unity coalition has no more than a relative—anything but an

absolute—majority in the National Congress. That will be a roadblock, but one that we should overcome through cooperation with the Christian Democratic Party on basic issues on which our programs coincide, and, particularly, with the support and active participation of the people.

As we see it, even the present political framework offers some opportunities for progress. But the institutions will have to be repatterned to make them serviceable for the policy of revolutionary change in the interest of the majority. Should a conflict arise between the executive and legislature, the Constitution permits the former to dissolve Congress once during its term of office on the basis of a referendum, and it is quite likely that this prerogative will have to be invoked at some point.

By and large, everybody knows what must be done. The people know it. The government knows it. Everybody knows the problems and the pressing tasks. Yet in a way, the Chilean revolution is following an uncharted course, with features all its own. The priorities and tempo of change, the rate of implementing the program, depend on a variety of factors, as well as the firmness of the new government. Discretion is the watchword. False steps must be avoided. We must measure the relation of strength unerringly, internationally as well as nationally, in order to go into every battle, engage in every clash, with full confidence in victory. We must continue building up our forces, enlisting new groups for participation in the continuous refashioning of society.

The nation has meaningfully declared for deep-going reconstruction as the only way to radically resolve the national problems and carry forward the age-old dream of prosperity, cultural progress and social justice. The nation knows that the path it has chosen is not strewn with roses, but is prepared, at the cost of sacrifice, to achieve liberation.

THE OBJECTIVE IS A PEOPLE'S STATE

The revolutionary process in Chile raises theoretical and practical problems. Their solution is crucial for its successful development and the end goal: socialism.

The Communist Party holds that for all the diversity and the specifics of the Chilean reality, we should not overlook the common laws operating during the transition to socialism.

This will probably raise many questions, such as that of the class composition of the government and the new legal status of the state, the function of the armed forces, the role of the proletariat and the Communist Party. Warning all revolutionaries of the danger of subjectivism and abstract stereotype, Lenin wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life. There is nothing more primitive from the viewpoint of theory, or more ridiculous from that of practice, than to paint, 'in the name of historical materialism,' this aspect of the future in a monotonous grey" (Vol. 23, pp. 69-70).

Let us look at these problems in the concrete 1970 Chilean setting.

Executive power has been assumed by popular parties. The cabinet consists of three Communists, three Socialists, three members of the Radical Party, two Social-Democrats, and a representative each from the Popular Action Unity Movement (a party split away from the CDP) and the Independent Popular Action, and one independent. Top officers in all local administrations, key departments of the central apparatus, embassies and missions are being turned over to people trusted by the President. They are men of the Left coalition. There is, of course, the danger of parochialism and of spheres of influence appearing in favor of one or another party in the various areas of the state machinery. On this score the political agreement on the formation of the government apparatus (supplementary to the program), says: "All forces entering the people's government, operating in alliance among themselves and with the pertinent public organizations of the workers and the people, will be represented in the working organs at all levels and in all the decisive spheres of state administration."

In the final analysis, this is a multi-party government and its activity reflects the coordinated action of all the composite forces. This type of government is consonant with the needs and traditions of the country, because not one, but several political groups have opted for social change. Besides, the multi-party system in the country is more than a hundred years old.

But the program also says that "trade unions and public organizations of workers, employees, peasants, housewives, students, intellectuals, artisans, small and middle employers and other strata will be enlisted in the framing of the appropriate government decisions. For example, in the field of social security self-administration by the contributors will be introduced on the basis of councils elected democratically by secret ballot. There will be direct representatives of the workers and other wage-earners in the directorates and production committees of state-owned enterprises. House committees and other neighborhood organizations will exercise control within limits set by the law and at the appropriate level over the work of the housing authority. These examples are given to illustrate a new conception, that of the real and effective possibility for popular participation in the work of government bodies."

The Popular Unity alliance is committed to refashioning the existing institutions in order to establish a new state in which the workers and people can exercise real power. The program lists measures projected by the new government, adding: "The new political constitution will legalize mass participation by the people in administering the state."

It will take time to carry through the necessary administrative and political measures to achieve this objective. A start has already been made. A few days before Salvador Allende assumed the Presidency, various organizations of workers and the people, including organizations of public servants, began framing projects for a number of urgent measures. These have been brought to the notice of the newly-formed government. The creative elan of the people will help the government work more dynamically, barring bureaucracy, while the nation's appreciation of the possibilities and difficulties will enhance public discipline and sense of responsibility.

ROLE OF WORKERS AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The working class is cast in an important role. It holds a leading place in the political sphere by virtue of its glorious traditions of struggle and high degree of class consciousness. It has a powerful organization—the United Trade Union Center, embracing nearly all the industrial and office workers of the state and private

sectors, with close contacts with the non-affiliated unions and exercising a strong influence among industrial and office workers, peasants, tradesmen and small employers, the intelligentsia and professionals. The workers' role as the decisive factor in national affairs was substantiated, among other things, by their acting as the main obstacle to a reactionary putsch. Indicatively, most of the votes for Salvador Allende were cast in provinces and cities where the workers are strong, militant and politically advanced.

The Communist Party is a proletarian party. But by virtue of its unitarian policy it is highly influential among the youth, farmers and intellectuals, helping tangibly to unite the popular forces around the working class.

The Socialist Party, too, has strong ties with the masses, and its prestige is also quite considerable among the middle strata.

For more than 14 years Communists and Socialists have worked hand in hand, jointly resolving many of the problems relating to the guidance of the labor movement and to the socio-political struggle as a whole. The Communists consider it their revolutionary duty to promote mutual understanding with their friends, the Socialists.

The people's access to government is open, and will become wider still in all spheres and at all levels. The objective is not a government with the participation of the people, but a state administered by the people, with the working class as the decisive force.

Consequently, by virtue of its influence, its numbers, political awareness, class discipline and high degree of organization, the working class can contribute greatly to government activity, making the most of its admirable features—tenacity in struggle and unshakeable determination in carrying forward the reconstruction, never stopping halfway. And this not in opposition to other segments of the people, but in alliance with them, safeguarding the common interest.

It would be folly to think there will be no difficulties. Difficulties there certainly will be. But we have reason to expect that mutual understanding, rather than internal difficulties, will prevail in the relations between the different social and political forces represented in the people's government. All Popular Unity parties and organizations are sincerely and honestly de-

termined to carry forward the program. What is more, judging by their class composition and program principles, the parties can and must coexist and cooperate, particularly in the area of the common objective: building a society without antagonistic classes. Hence the conclusion that the government can be multi-party also in the socialist stage. Clearly plurality will be a specific feature of our country's advance to socialism.

That does not rule out clashes of opinion and ideological struggles between the different democratic trends. The Popular Unity bloc emerged through hard political and ideological work among the people. And success depends on further efforts in the same direction. For this reason, the Communist Party regards mutual understanding among the people's parties as a necessary permanent factor.

THE OLIGARCHY, THE OPPOSITION AND THE ARMY

The attitude of the oligarchy is the very reverse. The oligarchy is a bitter foe of the projected changes, compelling merciless political struggle against it. The people's government proposes to tear down the foundations of its economic power and to demolish its material basis.

Implementation of the Popular Unity program and further social development should eradicate class contradictions and eliminate the exploiting classes.

A political opposition continues to exist. And as long as its material and ideological basis survives, it is preferable, as the program says, to recognize that opposition, provided it acts within the law.

The Popular Unity bloc proposes to strengthen the national character and professional orientation of the armed forces, working for "their broad development on the basis of military technology and science with the perspective of contributing to the country's economic growth without prejudice to their main purpose: defense of national sovereignty and performance of other specific functions. For this reason, the program says, "we must assure the material and technical equipment of the armed forces and create a fair democratic system of pay, promotion and pensions, which will provide the top and the lower officers, and the sergeants and privates, with sufficient material security for the duration of their service and after retirement, and with realistic opportuni-

ties for promotion on the sole basis of personal aptitude."

As repeatedly pointed out by President Allende, the Popular Unity parties came to power not as a result of grappling with the armed forces or any part of them. The armed forces did not take part in the fight for power, and when the people triumphed, with the National Congress confirming their victory, the armed forces publicly recognized the government. They retained their spirit of professionalism, their respect for the Constitution and the law. For this approach it was that the ultra-Right elements assassinated the army's commander-in-chief General Schneider.

To be sure, we should not overlook the circumstances in which the armed forces were formed, and especially the fact that their professional training was in recent decades influenced by the Pentagon. This does not go to say, however, that they are loyal servants of the imperialists and the upper classes. Our ground troops and navy were constituted in the fight for independence. Privates and non-commissioned officers in all the three arms come from a poor social background and nearly all the officers from the middle strata. The oligarchy and the prosperous bourgeoisie have long since stopped choosing a military career for their sons. It should be borne in mind, however, that in these days no social institution is indifferent to the social storms raging all over the world and the tragedy of the hundreds of millions of poverty-stricken people.

The attitude of the armed forces of the Dominican Republic during the U.S. invasion and the progressive nature of the military government in Peru show that a dogmatic approach to the army is no longer valid. The military establishment, too, needs change, but that change should not be imposed on it. It must be initiated by the military and based on their awareness of its imperatives.

Time will show what is to be done in other areas.

It may be proper to add in conclusion that the question of the state, its institutions and the role of the working class, requires practical answers. The search is on for ways of consolidating the popular unity, consolidating and improving the

new government. This cannot be done overnight. That is clear. But the forces taking over the helm of state represent a radical change in the class composition and orientation of the government. Change will affect the entire structure of state. The new constitutional government must be a people's government.

FOR A NEW SOCIETY

There are still many question marks in the assessment of the new reality and as to the way of preventing major errors. In that respect this commentary is no more than a tentative analysis.

The problems facing the people's government are great. There is the chronic inflation, with prices probably climbing another 40 per cent before the end of the year. There are the 200,000 unemployed. There is the shortage of 500,000 dwellings, of hospitals and schools, and there is the foreign debt of over \$2,000 million, the budget deficit, the outmoded industrial plant, the backwardness of our farming, etc.

To tackle these problems we need a new policy, one oriented against the interests of the rich, on the revolutionary reconstruction envisaged in the Popular Unity program, which the imperialist monopolies and the oligarchies are sure to try and resist.

Reaction has given notice that it will go to all lengths to protect its vested interests. So far, it has failed to perform a putsch, but is still banking on subversion and, as a last resort, on foreign intervention. It will try to bring about the collapse or overthrow of the people's government by splitting the popular movement, bribing parties and their leaders, by provocations or by encouraging conformism and reformism.

All this the forces of Popular Unity know perfectly well.

The Popular Unity coalition won power through struggle, tackling each political problem jointly with the people, with mass support. And that is how it must carry on, firmly convinced that a people united can crush its enemy, surmount the obstacles and build a new society.

Analysis in depth of new developments in the economics and politics of developed capitalist countries, imperialist strategy and tactics, diverse forms and methods of neo-colonialism, is a permanent component part of the theoretical work of Communist and Workers' parties. These questions were examined at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, and have been dealt with in a number of articles on the pages of this journal, including special studies of U.S. and West German imperialism. Deeper knowledge and creative development of Lenin's theory of imperialism are bound to play a bigger part in elaborating a scientifically-grounded anti-imperialist strategy. More materials analyzing the economics, politics and ideology of imperialism will be published in our journal in preparation for the World Anti-Imperialist Congress.

The leaders of several Communist parties have been asked to write on this subject, and one of these contributions, by Gus Hall, General Secretary, Communist Party USA, appears on the following pages. Other articles have been promised by Kurt Bachmann, Chairman of the German Communist Party, and William Kashtan, General Secretary, Communist Party of Canada.

New directions of development, new problems of imperialism

GUS HALL

Imperialism is the decaying stage of capitalist development. This process is not simple. There is no point where all operations come to a dead end. The decay takes place while capitalism adjusts to the problems brought on by the decay. The adjustments are forced by a changing reality. The world system of socialist states is a reality imperialism is forced to deal with. The rise of the colonial liberation movement has further changed the world realities. The scientific-technological revolution has added an additional new ingredient to the reality imperialism is forced to adjust to. No matter where imperialism turns, it comes eyeball to eyeball with the forces of the world revolutionary process.

To meet the new problems of this changing reality, imperialism maneuvers — retreats when it is forced to, adjusts its tactics when necessary. These adjustments do not affect the aims of imperialism. The

laws of its unequal development continue in force, the struggles between imperialist powers continue — but they all now function within and are influenced by the new set of realities.

Some of the adjustments to the new reality are embodied in neo-colonialism. Imperialism gives up its old methods of aggression when it is forced to do so. It uses new tactics but it also returns to the old methods whenever it is possible. In this sense, military aggression remains very much a part of the imperialist arsenal. Either open, direct aggression, as in Vietnam, or indirect supporting aggression, as is the case in the Middle East. The main force in the Israel aggression against the Arab countries is U.S. imperialism.

Neo-colonialism is imperialism's new adaptation, adjusting to the new relationship — to the new power of anti-imperialism. Neo-colonialism is imperialism's adapt-

ed form for a historic period when the balance of forces has shifted against imperialism. It is a substitution for the old. It is colonialism when imperialism has lost its direct political control over the enslaved countries.

Neo-colonialism has now become the dominant force of imperialist operation and exploitation.

The forces of world anti-imperialism must update their tactics to reflect this new phenomena. Neo-colonialism is not "soft," "non-violent" imperialism. The iron heel of neo-colonialism is very real.

Most of the newly liberated countries are celebrating their 25th anniversaries. It is 25 years since most of them won their political independence. What has happened in these 25 years is witness to the tenacity and to the bulldog-like grip that imperialism continues to hold over these lands. About two-thirds of the people in the non-socialist world live in these newly liberated countries. But today they account for less than one tenth of the capitalist industrial production. The old imperialist powers still account for more than 70 per cent of the foreign trade of these lands. The share of the developing countries in world trade has declined from 27 per cent in 1953 to 19 per cent in 1967. After 25 years, out of 350,000,000 families in the capitalist world who are engaged in farming, 250,000,000 mainly living in the areas where neo-colonialism is a decisive factor, still use a hoe and wooden plough as their main work tools.

Neo-colonialism makes much noise about "aid" to the developing countries. But this aid is a pathway to bankruptcy for the young nations. For 95 of such countries receiving "aid" in the form of loans and grants from imperialist powers their indebtedness has increased five-fold since 1953. The interest payments on these imperialist mortgage payments run into \$5,000 million and this sum is increasing every year. Because of neo-colonialism the economic gap between the countries of imperialism and the under-developed countries continues to widen. In the capitalist world the rich do get richer and the poor get poorer. The countries of Latin America, for example, suffer a 1½ billion dollar trade loss to U.S. imperialism every year. This is loot taken from the countries of Latin America that otherwise would go into accumulated capital for industrial development, for schools, housing, hospitals and, of course, higher wages.

Neo-colonialism moves to replace the old direct political control over the enslaved nations with economic and more indirect political controls. They have shifted to a greater emphasis on ideological controls.

After winning their form of political independence all of the liberated countries faced a crisis of direction. A struggle over whether to take the socialist path or the capitalist path — this became the most crucial question. In some countries the decision has been made, but in most of the countries it remains a serious question. This struggle is closely related to the development of class forces and the class struggle in these countries. The policies of neo-colonialism are influenced by this internal struggle because it is an unalterable fact that these countries can be a source of profit for imperialism only if they can be kept in the world capitalist orbit. And it is also a fact that they will remain in the capitalist orbit only if their economic development moves into the channels of capitalism. The resolution of this question in favor of capitalism has become a primary overall objective of neo-colonialism.

The "aid" programs are specifically designed to act as stimulators for a capitalist direction of development. Imperialism has set up such institutions to achieve the end of keeping the independent countries within the capitalist orbit and to move their economies along capitalist lines.

The Agency of International Development and the government-controlled foreign investment funds in banks now handle most of the "aid."

The dilemma of the newly liberated countries is clear in the following: 80 per cent of the total influx of new capital into these countries comes from such "aid" sources of imperialism. The string that is attached to all these programs is: remain in the capitalist orbit. But with all this so-called "aid" the outflow in the form of profits to the dispensers of the imperialist "aid" is much larger than the "aid."

Another neo-colonialist gimmick is to make some members of the national capitalist elements junior partners in industrial enterprises. The junior partners are tied to subordinate positions in these corporations and these corporations are closely tied to the basic interests of the imperialist country. The junior partners remain "partners" only if the mortgage payments are made on time.

Neo-colonialism is not non-violent imperialism. In today's world the open use of the Marines is not always advisable. Therefore, neo-colonialism has developed its "invisible" military force. For U.S. imperialism it is called the counter-insurgency corps. It is in fact a counter-revolutionary insurgency corps.

This is government-sponsored and financed gangsterism. It has many heads. The CIA, the Green Berets, the Army, the Air Force, the Marines each have their own gangster sector. The tools of these groups are murder, assassination, frameup, political and financial corruption and terror. It has now come to the light of day how President Kennedy on a number of occasions discussed the matter of whether and how Fidel Castro should be assassinated. This was at a time when Kennedy was launching his Alliance for Progress programs. These are two sides of neo-colonialism.

U.S. imperialist policy of counter-revolutionary insurgency includes a bigger role for the police departments of the oppressed nations. In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, Professor David Burks of Indiana University stated: "I think we have to face a reality. The reality is that when the insurgents appear the governments will call upon the army to eliminate the insurgents. But there comes a point — and this came in Cuba in 1957 and 1958 when Castro was in the Sierra Maestra, there can come a point when the army cannot handle this kind of situation because the military establishment tends to use too much force, tends to use the wrong techniques and tends therefore to *polarize the population and gradually force the majority of those who are politically active to support the revolutionary or insurgent force*. The troops are not trained — their orientation is not such that they are really competent to handle this kind of a problem. Whereas a civil police force — is with the people all the time carrying on normal functions of control — therefore can move very quickly whenever an insurgent problem develops."

As a part of neo-colonialist policies and Alliance for Progress in 1962 under President Kennedy's direction, U.S. imperialism established the Inter-American Police Academy. As of February 1969 there were 3,000 students—60 per cent from Latin America had graduated for police work. In addition to training programs in the

United States, AID sends "public safety advisors" to Latin America. In 1968 about 100 such persons were employed by AID in Latin America. To protect his massive oil interests in Latin America, Rockefeller, after returning from the mission for Nixon, in his "Recommendations for Action" recommended a continuation of the police training. "The United States should respond to requests for assistance of the police and security forces of the hemisphere nations by providing them with the essential tools to do the job. Accordingly the United States should meet reasonable requests from other hemisphere governments for trucks, jeeps, helicopters and like equipment to provide mobility and logistical support for these forces — for radios and other command control equipment for proper communications among the forces — for small arms for security forces."

The growth of monopolies and the development of monopoly state capitalism are formations peculiar to the imperialist stage of capitalist development. The evolution of state monopoly capitalist formations has been and is influenced by the difficulties and roadblocks facing present-day imperialism. The state has new assignments in carrying out the policies of imperialist oppression. The state has somewhat of a new and heightened role in carrying out the policies of neo-colonialism. The "aid" programs are state-sponsored and state grants. These grants and loans are, in fact, subsidies coming from the tax dollars to further increase the superprofits of private monopolies. Thus the state has become the main factor in holding the strangulating economic purse strings of neo-colonialism.

Neo-colonialism is now forced to deal with national governments, with states that are supported by militant anti-imperialist liberation movements. This creates new problems for imperialism. The imperialist state gives "aid" grants only to governments of countries who either promise or do move in the "capitalist orbit." To get the support of the governments of Australia, New Zealand, South Korea, Thailand and the Philippines for the Vietnamese aggression, the U.S. Government has given billions of dollars as "aid." These sums have been kept secret from the people of the countries involved as well as the people of the USA. The state also has a new role as the enforcer of the very high taxes in order to pay for the cost and

the "subsidies" incurred in the imperialist operations of the monopolies.

It is not only the imperialist state that has a new role in carrying out the neo-colonialist policies. A trade union leader of an imperialist country that supports capitalism becomes a very important cog in the wheels of neo-colonialism. The AFL-CIO leadership is a perfect example of how a trade union leadership behaves when they are lackeys of imperialism. U.S. imperialism has assigned an expanded role in its neo-colonialist foreign policies operations to Meany, Lovestone and the cadre around them. The International Department of the AFL-CIO headed by Lovestone is for all intents and purposes a branch of the CIA. Their specific task is to keep the trade unions of the oppressed countries in the capitalist orbit. The AFL-CIO Foreign Affairs Department has increasingly become an instrument of imperialist operation and exploitation at a moment when economic and indirect methods must be used. This Department uses large sums of money provided by the monopolies for its ideological work in the service of imperialism. Lovestone's International Department is, in fact, a department of neo-colonialism.

Neo-colonialism, to be effective, must try to hide its basic imperialist nature. It must try to hide its real purpose under slogans such as "Alliance for Progress," "Good Neighbor Policy," or to speak about "brotherhood" and "peace." As U.S. imperialism has been forced to turn to neo-colonialist practices it has increased its use of a cadre with a social democratic or a "left" cover. It was the social democratic cadre that organized and ran the "trade union schools" a few years back; the exposés of the CIA reveal that these were financed and run by the CIA to train forces for the trade union movement of Latin America.

Yes, imperialism is the decaying stage of capitalism. But it is not its dead-end. It remains a dangerous foe, it continues to maneuver, it continues its aggressive policies of enslavement. It continues to penetrate new areas wherever the opportunity presents itself. In 1953 President Eisenhower stated: "You don't really know why we are so concerned with the far-off southeast corner of Asia. . . . All of that position around there is very ominous to the United States, because finally if we lost all that, how would the free world hold the rich empire of Indonesia?" Only a few

short years after these words, with the help of the CIA as well as the negative effects of mistaken policies by the forces of anti-imperialism, the anti-imperialist coalition that supported the Sukarno government of Indonesia was smashed. For the moment the Communist Party of Indonesia was also destroyed as an effective force. This setback opened the flood gates for imperialist penetration into Indonesia. By August of 1970 the *Magazine of Wall Street* was able to state: "Every square mile of exploration territory on and around Indonesia's main islands of Sumatra, Java, Borneo, the Celebes, and West Irian has been nailed down, primarily by American oil companies," including Atlantic Richfield, Caltex (Standard Oil of California and Texaco), Union Oil Co. (engaged in a 'joint' Japanese consortium venture), Cities Service Co., Gulf Oil, Continental Oil and Getty Oil Co.—the area which accounts for over 50 per cent of all crude oil production in the Far East.

Because U.S. imperialism remains the hub for world imperialism, the new problems, the new direction of developments, are more discernible here.

While U.S. foreign investments continue to increase in all continents and industries and the total accelerates at a considerably faster rate than the growth of the national wealth and profit at home, nevertheless, the direction is at this moment away from the traditional and most profitable areas of investment—the raw material and low-wage neo-colonial areas of Latin America and Africa and Asia. The direction is towards heavy manufacturing areas of Europe and Canada where investments, frequently in U.S. branches and subsidiaries abroad, are most secure from expropriation, and where the capacity for applying the scientific-technological revolution for maximum exploitation is the most developed, and where the control of accumulated capital can best be accomplished.

The share of developed capitalist countries in direct U.S. investment rose from 48.3 per cent in 1950 to 67.2 per cent in 1967 and the share of developing countries fell from 51.7 per cent to 32.8 per cent, with Latin America showing a drop from 38.8 per cent to 20.1 per cent. This is a significant change in the direction of U.S. imperialist investments.

The above shows U.S. private direct investment in Europe multiplied 4.7 times between 1957 and 1968. This is higher than in any other continent. Europe accounted for 16.4 per cent of all U.S. direct

investment abroad in 1957 but by 1968 this was almost doubled to 29.9 per cent. Canada remains the largest single area for U.S. investment accounting for 30.1 per cent of the total in 1968. However, it is down from 34.2 per cent in 1957. Latin America's share dropped from 31.9 per cent in 1957 to 20.1 per cent in 1968. Asia's share remained relatively stable.

U.S. investment in Africa multiplied 4.0 times between 1957 and 1968 showing the second highest increase next to Europe. U.S. imperialism has important designs for Africa. Between 1963 and 1968 U.S. private investment in Africa grew at an average annual rate of 14 per cent and mineral and petroleum development account for nearly three-quarters of current U.S. private investment in Africa: "The industry is exceptionally able to seek out new sources and new opportunities to meet growing demands," notes U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers ("U.S. & Africa in the 70's," *State Department Bulletin*, April 20, 1970, p. 517).

Comparing the above it can be seen that Asia and Africa which in 1968 accounted for only 11.3 per cent of all U.S. private direct foreign investment, nevertheless accounted for 42.6 per cent of all U.S. profits from direct foreign investment abroad in 1969! No wonder U.S. imperialism is so concerned with being a "pacific power," etc.

Latin America, Asia and Africa in 1969 accounted for over two-thirds of all profits from U.S. private direct investments abroad in 1969, but for only one-third of U.S. private direct investment in 1968. U.S. imperialism has no intentions of voluntarily leaving these high profit areas of exploitation but the direction has shifted.

U.S. imperialism aims above all for penetrating the manufacturing industries which account for 50 per cent of all U.S. private direct investment in Western Europe. The aim is to capture and use the old accumulated industrial capital. Between 1958 and 1968 U.S. foreign private direct investment in manufacturing increased 202 per cent compared with 191 per cent for trade, 91 per cent for petroleum development, and 136 per cent for the all-industry average, and U.S. investment in manufacturing in 1968 was greatest in Western Europe and Canada.

The output of U.S. subsidiaries and branches outside the United States, mostly in Western Europe, is now \$200 billion or about six times U.S. exports abroad. In 1969 this amounted to a loss of over 20

million jobs that otherwise could have gone to American workers now suffering from the worst unemployment in six years.

U.S. imperialism, with most of its resources for research and development siphoned off into military applications, is losing ground in the race for economic stimulation afforded by the scientific-technological revolution. As noted by U.S. Pentagon Director of Defense Research and Engineering, John S. Foster, Jr., Japan's growth rate in technologically intensive manufactured products was 22.5 per cent during 1955-65 compared with 3.9 per cent for the United States, and 8.4 per cent for West Germany. Says Foster: "... our past national position of technological leadership is being eroded and is being challenged seriously by both our friends and our potential enemies."

RESERVES OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

U.S. imperialism is a wily and cunning foe and accounts for over 40 per cent of world capitalist industrial output. It is still very powerful and dangerous. In Latin America, for example, it is resorting to greater behind-the-scenes use of local police forces to achieve its aims of domination as well as an overall increase in military activities.

U.S. imperialism provides the function of gendarme for world imperialism. This is an important service it provides in the international capitalist division of labor that is necessary for combat against the world socialist camp.

U.S. imperialism is banking on use of the scientific-technological revolution to serve its interests and spends ten times as much as its nearest Western European rival, Great Britain, to this end. Formerly, the might of the monopolies was determined by the scale of their raw material resources but scientific and technological progress has reduced the consumption of raw materials per unit of finished goods by 75-80 per cent in value as compared with the pre-war level. "In 1969 in the United States the consumption of major raw materials per net ton of pig iron produced resumed a downward trend that has persisted during most of the last two decades," notes the American Iron and Steel Institute ("Steel Facts," July 1970, p. 3), and some experts predict that with the development of composite materials of extremely high stiffness and high-strength filaments bonded together with a soft plastic matrix, the amounts of steel, aluminum and wood currently used in structures

may be reduced by as much as 50 per cent in the near future.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The technological and scientific revolution has become a new disaster to the industrially underdeveloped countries of the world. In large measure, this fate is shared by the workers in the capitalist countries. The new technology in the hands of the big monopolies is a nightmare to the workers under capitalism. It has raised the question of job security as a most critical problem.

The new science and technology have become decisive new factors in creating an ever wider gap between the industrially developed capitalist countries and the nations either newly liberated or still under the boot-heel of world imperialism.

The development of substitute materials for natural materials, such as the families of plastics and fibres, has created a new problem for countries existing mainly by selling natural raw materials. This is a new crisis and the problem will become even more critical.

The scientific breakthroughs have also resulted in the development of new industries and in new concepts of production. These are very highly technical forms of production. These technological advances are most adaptable to the production processes of the industrially developed countries. Thus the scientific breakthroughs have become an important factor in shifting the export of capital from the less developed areas to the industrially developed zones of world capitalism. Together these developments have resulted in a new imperialist squeeze. In many countries the new products have cut back on the use of nature's own raw materials and the new technology moved into the industrially developed countries has cut back on capital expenditures in the underdeveloped areas. This has greatly sharpened the contradictions between imperialism and the oppressed nations and peoples. It has added new difficulties in the ability of the underdeveloped countries to develop their economies and to raise the standard of living.

Imperialism penetrates wherever the profits are highest. It does not necessarily give up its exploitation in other areas. But what is new is that the scientific-technological revolution has brought with it an important shift in the priorities of imperialist capital investment. This shift not only affects the relations between imperial-

ism and the underdeveloped countries, it also affects the relationships between the industrially developed countries.

The leap in U.S. penetration into the very heart of European capitalism is directly traceable to the scientific revolution. The pattern is very clear.

Today U.S. capital in Western Europe controls 80 per cent of the production of electronic computers, 50 per cent of the output of transistors, 15 per cent of radio and TV sets and 95 per cent of the market of integrated circuits. U.S. monopolies dominate the auto industry in Europe. Seventeen of the biggest U.S. industrial corporations own more than two-thirds of the total U.S. investment in West European countries.

In no other country in the world has American business penetrated so deeply into the key sectors of the economy as in Canada. American monopolies hold one half of the total assets of Canada's 400 largest companies. Over 90 per cent of the automobile industry is U.S.-owned; over 80 per cent of the rubber industry; 75 per cent of the chemical; 65 per cent of electrical apparatus. Over 50 per cent of the mining and smelter industry and the petroleum and natural gas industry is American-owned.

During the past 20 months, 500 more Canadian companies have slipped under foreign control, mostly American.

The technological revolution is bringing with it new patterns of penetration in Canada also. The big profits are in the areas where the new technology is both an instrument of penetration and an area of high profits.

The technological breakthrough has also greatly influenced the nature of world capitalist formations. The new technique has facilitated the rise of what Lenin called "super-monopolies." "This is a new stage of world concentration of capital and production incomparably higher than in the preceding stages." Worldwide conglomerates, new worldwide industrial and financial empires are in a new stage of development. The new technology drives industries based on past techniques into the ground. This has become a powerful club forcing capitalist formations into the world conglomerates. These "super-monopolies" pool their efforts and create world areas for their private exploitation. This forces consideration of new tactics and concepts in the struggle against these monster conglomerates.

This development is creating new con-

traditions and new divisions within world capitalism. It has given the process of the uneven development of capitalism a new dimension. The new technology has become a factor in the redistribution of the loot between imperialist countries.

These are important developments affecting the struggle over the question of what path the liberated countries should take — socialist or capitalist.

No matter what aspect of the problem of their relationship to imperialism one studies, the result is the same, the increasing and total bankruptcy of capitalism as a solution to their problems.

The emergence of state-monopoly capitalism, the scientific-technological revolution or the measures of neo-colonialism, are no solutions because they do not resolve the main contradiction that is in-born, inherent within capitalism. What is becoming clear to new millions is that capitalism in its imperialist stage of development has become the main roadblock to human progress.

U.S. imperialism continues to dominate the capitalist world. But it is on the losing end of the law of uneven development. As a result of changes in world reality and the Vietnam war the U.S. finds itself in increasing political isolation throughout the world. In contrast to previous wars, U.S. imperialism has had to bear the brunt of the cost of this one. Today the U.S. share in world capitalist industrial output has dropped from 56 per cent in 1948 to 44 per cent in 1969. U.S. domination of the "club" of 100 super-monopolies of the capitalist world has shrunk from 79 in 1956 to 67 in 1968. The U.S. share of world capitalist exports has fallen from 25 per cent in 1948 to 13 per cent in 1969. Foreign capitalist inroads into the U.S. home market have been growing at a faster rate than U.S. imperialist penetration abroad. In 1948 profit on U.S. investments abroad was 4.8 times foreign profit on investments in the U.S. In 1968 it was down to 2.6 times. Foreign holdings in the U.S. have grown by 55 per

cent over the past five years compared with a 35 per cent growth in U.S. investment overseas.

These are some of the new trends. What must be seen is that each adjustment, each shift creates new contradictions and new weaknesses for imperialism. This is the process of the decay.

The two opposite world processes will continue, each in its own direction and orbit. The contradictions of imperialism will continue to sharpen. Capitalism as a system will continue to decay.

On the other hand, the forces propelling the world revolutionary process are going to grow and mature. The historic transition from capitalism to socialism is unalterable. The world will turn more and more to socialism as the solution to its problems. To the new millions it becomes obvious that imperialism is the main roadblock to human progress, while socialism is the gateway to mankind's greatest leap to a new stage of human social existence. The countries of socialism will continue to build and grow economically, politically, scientifically and militarily.

Peoples in the newly liberated countries and those still under brutal imperialist rule will continue their struggle against all forms of imperialist oppression. The struggles will develop as the inner contradictions in these countries sharpen. The class forces are becoming more differentiated. The working-class forces will become a more decisive factor in the struggle for a socialist path.

The working-class movements in the capitalist countries are continuing to grow and develop. The developments of state-monopoly capitalism will of necessity continue to sharpen the class relationships. The class confrontation will become ever more critical in the capitalist countries.

The world revolutionary process will successfully complete its historic march because it is on the right side of history. They move in the same direction.

That just happens to be an objective truth.

The events of the past decade have laid bare more forcefully than ever the nature of U.S. imperialism as a world exploiter and gendarme, as the sworn enemy of liberation movements. The U.S. monopolies have penetrated the economy of dozens of countries, where they are increasing their capital investments and seeking to gain control of key positions in the economy.

(International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow, 1969)

For a genuine national, anti-imperialist and democratic front

ALI YATA

The emergence of Al-Koutla-Al-Watania, an alliance of the National Popular Forces Union and the Istiqlal Party, is a noteworthy development in Moroccan politics. The new alliance should be seen as a reaction to the July referendum, the new Constitution and the parliamentary elections, and denotes a new political situation that requires close analysis.

Morocco's post-independence policy reveals a steady and clearly expressed retreat from democracy, with the exclusion from political life of the anti-imperialist forces working for social, economic and cultural progress.

Every manifestation of that policy has been sharply criticized by the working-class vanguard. It has also at times come under fire from nationalist organizations but, unfortunately, at crucial junctures they relaxed their criticism and opposition.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CRISIS

Morocco's general crisis is the inevitable sequel to this policy based on rigid conservatism and alliance with neo-colonialism.

Morocco remains a backward agrarian country. In the absence of agrarian reform, material and technical assistance and democratic freedoms, the poor and landless peasants—and they make up the mass of our population—are left to the tender mercies of the feudals and the new landowners. Farm output is not enough to meet even the country's requirements in grain and sugar. Cultivation methods and technology are substantially unchanged. Fertilizers are beyond the reach of the poor

peasants and are hardly applied. The result has been to make Morocco dependent on the United States for grain, supplied on onerous political terms.

The export of citrus fruit, handled by the government export agency, is making little headway and is dependent on the "good will" of its Western partners, with whom the agency cannot effectively bargain. Actually, the agency is a useful institution—it has given us a government monopoly on transit trade—but it is increasingly becoming a pliant tool of the big landed interests.

Industrialization is no longer considered a priority aim and most of the big projects have been abandoned. Mining is not developing and the marketing of phosphates, our main cash product, is encountering mounting difficulties, for here, too, we are faced with American competition.

The balance of trade deficit (now officially estimated at 395.9 million dirhams), soaring living costs and the wage freeze are other indicators of Morocco's economic malaise.

The economic malaise has produced a social crisis. Farm output does not suffice to feed even the rural population. Jobs are scarce and poorly paid, and more and more Moroccans are emigrating to Europe into a life of merciless exploitation. There is increasing prostitution, crime and all the other social concomitants of poverty. This, plus years of misery and the bleak outlook for the future are undermining family life.

Education, too, is in crisis. It is now generally admitted that the government's education policy, based on a cultural agreement with France, has proved an utter

failure. Student unrest, in secondary schools as well as in universities, has been steadily mounting over the past five years, and with good reason. It is no chance accident that more than two million Moroccans in the 21-28 age group were not allowed to vote in the July referendum. Deficiencies in the education system are reacting on the development of culture; the national language is being discredited and we are more and more being isolated from modern Arab culture. Now, 15 years after independence, cultural life is in a state of stagnation. National traditions and national art are not being encouraged—at best they serve as tourist attractions. But the most ruinous effect has been lack of freedom of expression.

POLITICAL CRISIS

Here the crisis is due to the government's opposition to national parties, its attempts to build up pliant pro-government political organizations and the inability of existing political parties to change the situation.

The government has been waging a veritable war against the national movement. It has used different methods at different times and in different situations, but has not been squeamish in employing repression or engineering splits in national organizations. The following facts add up to a very clear picture: prohibition of the Moroccan Communist Party in 1960, arrests in October 1963, prohibition of the *Al Moukafih* newspaper in 1964; prohibition of the Party of Liberation and Socialism in early 1970, after 14 months of legality, and imprisonment of two of its leaders; liquidation of the National Liberation Army and Resistance organizations; dissolution of the Abdallah Ibrahim government, the arrest of many National Popular Forces Union leaders in July 1963; harassment against the Istiqlal Party—its Cabinet members were ousted at the end of 1962 and some of its leaders imprisoned; subversive activity against the Moroccan Labor Union in an attempt to destroy trade-union unity; arrest of union activists and leaders.

But none of these measures, nor all of them in combination, could split the patriotic organizations and political parties.

Attempts to build up pliant pro-government parties were unsuccessful. The Democratic Socialist Party had a short and wretched life. The Constitution Defense Front fell apart before the dissolution of

parliament. Some of these organizations have only a name: from time to time they come out with professions of loyalty to the government, only to recede into obscurity. The bogus pro-government trade unions have fared no better. All this has prompted the government to rely more heavily on "neutrals," but this has only increased its isolation. In short, it cannot dupe the masses, nor oust the national parties from the political arena. On the other hand, however, it has to be said that these parties have been equally unsuccessful in altering the alignment of forces in their favor.

The wide disparity between the people's will for sovereignty and the government's will to retain all its prerogatives has led to a crisis of the power structure.

To moderate mass pressure, contain the national movement and create the semblance of a "modernized" society, a Constitution was imposed in 1962 which for all practical purposes deprived parliament of effective power. The legally functioning parties used it only as a rostrum to appeal to the country. But after the big March 1965 demonstrations, especially the youth actions, an emergency was proclaimed and in June parliament was dissolved. Now, five years later, a new Constitution has been imposed with the obvious purpose of perpetuating the existing order of things. It denies the national parties fair representation in parliament and denies the latter legislative and supervisory powers. In short, the new power structure is little short of absolutism.

These and other facts are indicative of a profound general crisis. And few doubt that it can only lead to disaster. The express purpose of the Al-Koutla-Al-Watania alliance is to prevent it.

CLASS FACTORS

The determining factor in all these political vicissitudes is the alignment of class forces.

The fact is that ever since independence the feudal forces have exerted a dominant influence. Their aim was securely to entrench themselves in power, break out of dependence on the support of the nationalist bourgeoisie and progressive petty bourgeoisie and, more important, at any price prevent a working-class take-over.

The feudals and the new landowners are working hand in glove with neo-colonialism to block much needed reform in agriculture

and industry. They can do this by operating through a corrupt bureaucracy that has no compunction in digging into the national exchequer.

Of course, it is not in the interests of the three—the feudals, the new landowners and the bureaucracy—to cooperate with other social groups, or to change the country's overall policy, which is increasingly impeding national development and adversely affects even the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. It is in this light that one should assess the absolutist bias in the 1970 Constitution, the repressive measures—and threats of more to come—against all opposition forces, and the assiduous cultivation of conservative ideology.

The national forces have drawn useful lessons. This applies especially to the proletarian vanguard, which is guided by scientific socialism, is supremely faithful to the people, rejects opportunism and has drawn many lessons from the Moroccan and international workers' and national-liberation movements.

Its slogans, which provide the answer to the country's problems, are winning increasing support from all progressive-minded Moroccans.

The main slogan is for a broad front of patriotic and freedom forces that will put an end to all the discord, hate and disagreement that has hitherto prevented unity of the National Popular Forces and Istiqlal.

When independence was proclaimed, Istiqlal worked in alliance with the feudal element, underestimating its reactionary nature, and this handicap was inherited by the National Popular Forces Union and a break-away group of Istiqlal. Both parties also underestimated the strength and capability of the mass movement which, in fact, had won the country independence. As was only to be expected, this policy led to harmful compromises and errors in the appraisal of imperialism. One faction disregarded the need to consolidate national independence, while the other disregarded the need to combat neo-colonialism.

Now the two parties are joined in an alliance committed to fight both reaction and imperialism. The third point of their alliance program exposes the "collusion of the feudal elements, imperialism and neo-colonialism against the masses and their national organizations." It is not, therefore, simply a matter of reconciliation, but rather of conscious defense of national interests.

But this has been achieved not without mass pressure. The unity campaign conducted by the proletarian vanguard over the past few years has met with wide response from workers, students and progressive intellectuals. Support for an alliance of all patriotic and progressive forces on a common program of struggle against imperialism and reaction has come from congresses of the National Students Union and political and trade-union leaders.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NEW ALLIANCE

Positive Aspects. First of all, Al-Koutla-Al-Watania has adopted a national-democratic program, in which seven of its 11 points set out the demands for democratic and social progress, and the other four call for anti-imperialist solidarity and unity.

Secondly, Al-Koutla-Al-Watania ended the strife between the two opposition parties. For years, the two parties were chiefly preoccupied with scrimmaging for influence in the various regions. In this setting Istiqlal set up splinter groups among workers and students, now deprived of all legitimate ground.

The Al-Koutla-Al-Watania thus signifies that those who had previously sown dissent and pitted one group against another, have failed. We should note that during the proceedings against the Party of Liberation and Socialism, the political participation in its defense of the two parties served notice that they were turning their backs on sectarianism and had apprehended the danger arising for all quarters. The alliance has resources in abundance to win the people's trust and repel the official propaganda attacks on both parties. What is needed, probably, is that it should spell out the ways of meeting the vital needs of the masses more clearly than this is done in its program.

Thirdly, the alliance was forged not by integration, and the organizations concerned retain their autonomy. In the present circumstances fusion would yield no political or ideological advantages to the Left. Furthermore, the alliance has been declared open for other national organizations, which shows that its proponents know they need the support of other progressive and patriotic forces and are seeking cooperation and union. We can only welcome this attitude, for it helps dispel the pernicious spirit of sectarianism and hegemonism.

These positive factors show that Al-Koutla-Al-Watania is a welcome develop-

ment, holding promise of far-reaching results.

The Flaws. To be sure, the alliance has its flaws, which should not be overlooked.

To begin with, the means of achieving the aims of the program are still to be defined and finalized. It is more important than ever to lean on all the forms of the struggle of the organized masses. The same applies to the youth, whose role is growing steadily. The social demands of the workers, the people in general, should not be neglected.

The alliance would benefit from extending the top-level agreement to the branch organizations; this would help secure the support of the masses.

Besides, although no obstruction has yet been registered (thanks to thorough preparation of the alliance, kept secret until the press conference), all activists must be properly briefed and the public informed about the sense and purpose of the alliance, which responds to the present needs and guarantees the success of joint action.

Lastly, the alliance will not be fully effective until other patriots faithful to the people's cause, those who have fought consistently against imperialism and aspire to truly democratic institutions, participate in it wholeheartedly in some way.

Ideologically, Al - Koutla - Al - Watania, which embraces broad segments of our nation, from the anti-reactionary section of the bourgeoisie to the progressive intelligentsia, represents trends supporting the progressive democratic platform and aspiring to the structural reforms. Certainly, the working people, the nation as a whole, are interested in facilitating these objectives; but we should not forget that passage to a socialist society, wiping out exploitation of man by man, is practicable only under working-class leadership on the basis of scientific socialism. That is the approach through which the representatives of the working class, the bearers of its progressive ideology, will shape their activity. Working-class participation in Al-Koutla-Al-Watania is not only desirable but essential, now and in the future, in order to build up a genuinely militant front that could rally the people. It is unwise, even highly damaging, therefore, to accentuate ideological differences or considerations.

Politically, the proletarian vanguard has a comprehensive program that responds to the vital national demands and opens up the socialist perspective.

Joining the alliance, the working-class vanguard is seeking to blend its own ex-

perience with that of its other participants, and to do its share in promoting the Charter and, given autonomy and democracy, in carrying forward the jointly projected program.

Do the founders of Koutla understand this? Do they know that this would stimulate mass activity, advance the struggle, strengthen the revolutionary trend and speed structural change? Are they prepared to stand their ground against all the intimidation and anti-communism emanating from foreign, as well as local reactionary sources?

The Prospects. In substance, this implies the inclusion in the alliance of the political and ideological vanguard of the working class, which has a fairly strong influence in the country and has incontestably won prestige.

The initiators, too, have expressed the wish—and with good reasons of their own—that the working class should join them, since that would serve the interests of the united front. That accords with the aspirations of all progressives. As things stand now, the mistakes can be rectified and the situation improved if the alliance survives and becomes stronger, blending with the masses and keeping abreast of the realities.

The reactionaries, never loath to exploit opportunism, hoped that the constitutional referendum and the elections would catch the national movement unawares, would split it, precipitating one faction into their own camp and consigning the other to purely passive opposition. Instead, Al-Koutla-Al-Watania reacted vigorously, with the opposition becoming the center of attention. The authorities wanted to prove their absolute pre-eminence, but betrayed their intrinsic weaknesses and showed their social basis to be narrow.

The alliance offers new opportunities, because in the present set-up it paves the way to democracy and final national liberation. That our standpoint was correct and our analysis lucid, has been fully borne out. We were right in persevering in our struggle against sectarianism, working against isolation and striving to maintain the highest degree of activity as the vanguard of the working people and bearers of their ideology.

PRINCIPLES AND EXPERIENCE

The correctness and insight of our standpoint derive from the scientific nature of our teaching.

The analyses that we have put before the public since the day of independence, reveal the main contradiction to be that between imperialism and neo-colonialism, the feudal elements and reaction, on the one hand, and the nation as a whole, on the other. All classes and strata, except the feudal forces and some reactionary elements, have a stake in proceeding to the second stage of the national-democratic revolution—a stage dominated, as before, by the main contradiction between foreign colonialism and all social classes at home, exclusive of the feudal and certain other reactionary elements. This does not mean to say that contradictions do not exist between the afore-mentioned social classes; these do exist and keep surfacing occasionally, but they are still, and should remain, secondary, not to impede the natural advance to universal liberation.

Alliance of all the anti-imperialist classes is essential if these contradictions are to be resolved. That is borne out by national experience and by that of the world revolutionary movement. Neither Istiqlal nor the National Popular Forces Union, which had hoped to seize power alone, have succeeded. The only way to succeed is by concerted effort. But the alliance must be complete. As we have said time and again, there can be no question of obstructing any one of the classes in playing its role, depending on its possibilities and resources. On no account can we accept the view of those who regard the national-democratic revolution as the exclusive business of their own class or organization, writing off the others.

So far, the aims and resources of Al-Koutla-Al-Watania are limited. Its flaws are of a distinct class character. It is an alliance in which the proletariat as such is not represented, and it is one of our objectives to help remove that serious deficiency.

In the national front the working class should occupy its proper place as the most revolutionary of all classes (which it has proved to be in the struggle for independence), and not only because it has a stake in the projected changes, not only because it will fight more tenaciously than others, but specifically because it should by the nature of things head that front in order to accelerate our country's passage to the third stage of the national-democratic revolution, carrying through the socialist revolution and safeguarding our sound national traditions.

International experience shows that:

1) any front erected against or without

the working class, against or without its political organizations and trade unions, cannot aspire to genuinely progressive gains;

2) a front formed with the working class but headed by the big or petty bourgeoisie, may play a positive role but is sure ultimately to disintegrate under the impact of intrinsic contradictions;

3) only a front led by the working class, embracing other social strata, can reach the end goal and secure complete national and social liberation.

FOR A GENUINE NATIONAL, DEMOCRATIC AND ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT

Our standpoint concerning the alliance of the national anti-imperialist and democratic forces was not forged overnight. Neither is it seen as an episode on the way to a definite objective. True, we called for alliance in the name of concrete and limited objectives. But we saw them as stages in the unfolding of the alliance, each encompassing broader spheres of operation.

For us alliance is the best way of utilizing the revolutionary opportunities, the best way of mobilizing the people—the urban proletariat, the poor and landless peasants, and the consistently progressive segment of the intelligentsia. These forces, the most revolutionary of all, should be not merely part of the national anti-imperialist front, but its backbone.

We have always held that the political and ideological representatives of the most revolutionary strata should be the mainstay of unity. That is why we have called for a Left coalition, addressing the Moroccan Labor Union, the workers' trade union center, on the one hand, and the National Popular Forces Union, also representing an important segment of the urban population and the progressive intelligentsia, on the other.

This coalition should respect the autonomy of the parties, with the purpose, in the initial stage, of consolidating itself from below by joint action and struggle. The next stage—and the end goal of the coalition—would be to constitute a united revolutionary party, the membership of which would be drawn from the above revolutionary strata and which would accept their ideology and methods—the theory of scientific socialism, the organizational principle of democratic centralism, aspiring to a socialist society and developing our progres-

sive spiritual and moral values, the positive contribution of our Arab-Islamic civilization.

This Left coalition will then *join other patriotic forces* in the framework of a broad national anti-imperialist and anti-feudal front with a jointly-framed, democratically evolved program with mass approval.

Since other patriotic forces will never be more than auxiliary—rather than decisive—the understanding with them would be based on the public interest, which, evidently, does not rule out honorably acceptable concessions.

The general circumstances underlying our standpoint have not changed. A Left alliance is as sorely needed as ever. And no less relevant is mass support.

In sum, while maintaining our vigilance and principles, proceeding from a serious and profound analysis of the situation as a whole and of the recent events in particular, we must define our answer to Al-Koutla-Al-Watania. Any categorical and final answer drawn emotionally and in contravention of the concrete analysis, should be avoided at all costs. It would be sectarian folly to maintain that Al-Koutla-Al-Watania, since formed without us, is merely a two faction alliance temporarily concluded by the national bourgeoisie and that it should therefore be ignored.

Neither should we opportunistically maintain that our fondest project is at last materializing, that the national movement is moving towards unity, that the Moroccan bourgeoisie will perform a democratic revolution and we, trailing in its wake, will support it unconditionally.

We must work out our own attitude, based on our principles, and our direct and indirect experience in the context of a clearly defined strategy, taking account of all the arising opportunities. Though it is not

the kind of alliance we have worked for over the years, Al-Koutla-Al-Watania is the next best thing and may prove a highly important element in forging that alliance. That is why we must play our part in order that this alliance should finally materialize.

We have acclaimed the initiative, we have given it our political support, and we must help the alliance achieve the objectives set out in its program. As long as that orientation prevails, the way to a genuine national alliance is open.

Consequently, we must steer clear of passivity and, just as we have rejected sectarianism, also reject purely passive accession. Our joining the alliance will be as active as we wish it to be. What we want is to help mobilize the masses, organize the popular struggle, help Al-Koutla-Al-Watania grow. Our joining the alliance should imply respect for the independence of all its participants, and a mutually critical, constructive, fraternal spirit. It will not cause us to abandon the vanguard role of the working class, the poor peasants and the revolutionary intelligentsia; on the contrary, it should accentuate that role in the struggle for the working people's interest, stimulating the national movement with progressive ideals.

The constitution of Al-Koutla-Al-Watania at a most responsible junction in our national life, has given hope and satisfaction to all patriots and progressives, who regard it as a means of blocking general degradation, securing the country's regeneration, progress and prosperity.

This hope should not be in vain. The alliance must attain its objectives and perform its mission.

Not only do we sincerely and ardently wish this to come true, but are firmly determined to help it come true.

The Guatemalan revolution and Lenin's ideas

HUBERTO ALVARADO

The first attempt to form a Communist party in Guatemala was made in Lenin's lifetime, in 1921. Due to an unfavorable situation at home, specifically the immaturity of the working class, the Communist Party, still weak, was routed in the late twenties and its founders killed or jailed. It was only years later that the working class reappeared on the political scene and it became possible to found a Communist party. This was a result of increasing contradictions in Guatemalan society, the bourgeois-democratic revolution which began in October 1944 and the defeat of fascism in World War II.

The original purpose of labor organizations was economic struggle. Subsequently growing class conflicts and other factors necessitated organization for political objectives. The working class turned from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself," as Marx put it.

The Guatemalan Communist organization came into being on September 28, 1949, at a time when the finest spokesmen of the workers and intellectuals had assimilated the main tenets of Lenin's theory of the party.

The Guatemalan Party of Labor has since gained considerable experience in organizing work at various stages of the revolution. It was semi-legal at first. Then, in the brief period when the revolutionary government under Jacobo Arbenz was in power, the Party operated on a legal footing. Forced underground by the U.S. intervention in June 1954, it began to fight the dictatorship. In March and April 1962 the Communists organized mass actions that developed into an armed struggle.

Our Party has gone through many experiences — a difficult beginning with a few branch organizations, rapid growth during the revolutionary upsurge, a painful return to illegality. It has had to deal with the problems of armed struggle and those of fighting splitters and liquidators.

We have always seen it as our task to apply Lenin's theory of party building correctly, to implement its principles—democratic centralism, collective leadership and the obligation of every Party member to belong to one of its organizations. We devised organizational methods according to the distinctive conditions of our struggle. Hard-gained experience showed us that to oppose these fundamental principles means endangering the very existence of the Party as the vanguard of the working class. It also revealed that the organizational principles making the Party a dependable weapon of the proletariat in the fight for political power enable it to make flexible use of diverse forms of struggle ranging from legal activity to the organization of armed struggle in illegal conditions.

SCIENTIFIC AND CREATIVE APPROACH

"We do not regard Marx's theory," Lenin said, "as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think that an *independent* elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for this theory provides only general *guiding* principles, which, in *particular*, are applied

in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 211-212).

A profoundly creative and scientific approach to Marxism helped Lenin to carry it forward in accordance with the new tasks. This was particularly true of problems of the revolution, Party building, imperialism, philosophy in the light of the latest scientific discoveries, and the principles of building socialism. To accomplish these tasks Lenin had to fight against those who tried to reduce Marxism to a set of dogmatic formulas and distorted the scientific character of dialectical and historical materialism.

In the early years, our Party's inadequate knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and national reality led to strategic and tactical mistakes. Due to shortcomings in theoretical work, we were slow in drawing proper conclusions from the historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. However, the new tasks posed by the revolutionary movement in Guatemala and by the situation in the world Communist movement after 1960 prompted us to give greater attention to theoretical work by studying Marxism-Leninism more carefully and by applying it more strictly as a scientific method of interpreting Guatemalan reality.

Experience brought it home to us that conservative, Right-opportunist, Leftist and adventurist trends in a party result from an inadequate ideological training of cadres and from a dogmatic study of Marxism-Leninism. There can be no real knowledge of Marxism-Leninism if it is approached scholastically, rather than creatively. It is no easy task to comply with Lenin's demand that Marxist theory be applied with due regard to reality in the country concerned. There are numerous pitfalls on this road. The experience of the socialist system and the world Communist movement indicates, however, that the only correct road is the one which Marx and Engels took and along which Lenin continued.

The prime duty of Guatemala's Communists is to contribute to Marxism-Leninism by providing a theoretical generalization of their practical experience. At one time our interpretation of Marxism was somewhat mechanical. We occasionally drew on the enormous experience of the international Communist movement as a model and indiscriminately transplanted various characteristics of it on to our soil, disregarding the distinctive aspects of Guatemalan reality.

Nevertheless, the more than twenty years' experience of our Party shows that we have been following the right path. On the other hand, we are continuing our quest in many fields, assessing and generalizing our experience so as to chart our own revolutionary road on the principle of interconnection between theory and practice.

STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Lenin was a brilliant strategist and tactician of the revolution. His statements on the science and art of political leadership are universally valid and their scientific accuracy makes them a source of knowledge. Lenin made a notable contribution to Marxism by his scientific theory of the revolution taking into account the great complexity of historical processes. "There are no miracles in nature or history," Lenin said, "but every abrupt turn in history, and this applies to every revolution, presents such a wealth of content, unfolds such unexpected and specific combinations of forms of struggle and alignment of forces of the contestants, that to the lay mind there is much that must appear miraculous" (Vol. 23, p. 297).

Strategy and tactics are inseparable. Strategic or tactical mistakes may greatly injure the cause of the revolution and lead to failure. A rich and distinctive reality will reveal any discrepancy between a strategic pattern and its tactical application. Our Party's experience during the 1954 intervention by the USA and in the pre-insurrection days of March and April 1962, as well as some early stages of the armed struggle in Guatemala, fully brought out our general and particular miscalculations in tactics, which should have been in line with our potentialities and organizational skill and with the thoughts and sentiments of the people. To be sure, this situation was due to many causes but its main cause was our insufficient tactics arising from an inadequate elaboration of strategy and, as the Fourth Party Congress pointed out in December 1969, from the low ideological standard of the membership, a poor knowledge of dialectical and historical materialism and national reality, and the fact that the Party's links with the masses were feeble.

THE REVOLUTION IS ONE PROCESS

The Fourth Congress reaffirmed the Party's concept of the Guatemalan revolution

as one process consisting of two closely linked stages. The first stage is the agrarian, anti-imperialist revolution of the people and the second, the socialist revolution. The main object, the socialist revolution, is a topic being discussed among the revolutionary forces advocating armed struggle in Guatemala. It is also the main issue in the fight against Leftist and Rightist deviations. In 1964 "Left"-wingers, especially the Trotskyists, insisted on an immediate socialist revolution and even tried to specify the time it would take to accomplish (two years). Other adventurist groups also took a stand for an early revolution. These groups proceed from false premises. They discount the urban middle strata, ignore the working class and overestimate the peasants. They disregard the mass struggle in its entirety and the actual level of the country's productive forces.

The Rightists show a tendency towards reformism and a certain fear of revolutionary action. They hope that "strategically" the national bourgeoisie may constitute a revolutionary force. As we see it, the national bourgeoisie is renouncing struggle ever more emphatically, ceding the administration of public affairs to frankly reactionary, pro-imperialist forces because it dreads revolution. We are keeping careful track of the drift of contradictions among the national bourgeoisie, which finds itself in political crisis more and more often and has to wrestle with growing economic difficulties. We realize that, given definite conditions, it may assume an anti-imperialist stance or, in any case, take this or that action against imperialism in its own interests. Our task is to reveal these possibilities and use them for the benefit of the revolution. Strategically, however, we do not regard participation of the national bourgeoisie as a *sine qua non* of the revolutionary process.

The leftists overrate the revolutionary potentialities of the peasants, whom they consider the vanguard of the revolution. They do so because the peasants in our country constitute the largest and hardest hit segment of the population and live in areas where an armed struggle can be launched. Our Party is aware of the peasants' revolutionary potentialities and even believes that they may become the main force of the revolution. However, we dissociate from neo-Narodnik petty-bourgeois idealization of the peasantry and refuse to regard it as the vanguard of the revolution. The strategic goal of our revolution goes beyond the struggle against feudalism.

Hence, for economic, political, social and ideological reasons, it is only the working class that can and should play the leading role in the revolution. On the other hand, our Party does not, unlike the ultra-Leftists, mistake the agricultural workers (rural proletariat) for the majority of the peasantry (rural petty bourgeoisie).

It is also important to note that certain ethnic characteristics of our country have given rise to would-be new ideas about the role of the Indian peasants as a revolutionary race. This is an attempt to substitute interracial strife for the class struggle. Our Fourth Congress stressed that the Indian population is involved in the revolutionary process but the criterion of its involvement is "its class situation and its condition as an exploited group; however, account should be taken of the particular forms in which its social consciousness expresses itself."

Lenin pointed to the interrelation between the bourgeois-democratic and the proletarian, socialist revolution. "The first develops into the second," he said, "the second, in passing, solves the problems of the first. The second consolidates the work of the first. Struggle, and struggle alone, decides how far the second succeeds in outgrowing the first" (Vol. 33, p. 54).

The popular character of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution is accentuated in our time. It tends to develop rapidly into a socialist revolution provided the Communist Party and the working class as a whole—the working class of town and country in our case—are equal to the leading role.

The interrelation of democratic and socialist tasks in the process of the agrarian, anti-imperialist and popular revolution growing into a socialist revolution is particularly marked today. This entitles us to speak of the revolution as one process consisting of two stages. The prospect of carrying out the socialist revolution today stands out more clearly than ever before.

WORKER-PEASANT ALLIANCE

The actual establishment of an alliance of the workers and peasants and the forms of the alliance depend on the economic, political and social evolution of the country concerned and on its distinctive historical traditions. Our Party has gained some experience of this in diverse conditions of struggle. Under the Arbenz government it played the decisive role in de-

veloping large trade-union and peasant organizations: the General Confederation of Working People of Guatemala, which united hundreds of thousands of industrial and agricultural workers and non-manual employees in the public and private sectors, and the National Peasant Confederation of Guatemala, which united over 250,000 poor and middle peasants. It was a period of high activity by the masses in legal conditions, when the Party succeeded in organizing them and guiding their struggle for an agrarian reform, for a minimum wage in town and country, and in mobilizing the working class for firm and consistent defense of both the economic and political interests of the peasants. The experience of that period indicated that under a democratic regime, with the mass struggle on the rise, one of the main forms of the worker-peasant alliance in our country was the trade-union and peasant movement organized under the Party's leadership.

Now that we are operating in entirely different conditions, we are gaining new experience. Our reaction to growing repression is armed struggle and we mean to continue it. The trade union movement is divided today and it is only the unions influenced by the reactionaries that are operating freely. The only consistently proletarian trade union federation is continually hit by repressive measures. The organized peasant movement has been greatly weakened by persecution and is virtually outlawed.

Guatemalan reality shows that a most effective form of establishing a worker-peasant alliance today is large-scale political and military organization of the masses in illegal conditions providing for the use of diverse forms of economic, political and armed struggle to achieve immediate objectives and win political power for the workers and peasants.

This important problem is particularly hard to solve where the Communist party is illegal. The peasant masses give in readily to the ideology of the bourgeoisie and landowners, and the party of the working class has much greater difficulty in influencing them. In our country a special role falls to the agricultural proletariat, a natural component of the worker-peasant alliance. Its class position and level of class consciousness bring it close to the urban workers. Socially it is close to the semi-proletarian section of the peasantry.

REVOLUTION THROUGH ARMED STRUGGLE

For twelve years, 1949-1961, our Party envisioned a peaceful revolution. However, the Third Party Congress came to the conclusion that the Guatemalan revolution might have to be carried out through armed struggle. This conclusion was prompted by an analysis of the economic, social and political situation in the country which the Congress made, taking account of the defeat of the revolutionary movement in 1954, the brutal repressive measures adopted by the ruling classes in an effort to retain their power at all costs, the growing militancy of advanced workers, peasants, students and intellectuals influenced by the Cuban revolution, a sharpening socio-economic crisis and the country's increased political instability. In May 1961 the Central Committee reaffirmed its decision as being in accordance with conditions at home. Lenin wrote: "The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with *this* and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of the *entire* theory of Marx and Engels" (Vol. 25, p. 400). Discussion in the Party revealed that we had not always kept Lenin's advice in mind. A general idea of the nature of the discussion may be given by quoting a passage from Lenin's *"Left"-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder*. "Right doctrinairism," Lenin wrote, "persisted in recognizing only the old forms, and became utterly bankrupt, for it did not notice the new content. Left doctrinairism persists in the unconditional repudiation of certain old forms, failing to see that the new content is forcing its way through all and sundry forms, that it is our duty as Communists to master all forms, to learn how, with the maximum rapidity, to supplement one form with another, to substitute one for another, and to adapt our tactics to any such change that does not come from our class or from our efforts" (Vol. 31, pp. 103-104). Indeed, our Party of late has had to combat Right-wing, conservative trends as well as Leftist adventurist ones.

As early as 1961, the Party's Central Committee demonstrated the need to accomplish the Guatemalan revolution through armed struggle. However, the very first steps in this direction showed that the Party was unprepared for armed action because it had yet to master the science and art of war. The Fourth Congress pointed out that conservatives in the Party had

frustrated the theoretical and practical preparation of armed action. This is why the effort to implement the new line caused a certain disarray in our ranks. "Every military action in any war to a certain extent disorganizes the ranks of the fighters," Lenin wrote. "But this does not mean that one must not fight. It means that one *must* learn to fight. That is all" (Vol. 11, p. 220).

The main conclusion to be drawn from this is only too clear — we must learn to fight. A Marxist must champion class struggle and not social peace. Lenin wrote that "an oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves" (Vol. 23, p. 80). We never forget this.

Our Party learned that lesson at the price of losing some of its best leaders, cadre members and activists, at the price of making bad mistakes and going back to the starting point again and again. Our struggle for a bright future has its ups and downs and goes through retreat and offensive as it follows its unexplored path. We strive to apply the Marxist-Leninist principle of using the most diverse methods and forms of struggle depending on the situation in the country concerned. The point is not to invent new forms or methods but to generalize those developing in the course of the revolutionary movement, to impart an organized and conscious character to them.

We are now passing through a particularly trying period, although last year we overcame a crisis in the Party. The Fourth Congress decided on the Party's general line. This year the Party has been active in economic, political and armed struggle, trying to make its strategy and tactics more effective, to win over the masses and to bring them into the people's revolutionary war.

The Party sees to it that Lenin's recommendations on strategy and tactics are studied and followed. It is doing its utmost not to stray from the right course, especially today, when it has chosen the armed struggle and when the enemy is able to hit us because the alignment of forces is still unfavorable to the revolution. True to Lenin's advice, we did not panic in fighting against various deviations. We calmly and firmly retreated just as far as was necessary to prepare new revolutionary offensives.

CRITERION OF GENUINE REVOLUTIONISM

The relationship between revolutionary and reformist activity has always posed a big problem in our country and given rise to widespread controversy. This problem is particularly acute now that we are fighting Right-wing and Leftist trends. The pseudo-revolutionary, adventurist, demagogic and provocative phrasemongering of the ultra-Leftists and Trotskyists began to gain ground in our country in 1964. It is used to some extent by the advocates of the muddled ideology of impoverished sections of the petty bourgeoisie, which sometimes links up with the lumpen-proletariat. It misrepresents the actual relationship between revolutionary action and social reform.

Nor must we forget that the bourgeoisie and the more affluent groups of the petty bourgeoisie are out to dampen the militancy of certain segments of the working class and middle peasantry through limited reforms meeting some material needs and occasionally inducing political neutrality in a section of the population. Without proper theoretical clarity it is hard to defeat conservative and Leftist trends whose adherents fail to grasp the dialectical relationship between revolutionary and reformist activity and extol one to the detriment of the other.

We know we must not substitute mere enthusiasm for an analysis of reality nor forget what Lenin said about true revolutionary Marxists in 1921: "The greatest, perhaps the only danger to the genuine revolutionary is that of exaggerated revolutionism, ignoring the limits and conditions in which revolutionary methods are appropriate and can be successfully employed. True revolutionaries have mostly come a cropper when they began to write 'revolution' with a capital R, to elevate 'revolution' to something almost divine, to lose their heads, to lose the ability to reflect, weigh and ascertain in the coolest and most dispassionate manner at what moment, under what circumstances and in which sphere of action you must act in a revolutionary manner, and at what moment, under what circumstances and in which sphere you must turn to reformist action. True revolutionaries will perish (not that they will be defeated from outside, but that their work will suffer internal collapse) . . . if they abandon their sober outlook and take it into their heads that the 'great, victorious, world' revolution

can and must solve all problems in a revolutionary manner under all circumstances and in all spheres of action" (Vol. 33, pp. 110-111).

The impact of Lenin's legacy on the activity of our Party is tremendous and will lead us to many more conclusions in the future. What makes us confident is the achievements of the socialist community, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement. Difficulties, differences and reverses should strengthen our resolve to fight on unrelentingly, for, to quote Lenin, those who want to defeat capitalism "must have the perseverance to try hundreds and

thousands of new methods, means and weapons of struggle in order to elaborate the most suitable of them" (Vol. 29, p. 426).

Marxist-Leninist science has announced a new era in man's history. Lenin brilliantly carried forward Marx's and Engels' cause. He made a decisive contribution to their theory and to its translation into a historic reality. All Communists must continue this effort if Marx's prophecy about transforming the world is to come true. We Guatemalan Communists, for our part, reaffirm the resolve to fight for the revolution and socialism expressed by our Central Committee.

NOTE

Effective beginning with its January 1971 issue subscription rates for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW will be increased to \$5.00 a year, and 50 cents a copy.

New stage in the People's Progressive Party

CHEDDI JAGAN

The 16th Congress of the People's Progressive Party of Guyana held on September 5-6, 1970, was the first to be concluded since the Special Conference in August 1969 decided that the Party should be restructured and reorganized on Marxist-Leninist principles and that its Congress should be held biennially instead of annually.

Fulfilling a Conference decision, the Congress elected a collective leadership of 32 members for its General Council in place of seven officers and 15 other members.

*The People's Progressive Party of Guyana was founded in 1950, formed by the Political Action Committee established in 1946 by a group of patriots headed by Cheddi Jagan. The new Party mounted a determined struggle against the British colonial authorities for the country's independence, a higher living standard and democratic rights.

The PPP is the most numerous of the country's seven political parties, its political line being highly popular. The Party leans on the working class and farmers, and has the support of progressive intellectuals and some sections of the petty bourgeoisie.

The PPP won elections to the legislative body on three occasions (1953, 1957 and 1961); its leader, Cheddi Jagan, was Prime Minister. At the country's helm for a total of eight years, the PPP carried out a set of important measures raising the people's standard of living, distributing large tracts of idle land among peasants, pushing up exports and extending the system of elementary schools and hospitals.

Between 1957 and 1964, when, as Cheddi Jagan put it, the Party was in office but not in power, the imperialists, through CIA subversion and corruption and mass media incitement, caused sections of the working people to strike and riot against their own interests. In 1964, as a result of concerted efforts by home reactionaries and foreign imperialists, a government formed by the People's National Congress (PNC) came to power in Guyana. Since then, the People's Progressive Party has been in the opposition, fighting for an end to imperialist domination in the country's economy and politics.

The Congress is the Party's supreme body. Its publication is a weekly newspaper, *Thunder*.

The General Council elected from its members its General Secretary, eight other secretaries and an Executive Council of 12.

The 16th Congress made a significant departure. Previously, the highlight of the Congress was the speech of the Leader of the Party. On this occasion, the General Council prepared and approved a Report which was then circulated to all the party groups for discussion prior to the Congress.

The Report made a concrete analysis of the situation inside Guyana against the background of the realities of international life. The Report stressed the necessity in the anti-imperialist struggle of the three revolutionary streams moving closer together for concerted action.

After setting out gains against certain setbacks in the worldwide struggle, the Report, concluding the section on the international situation, stated:

"The PPP sees the necessity for the greatest unity of all the revolutionary, anti-imperialist forces. We believe in the power of international working-class solidarity, and will strive to develop in the Guyanese working masses the spirit of proletarian internationalism, which is vital to the success of Guyana's struggle for economic independence and socialism. We do not uphold policies of national separation or exclusiveness which only help imperialism to weaken the liberation movement and retain its domination."

The People's National Congress (PNC) regime has not only bartered away our national sovereignty. By a series of acts,

it is also denying the rights of the Guyanese people and perpetuating itself in power by force and fraud. Realizing that increasing numbers and strata of people are becoming opposed to the government, the Congress urged the General Council of the PPP to explore all possibilities and to utilize all means to unite all the opposition forces in a broad-based anti-imperialist alliance for democracy and national liberation.

Guyana's neo-colonial status under the regime of the People's National Congress is pinpointed by its domestic and foreign policies, its military agreement with the USA and its commitment to the West in the spheres of trade and aid, scientific and cultural contacts. Its economic policy is bankrupting the country.

Economic development has been more apparent than real. Industry is at a standstill and agriculture is in decline. The much-touted G\$300 million seven-year (1966-1972) Development Plan ground to a halt and collapsed.

Huge foreign debts have accumulated. Deficit financing, increasing annual debt charges and a growing civil and military machine have led to increasing taxation. This, coupled with mismanagement, corruption, squandermania, jobs-for-the-boys, bribery and nepotism, imposes a heavy burden on wide sections of the people, but mostly on the workers, farmers and the unemployed.

The imperialists, being forced to concede nominal independence, have installed a new native (local-born) puppet elite. With every passing day the PNC government demonstrates its subservience to U.S. imperialism.

The main sectors of the economy are still in foreign hands, and no genuine efforts are being made to change this. A government bent on achieving economic independence would give this matter top priority. Only lip service is paid to economic independence. In reality, we are sinking deeper into dependence.

But instead of change, the PNC government was dishing out new gimmicks such as "cooperative republic" and "meaningful participation," the objective being that through such propaganda techniques the regime could hold out some hope to those who wanted to believe in the People's National Congress even though they could see and feel that things were getting worse.

Condemning the reformist approach of the government, the Report called for

revolutionary change to end imperialist domination of Guyana's economy and politics. "To eradicate poverty and end injustice," it said, "requires a fully integrated, all-embracing program—not a social welfare approach—led and participated in by the people involved."

It proposed, and Congress unanimously approved, a program embracing:

(a) Nationalization of the commanding heights of the economy—foreign and local "compradore" capitalist-owned and-controlled factories, mines, plantations, banks, insurance companies, and foreign trade.

(b) Strict system of foreign-exchange control.

(c) Emphasis on simultaneous industrial and agricultural development, mainly in the public and cooperative sectors.

(d) Effective rent and price controls.

(e) Land reform.

(f) Trade with countries in both East and West.

(g) Full democracy and workers' participation and control at all levels.

Discussing the role of the Party in the past and the future, the Report observed:

"The PPP has served the Guyanese people well. It played the leading role in the struggle for independence. It awakened the masses to the need for radical changes and to the possibility of such changes. It brought political awareness to the people and gave a sense of purpose in the political struggle. It has always championed the cause of the workers and farmers from whom it has drawn strength, and earned the people's confidence.

"Today, the party is called upon to bear even greater responsibility and to give more effective leadership to the masses in the struggle for democracy, national liberation, and socialism.

"The party is the key to the development of the mass movement against imperialism and its puppets today and for a bright socialist future tomorrow. There can be no guarantee of a people's victory without the vanguard role—organizationally, ideologically, politically—of the party . . .

"The loose, mass party has served its purpose. It grew up in the historical conditions of the time mainly as an electioneering party. The conditions of the struggle today and in the future demand a more effective vanguard such as can be provided only by a Marxist-Leninist party.

"The main elements of such a party are made up of Marxist-Leninist ideology, democratic centralism in party life and work,

an experienced body of cadres closely linked with the people and their struggle."

The Report noted that the tasks facing the party are not easy since we were not starting from scratch to form a Marxist party and we had the heritage and burdens of old methods of work, of diverse outlooks to contend with. Emphasizing that the scientific, revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism is acknowledged as the guiding ideology of the party, it called for the fullest use in the face of the sharpening class struggle, nationally and internationally, of the ideological struggle to defeat bourgeois ideology.

The resolution on Foreign Affairs:

(a) called for the recognition by all states of the German Democratic Republic; the seating of the People's Republic of China and the expulsion of Taiwan from the United Nations; the unity of Caribbean leaders in eradicating the vestiges of colonialism and the threat of neo-colonialism in the region; the government of Guyana to establish diplomatic relations with all socialist countries and pursue a genuine and meaningful policy of non-alignment;

(b) condemned the continued presence of American forces in Southeast Asia; U.S. aggression in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia; continued U.S. military and economic support for Israel and her aggression against the Arab people;

(c) expressed solidarity with and support for the national liberation movement in Southern Africa; the Cuban Revolution;

achievements in Libya, Sudan, Tanzania, Congo (Brazzaville), Ceylon, Peru and Chile; the movement for the realization of Black dignity in America; and the popular movement in Trinidad and Tobago.

A resolution not to contest the remaining local government elections was also passed by Congress. This evinced the greatest interest because of the extensive fraud in the recently-concluded local government elections, surpassing that of the 1968 general election.

In the discussion on the Report on this question, it was pointed out that the delegates "must take a stand against electoral fraud. As the people's dissatisfaction increases, the PNC government will resort to more and more fraud. What we have witnessed recently is not an election, but a selection and allocation of seats by the PNC government." To continue contesting the municipal and district elections "is only to give to the PNC the excuse to pretend that Guyana is a parliamentary democracy where fundamental rights, including the right to vote, are respected. The PNC regime has clearly blocked the path to peaceful change. More and more it is relying on violence."

The Congress ended on a high note of unity and determination—unity in the face of opponents and detractors who were sowing seeds of dissension and predicting splits, and determination to continue resolutely the struggle for national liberation and socialism.

Great victory for Lebanese communists

GEORGES BATAL

The official legalization of the Lebanese Communist Party, Comrade Nicolas Shaoui, its General Secretary, said in an interview with the *Al-Akhbar* weekly, is, essentially, a recognition of realities. In its forty-six years it has never fenced itself off from the national or class struggle, in which it suf-

fered many casualties, among them Comrade Farajallah Helou, one of its outstanding leaders.

Founded when Lebanon was a French mandate territory, the Party played a consistent and active part in the national liberation movement and the popular struggle

to end the mandate and the occupation—a struggle that led to political independence and the evacuation of foreign troops after World War II.

The formation of the Communist Party is associated with the growth of the working class, the development of its class consciousness, and the organization of trade unions. From its inception it has been the only political force speaking for the interests of the laboring classes. It led the struggle for their demands and was largely responsible for the growth of the trade union movement. After independence, the Party has continued its work in the new conditions, gradually emerging as a national political force to be reckoned with.

Periods of illegality alternated with legal activity, police terror with relative calm. But the Party learned to combine illegal forms of work with legal, always in the forefront of the struggle, upholding the independence and interests of the working class and people in the face of imperialism, reaction and Zionism.

The Party was able to function legally on several previous occasions, but these were due mainly to external, international factors. The first prolonged spell of legality followed the victory of the Popular Front in France; the next resulted from the Soviet Army's victories. Now, however, legalization is primarily due to domestic and inter-Arabic factors, and moreover, has been reinforced by legislative act.

To appreciate the significance of this victory, one must look back a year or two at the objective and subjective factors that made complete legalization and its legislative recognition an unavoidable necessity.

The principal contributing domestic factor was the growing economic, social and political crisis of the ruling financial oligarchy. It clearly showed the working class and the people the correctness of our Party's earlier assessments and the need for a national-democratic regime. As the crisis developed, popular resistance mounted, together with the influence of our Party and other progressive forces. This found expression in major strikes and successful Communist efforts within the trade unions to promote working-class unity. For the first time in the country's history the strike movement involved civil servants: engineers, teachers, post office, state security personnel, etc. The economic position continued to deteriorate, and this was reflected in the financial sphere, the mainstay of Lebanon's economy. Several banks were

insolvent, deposits dwindled, crediting and other financial operations were hamstrung.

The political crisis of the financial oligarchy regime was most vividly exemplified by the 1969 government crisis which lasted seven months and paralyzed the work of the legislative branch. This was coupled with aggravation of differences between representatives of the financial oligarchy within and outside the administration, which facilitated the activities of the democratic forces by creating an atmosphere of greater freedom and democracy.

The main inter-Arab factor contributing to the Party's legalization was the June 1967 war unleashed by Israel, and its consequences: the upsurge of popular opposition to imperialism, Zionism and reaction and the masses' turn to the Left. The realization was growing that the petty bourgeoisie were incapable of leading the liberation movement or achieving its basic aims, and people came to see the limitations of bourgeois political programs. All this produced a swing in favor of firmer, more decisive leadership and more radical and balanced political programs. The conditions gradually matured for the working class and its Party to play a bigger part in the Arab national liberation movement.

The influence of the inter-Arab factor on political life was additionally augmented by the growth of the Palestine resistance movement in Lebanon. Its alliance with the Communist Party and other progressive popular forces and parties helped to tilt the political balance in favor of the popular movement, consolidate democratic freedoms and curtail the activity of the reactionary forces.

The main international factor was the growing role of the Soviet Union in the area, a role recognized by all anti-imperialist forces. It also decisively contributed to the consolidation and extension of the Arab national liberation movement and the progressive Arab regimes. Popular appreciation of the Soviet Union's role helped strengthen the democratic movement in Lebanon.

Under pressure from these domestic and external factors, the regime was forced to make concessions to moderate the more acute contradictions in its relations with the popular movement, the progressive Arab states and the Palestine resistance movement, and thus find a way out of the government crisis. The appointment of Kamal Joumlatt, chairman of the Progressive Socialist Party, as Minister of the Interior removed the obstacles to broad

activity by our Party and other progressive forces.

In addition to the objective factors contributing to legalization, one must also take into account the subjective factors, notably changes within the Party which enabled it to make effective use of new openings. These factors date back to the preparations for the second Party congress, which rectified Party policy, enhanced its influence on domestic and inter-Arab affairs and strengthened its links with the masses.

The rectification of the Party's general line was effected in the face of fierce opposition from Right- and Left-wing opportunist elements in the former Party leadership. The concept of "alliances" was defined in terms of a class approach. It has been forcefully demonstrated that a class assessment of alliances is in no way isolationist, as claimed by the opportunists. On the contrary, the new policy has increased the Party's influence and kept it from tailing after one or another bourgeois group.

Pursuing the Second Congress line, the Central Committee correctly assessed the situation in our part of the Arab world and specified the forces exerting the greatest influence on the nation's life. This provided the basis for our present alliance policy. The Party's activity on the inter-Arab scene not only helped rectify its general line, but also strengthened its positions within the country and abroad.

In the Central Committee's view, legali-

zation is an important victory, a democratic gain for the Lebanese national movement as a whole, an extremely important gain for the working class, an event that will doubtlessly influence the development of Communist parties in the Arab world and their relations with the progressive forces within their countries. At the same time, for all the importance we attach to this victory, we harbor no illusions. For the situation in our area is unstable and there is always the possibility of provocations.

In the new conditions, the Central Committee has set the Party major political and organizational tasks. We have to step up the struggle on all fronts and make the most of legality for the Party as a whole, for each organization and member. Legalization—and this the CC has emphasized—does not mean a radical change in the Party's general line: on the contrary, consistent operation of the Party's line had, in fact, led to legal status.

Our victory has stimulated enthusiasm and a feeling of pride in the Party. In the CC's view, the main task now is to utilize the new situation and step up work to strengthen and expand our ranks and to realize the Second Congress's slogan, "For a mass Communist Party in the Lebanon!"

And the earnest of making our victory secure is strengthening the Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and consolidating its ties with the masses and its alliances.

Philippines: results, difficulties, prospects

JORGE MARAVILLA

On November 7, 1970 the Communist Party of the Philippines observed the anniversary of its founding, the 40th year of its existence as the vanguard party of the Filipino working classes. Founded on November 7, 1930 in Manila, it has been steeled by the severest of trials in the struggle against imperialism, for national freedom and toward the goal of socialism.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is proud to point to its founding day, which was chosen to symbolize the inspiration given to Filipino workers by the October revolution. Although forced by the severity of repressive conditions imposed upon it by American imperialism to fight for prolonged periods in relative isolation from its brother parties, the CPP has never wavered in its internationalist outlook and has fully subscribed to such unity declarations as those approved by the meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1957, 1960 and 1969.

Throughout almost its entire existence, the CPP has been an underground party, compelled to work under conditions of illegality. Only in brief intervals that total less than five years over the past four decades has the Party been able to work in circumstances of partial freedom. During its many years of contending with both legislative and savage military suppression, the CPP has shown its readiness and its ability to conduct any and all forms of struggle or their combination, depending upon the circumstances created by imperialism and its allies, to preserve and to extend the Philippine revolutionary movement and the people's organizations.

Predominantly, the experiences of the CPP have been gained in the struggle against

neo-colonialism in all its open and devious forms. The Party's beginnings lay in upholding the true national interests of the Filipino people against the compromising of their independence struggle by a colonial ruling class, and since 1946 it has waged a difficult fight against one of the most stifling of all varieties of neo-colonial dependence. Its experiences have been those of a Marxist-Leninist party leading an anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation and against the neo-colonial allies of imperialism in the Philippines.

PROLETARIAN ROOTS OF THE CPP

The foremost feature of the Communist Party of the Philippines at its inception was its wholly proletarian origin. It was preceded by a Labor Party, formed in 1922-24. The Labor Party was the voice of the broad and diffuse Congreso Obrero de Filipinas (COF) which, as well as Left-wing militants, included conservative elements and opportunist leaders in the pay of imperialism who obstructed the development of a vanguard Marxist party. In 1929 the COF split into Right and Left union groupings, and a Left-wing federation, the Kati-punan ng mga Anak Pawis ng Filipinas (Proletarian Labor Congress of the Philippines) or KAP, was created by trade union leaders with a Marxist orientation.

In the split of the KAP from the class collaborators and opportunists in the COF, there were two main ideological issues: the need to create a political party based on the class struggle, and the need for the unity of organized Filipino workers with the Communist-led international trade union movement.

In one of their first resolutions the KAP leaders reasserted affiliation with the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat and the Red International of Labor Unions. Another resolution called for the support and the defense of the Soviet Union. Both of these principled positions demonstrated a recognition of the importance of international solidarity in the struggle for national and social emancipation by the Filipino people. The main decision taken coincident with this was to work for the creation of a genuine vanguard working class party.

In the steps toward this goal two dates were selected to symbolize the ideology of the new party. One of these was August 26, the anniversary of the beginning of the revolution against Spanish rule in 1896, the starting point of the modern national liberation movement in the Philippines. On August 26, 1930 a conference was called to found the Communist Party of the Philippines. The second date, selected then, was November 7, 1930, to express the outlook of proletarian internationalism of the CPP. On this date the CPP was publicly proclaimed and formally launched at a mass meeting.

The Conference that founded the CPP was composed of delegates from the unions belonging to the KAP and the National Peasant Confederation, and the first 35-man Central Committee that was elected was mainly made up of trade union leaders and representatives of the National Peasant Confederation (including its four leaders). Elected as general secretary was Crisanto Evangelista, a typesetter and president of the printers' union.

Crisanto Evangelista was the outstanding Marxist-Leninist in the Philippines. He fought for the CPP to be guided by a militant working-class ideology, by proletarian internationalism, and by uncompromising struggle against American imperialism and its Filipino ruling class allies. He continues to be an inspiring example to the CPP.

THE CPP AND THE STRUGGLE FOR GENUINE NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

The foundation of the Communist Party of the Philippines was a logical outcome of the sharp issues involved in the struggle for complete liberation from American imperialism. Throughout its period of colonial rule in the Philippines, from the seizure of the country from Spain in 1898, American imperialism has carefully nurtured the collaborationist tendencies of the

Filipino ruling classes, sections of which had initially participated in the taking up of arms to oppose American conquest. By the end of World War I the great bulk of the Filipino ruling classes, especially the big landowners and compradores, and the political parties that they controlled, had been fully conditioned to assist imperialist aims and to accept their place in the neo-colonial system devised by American imperialist policy-makers. Giving lip-service to the desire of the Filipino masses for independence, they were negotiating with the United States for a limited form of independence, in which the American monopolists and militarists would remain predominant in the Philippines.

During the 1920s the mass organization of workers and peasants and their militant struggle against increasing exploitation represented a decisive break by the enlightened and class-conscious masses with the Filipino ruling class leaders and parties that had betrayed the cause of national liberation. Creation of a Communist Party marked the taking of an independent path by the working classes and the opening of a clear-cut struggle against the neo-colonial aims of American imperialism.

The imperialists understood this very well, and in May 1931, barely six months after the launching of the CPP, Communist leaders were arrested en masse, imprisoned, then exiled individually to remote regions of the country, while the Supreme Court of the Philippines declared the Party illegal. These moves initiated the prolonged, persistent and unsuccessful attempts by imperialism to destroy the Philippine Communist Party, which continued to bring its program to the people by whatever means, to lead strike struggles and demonstrations, and to root itself deeply among both workers and peasants.

Suppression served merely to heighten the unity and militant spirit of Filipino workers and peasants. A revolutionary Socialist Party, for example, formed in the province of Pampanga in 1933, merged with and accepted the ideological, tactical and organizational principles of the Communist Party in 1938. The prestige of the Communist Party was such that no other major political groupings developed in the Philippine working-class movement for nearly four decades after 1930.

Certain ideological struggles went on within the Party in this period. Although its solid proletarian composition gave it a firm foundation, a tendency existed at first to distrust all middle class and intellec-

tual elements. The anti-intellectual bias could be traced to the past betrayal of the national liberation cause by this sector and its compromise generally with imperialism. During the decade of the 1930s, however, the effect of the world crisis of capitalism, the growth of fascism, and, in the Philippines, a ruling class agreement to a U.S. Independence Act passed in the U.S. Congress in 1934 that fell short of genuine freedom, revolutionized many Filipino middle class intellectuals and brought them to accept Marxism. Their entry into the Communist Party helped to enrich its ideological content and to overcome certain sectarian tendencies.

In 1938 the CPP attained a tacit state of legality in the interests of an anti-fascist united front, facilitated by the fears of American imperialism at the time of aggressive Japanese fascism in Asia. Broad anti-fascist organizations were fostered by the Party side by side with expanded militant trade unions and peasant unions. The CPP sought to concentrate on the struggle for social justice and social emancipation.

THE CPP-LED GUERRILLA STRUGGLE AGAINST JAPANESE OCCUPATION

World War II, with the initial defeat of American forces in the Philippines and the occupation of the country by the Japanese fascist armies, brought a catalytic and qualitative change in the development of the Communist Party of the Philippines. The bulk of the Filipino ruling classes and politicians shifted their collaborationist loyalty to the Japanese conquerors. In this situation, the Communist Party was the only organized political force that resisted the invaders, and it became the chief target of Japanese suppressive activities. Cristano Evangelista and other leading Communists were captured at the outset, and killed when they refused to collaborate.

The CPP, however, went underground and organized guerrilla resistance to the invaders, basing the resistance movement on the organized peasant and worker masses. Taking the place of Cristano Evangelista as general secretary was the brilliant Marxist-Leninist intellectual and scientist, Vicente Lava, who gave strong emphasis to tight organization, ideological education, and discipline.

During the period of the war, the CPP largely purged itself of organizational looseness that had tended to occur in the first decade of its existence, and developed into a tightly-knit fighting revolutionary party.

The Party grew rapidly and a large number of cadres were developed and trained in underground Party schools.

A guerrilla army of 20,000, the Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon (People's Army Against Japan) or Hukbalahap, was created under Communist leadership and engaged the Japanese forces in countless battles. Functioning governments at a village level were set up in all the provinces of Central Luzon and in parts of Southern Luzon, and these gave a form of democratic self-rule to the people in these areas for the first time. The wartime period was an important stage in the overall development of the national liberation struggle in the Philippines.

United front arrangements with other anti-Japanese forces were pursued. However, varied guerrilla resistance groups that were under American influence or had American officer leaders refused alliances with the Hukbalahap, barred its expansion to other provinces, and even fought against it, indicating the American imperialist fear of the CPP's growth. Because of its confinement to only a part of the country and to only its main island, the Communist-led liberation movement was not in a strong enough position to shape national events decisively when the war ended on the eve of the promised independence date.

NEO-COLONIALIST INDEPENDENCE AND ARMED STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION

Nevertheless, the mass influence of the Communist Party and the prestige it had gained in the fight against Japanese imperialism made it an important force standing in the path of the aggressive aims of American imperialism. Although American imperialism was compelled to carry out its promise of independence for the Philippines in 1946, it undertook to impose vastly more onerous neo-colonial conditions on that independence.

The Communist Party called for a peaceful path to independence, through the democratic elections appointed for April 1946. It supported the moderate Nacionalista Party wing of the Filipino ruling classes in the 1946 election that preceded independence. Although the imperialist-backed landlord-comprador Liberal Party won the election and was handed the reins of independence as a puppet regime, the Nacionalista opposition had made a strong showing in the Philippine Congress, and the Left-wing nationalist grouping, the

Democratic Alliance, in which the Communist Party participated and entered successful candidates, had elected a number of members of Congress and held what amounted to the balance of power in the legislature. The imperialists and their allies lacked the necessary two-thirds majority vote to approve the neo-colonial economic and military agreements.

At this point American imperialism cynically engineered the arbitrary ouster of Democratic Alliance and some Nacionalista congressmen from office as a dictatorial means of gaining approval of the neo-colonial government to embark on a brutal campaign of military suppression of the mass base of the liberation movement in the Luzon provinces, above all the Communist Party.

The CPP, which exhibited its readiness to participate in the political life of independence in a legal, parliamentary way, was forced, with the mass organizations it led, into a defensive armed struggle to survive. Since the CPP had not planned or initiated the adoption of armed struggle, it experienced a period of confusion until a definite strategy and tactics could be evolved. Attempts from 1946 to 1948 to negotiate a democratic settlement embodying a guarantee of democratic rights to the people and the adoption of nationalist policies by the government were rebuffed. The CPP decided that it had no other choice than to develop its armed defense into a guerrilla, people's war of national liberation.

In the course of the armed struggle, which continued as the main form of struggle from 1946 to 1956, the Communist Party experienced both great advances and serious setbacks. Its presence and influence were spread to many new areas of the country and to millions of Filipinos, and a considerable growth of the Party occurred, with the development of many new cadres. Rich experiences of struggle were gained. The armed struggle itself, however, was suppressed by imperialist intervention and the CPP suffered grave losses, with the majority of leading cadres either killed or imprisoned with extremely long sentences. Most of the original proletarian core of the Party was slaughtered during the almost continual armed struggle from 1941 to 1956.

The reason for this setback was failure to study sufficiently the conditions in the Philippines and to assess properly the relations of strength and the options open to the liberation forces and to imperialism

and its allies. There was a leftist tendency to project the armed struggle to the exclusion of other forms of struggle, and a similar tendency to assert the full hegemony of the CPP over the liberation movement to the neglect of a broad anti-imperialist struggle. There was a failure to overcome the isolation of the CPP and of the national liberation struggle from its international allies. From these shortcomings the CPP has learned much.

American imperialism has boasted of suppressing the Philippine national liberation struggle and has claimed this as a "model" of "counter-insurgency" operations. In truth, its repeated attempts to destroy its main target, the Communist Party of the Philippines, have been utter failures. In 1957, while boasting of triumph, it showed its fear of the Party's regenerative powers by insisting that the Philippine government enact an Anti-Subversion Law that officially outlaws the CPP and provides the death penalty for its leaders. None of these boasts or measures have had any effect. Today the Communist Party of the Philippines has recovered from its setback, has refitted and expanded its organization, has again developed many new cadres, and is helping to lead broad mass struggles against imperialism and neo-colonialism on a larger scale than ever before.

AMERICAN NEO-COLONIALISM IN THE PHILIPPINES

Increasingly, the Philippine economy is put at the mercy of the huge American monopoly, banking and financial circles and U.S.-dominated international financial organizations. These have imposed a foreign debt on the Philippines that reached \$737 million in 1968 (not including \$200 million of private sector debt). Most of the loans involved have been not for the import of capital goods or other development purposes but for offsetting deficits in the balance of payments. Servicing of these debts is passed off onto the masses in the form of high taxes and high prices.

American imperialism has made every effort to harness the Filipino ruling classes to its policies and to make them "junior partners" in its neo-colonial system. U.S.-sponsored programs, administered by American "technical assistants," have worked out decentralized local government and economic development schemes that discourage a strong centralized na-

tional public sector, while local financial institutions and banks have been shaped totally to the fostering of small private commercial and business ventures. The consequences of this cynical promotion of private enterprise have been the complete control of the Philippine economy by foreigners.

There is the relentless trend toward a worsening of conditions in the countryside, where the tenancy rate, a measure of landlessness and rural impoverishment, continues to rise. American imperialism actively promotes a system of "capitalist agriculture" based on huge agro-industrial estates. Rural hunger drives hundreds of thousands of people from the countryside to the cities.

In addition, American imperialism has forced gross distortions on Philippine foreign policy to benefit its own aggressive and cold war aims. Throughout its existence as a formally independent state, the Philippines has been prevented by the hand of the U.S. State Department from having diplomatic, trade or other relations with socialist countries, a policy that has abnormally restricted Philippine trade and cut the Filipino people away from the underdeveloped world's most important and most advantageous source of economic and technical assistance for growth. Instead, collaborationist Philippine governments have allowed themselves to be pressed into anti-Communist alliances like SEATO and ASPAC, and persuaded to play a mercenary role in support of the inhuman U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

At home these policies have been duplicated not only by one of the most vicious anti-Communist laws in the world, but by a growing increase of emphasis on suppressive agencies and on fascist methods.

PRESENT UPSURGE OF POPULAR STRUGGLE

It is significant that in the past year the disastrous effects on the Filipino people of these neo-colonial conditions have begun to come to a head in an upheaval of mass struggle unprecedented in the Philippines since independence. The suppression and demoralization that naturally affected the masses following the setback to the Communist-led armed struggle for national liberation in the 1950s, has long been swept away in a widespread readiness of the people for organization and for struggle. In this, despite difficult underground

conditions, the CPP has played an important part.

New organizations of the people have materialized with a high degree of militancy—trade unions, peasant unions, student organizations, youth movements, nationalist associations. A feature of this is that, in spite of the Anti-Subversion Law and the censorship activities of the state, an extensive interest in Marxism has developed, especially among the youth. Anti-imperialism, the hallmark by which barely a decade ago a person was branded as a Communist, has become the proudly proclaimed ideology of broad circles at all levels of Philippine society.

A wave of strikes has been mounting in a wide range of enterprises, both American-owned and Filipino-owned. This has spread with profound effect to government employees, who in the past have had little organization or militancy. Strikes and demonstrations involve teachers, local government employees, doctors and nurses in state hospitals and others who demand salary increases and come out in defense of their other vital interests.

Mass protests against the sending of a contingent of 2,000 Filipino troops to Vietnam in 1967 and against the expansion and use of U.S. military bases in the Philippines for operations against Vietnam reached such an extent that they forced President Ferdinand Marcos to recall the troops at the end of 1969. Subsequent attempts by the United States to involve the Philippines in its brutal invasion of Cambodia have failed to make headway because of the popular opposition.

A campaign for the freedom of political prisoners, mostly Communists, which collected 64,000 signatures on a petition in a short space of time and caused growing demonstrations, forced the Philippine courts to remove death sentences and life sentences from many of those confined for nearly 20 years. The campaign won the release of many prisoners, including Jose Lava and Ramon Espiritu, Political Bureau members of the CPP, in January 1970, and it continues for those, like the Communist leaders Jesus Lava, Federico Maclang, Casto Alejandrino and others, who remain incarcerated under circumstances of extreme injustice. The demand has been raised for the repeal of the Anti-Subversion Law.

A growing demand for diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, has developed in many sectors.

A boycott of the presidential election of November 1969, called for by a number of organizations and given the support of the Communist Party, won considerable backing. The boycott call stressed that it was not intended to reject the electoral process, but to condemn its corruption and misuse to serve the interests of a few.

The stirrings indicated by these events burst fully into action in the early months of 1970, following a brutal police attack on January 26 on a peaceful demonstration outside the legislative building in Manila, mainly of students, demanding democratic reforms as a new session of Congress opened. Further attacks by army troops and police on demonstrators protesting this incident, which resulted in the death by shooting of four students, far from suppressing the protest, brought a tremendous outpouring of mass demonstrations across the entire Philippines. Over 150,000 people massed in the streets of Manila and of the provincial cities of Tarlac, Cabanatuan, Cebu City and others, protesting against feudalism, imperialism and fascism.

Throughout February, March and April a series of "people's marches" with 30,000-60,000 people participating at a time took place in Manila and in many other cities, especially marches through working class districts, bringing to wide sections of the population the issues of the struggle against imperialism and for democratic changes in Philippine society. The concept of a "parliament of the streets" was developed, a mass forum, to demonstrate popular distrust of the corrupt bourgeois legislature and the need to bring issues for discussion and for decision to the people.

Of most significance has been the very broad character of the participation in these demonstrations, embracing workers, peasants, students and other youth, unemployed, business and professional groups, religious organizations, neighborhood associations, nationalist groups and others. In the committees that have sponsored the largest of the demonstrations, over 50 organizations have been represented, many of them spontaneously organized as events have developed, involving people who had not experienced organization before.

IMPERIALIST ATTEMPTS TO SPLIT THE POPULAR MOVEMENT

These signs of a growing revolutionary temper in the Philippines have alarmed im-

perialism. Taking note of the anti-imperialist mood of the masses, the U.S. Nixon administration has agreed officially in the coming year to negotiate the revision of all American economic and military agreements with the Philippines. Under no illusions about imperialist sincerity and cognizant of the "Guam doctrine" of making Asians fight Asians and of devising more subtle neo-colonial arrangements, the Communist Party of the Philippines and other popular organizations are ready for sharper struggles to come to resist and to throw off the domination of American monopolists and militarists.

Imperialism and its allies are making strenuous efforts to head off the developing revolutionary forces and to sow confusion in the popular movement before it can become more fully integrated. Promising reforms on the one hand, they continue to employ increasingly the army, police and private armies for suppression in the countryside and in the cities.

Attention is being focused on a national Constitutional Convention to be held in 1971 to amend the Philippine Constitution adopted prior to independence.

The Communist Party, while prepared to fight issues wherever they arise, including in the struggle for Constitutional reform in which it will fight for the adoption of democratic amendments, has warned of the futility of expecting democratic changes from neo-colonial bourgeois bodies in which the people and their organizations are not represented and has insisted that changes can come only from mass struggles.

Great harm is done to the national liberation movement by the destructive and disruptive activities of the pseudo-Left, particularly a self-styled revolutionary grouping that professes to follow the ideas of Mao Tse-tung. This anti-Party grouping, headed by the careerist adventurer, Jose M. Sison, has presumed to usurp the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines ("reorganized") and issues statements ostensibly in its name that are given widespread and extensive publication in the conservative Philippine press. The Sison group makes use of a minority student-based organization, the Kabataan Makabayan, and has associated itself with an armed group in a small area of Central Luzon, mainly limited to a corner of the province of Tarlac, which it calls the New People's Army.

Small as it is, this revisionist grouping is publicized widely by the imperialist me-

dia in order to promote splitting and to bring discredit upon the popular movement. Its chief harm is done by its highly provocative behavior in precipitating violence during demonstrations, thus alienating sectors of the population otherwise prepared to support the popular cause, in projecting ultra-extremist phrases and slogans that distort and confuse issues, and in advocating and seeking to promote immediate armed struggle in wholly premature and unfavorable conditions. The value of the Sison group to the imperialists and neo-colonialists can be seen in their efforts to use its provocations as an excuse to move toward suppressing the popular movement as a whole.

Imperialism and its neo-colonial allies, however, would be committing a major error in thinking that they can embark upon another round of armed suppression in the Philippines. The national liberation movement today has a much broader base than in the 1940s, when the illusions of "independence" permeated many sections of the population, and its vanguard is a more mature and experienced force.

* * *

On its 40th anniversary the Communist Party of the Philippines is actively assuming its responsibilities in this new and heightening stage of the struggle by the Filipino people to give a genuine and democratic content to their independence. Looking back on its difficult and varied struggles, in which it has sought to learn the lessons of victory and setback, of legal and illegal battles, of peaceful and armed means, the CPP is preparing itself for broader and sharper confrontations with imperialism and with the ruling classes that it utilizes. It is conducting a joint struggle: against imperialism, and for the achievement of national-democratic goals in the social emancipation of the Filipino people.

Among its present tasks the CPP includes:

—the strengthening of the proletarian core on which it has been based by inten-

sifying its organizational work among the urban industrial and other wage workers, while expanding the organization of the peasantry and of the increasingly revolutionized intellectual and middle class sectors;

—placing, in the coming period, greater emphasis on its ideological work among its members and the masses, and on the struggle against the Leftist, reformist and revisionist elements, against armed action slogans that ignore objective realities, ideas of prodding the revolution and disregard of the role of the economic and political struggle and parliamentary activity; more intensively combating illusions that the popular revolutionary movement can score quick and decisive success without sustained revolutionary work, calling for heroism and sacrifices; exposing the disguised neo-colonialist oppression and exploitation and projecting the concept of non-capitalist development;

—explaining to the Filipino masses that they have no alternative but to respond in better measure to the organized violence of the enemies of the revolution, preparing for and developing the most varied forms of struggle, legal and illegal, peaceful and otherwise, in order to engage the broadest possible masses of the people in the fight for genuine national freedom and to meet any eventuality forced on the people by a desperate imperialism.

The CPP must intensively and extensively project the national democratic movement, oppose and expose the intrigues of U.S. imperialism, its economic and political oppression, retention of its military bases on our territory and its aggressive war in Vietnam and other countries. It must raise its voice in protest against the suppression of mass democratic organizations in the Philippines.

The earnest of our success is active extension and strengthening of the CPP's ties of unity with brother Marxist-Leninist parties and with national liberation movements in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and of unified struggle against imperialism and its aggressions.

In brief

MEETING OF EUROPEAN COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Twenty-seven Communist and Workers' parties of Europe met in Moscow on October 20 and 21, 1970.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the Central Committees of the Communist Party of Austria, Communist Party of Belgium, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, Bulgarian Communist Party, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, German Communist Party, Communist Party of Germany, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Greece, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Communist Party of Ireland, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Luxembourg, Polish United Workers' Party, Portuguese Communist Party, Rumanian Communist Party, San Marino Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Swiss Party of Labor, Left Party—Communists of Sweden, Communist Party of Spain and Communist Party of Turkey.

The participants in the meeting exchanged views on problems of the struggle for European security.

The meeting proceeded in a spirit of friendship and fraternal cooperation.

CANADA

The situation in Canada is fraught with a threat to the democratic rights of Canadians. It would appear, declares a statement by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Canada, that the kidnapping incidents involving the Quebec Liberation Front (FLQ) are being used as a pretext for an attack on democratic and civil rights, rather than on the causes that made the kidnappings possible in the first place.

Kidnapping and other acts of terrorism, the statement goes on, are anarchistic methods of struggle which have nothing in common with the necessity of uniting the working class and its allies against Canadian monopoly and U.S. imperialism. Such acts, irrespective of the motives of those behind them, merely give reaction a pretext to perpetuate its anti-people and anti-national policy. The CEC emphasized that it is not enough to condemn such acts as a form of struggle. It is even more necessary to condemn the national, social and economic inequality which exists in Quebec.

The Communist Party has campaigned for years in English and French Canada for a new constitution based on the equal, voluntary partnership of the two nations, based on the right to national self-determination. It has campaigned for structural changes which would wrest control of the economy from monopoly, Anglo-Canadian and U.S. monopoly alike. It has long campaigned for overcoming the inequalities in wages, educational standards, health, housing, and employment opportunities. The refusal of the federal and Quebec governments to act on these proposals has aggravated the crisis in Quebec.

The Communist Party disassociated itself from the tactics of the FLQ, which do harm to the struggle for meaningful social change in Quebec and throughout Canada.

Democratic Canadians in English and French Canada, the statement says, need to unite their efforts around a truly national and democratic program, such as the Communist Party advances, a program which is directly linked to the battle for Canadian independence.

MONGOLIA

In a resolution, "On the 50th Anniversary of the Founding of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party," the Party Central Committee called upon the Communists and all working people to mark the occasion, to be celebrated on March 1,

1971, by new labor achievements, heightened political activity and multiplied efforts to further economic and cultural advance.

Founded by Mongolian revolutionaries headed by D. Sukhe-Bator, the resolution says, the MPRP has carried out the political program adopted at its first congress and has led the Mongolian people, inspired by the liberation ideals of the Great October Revolution, to the triumph of the popular revolution.

In these fifty years the MPRP has travelled a difficult but glorious road, leading the people's revolutionary struggle for liberation from colonial and social oppression, for the establishment and consolidation of the people's power, overcoming the nation's age-old economic and cultural backwardness and building a socialist society.

The MPRP, the resolution emphasizes, has developed from a small group of revolutionaries into a broad mass organization of Communists comprising tens of thousands of the most active and advanced representatives of the working class, cooperative peasantry and people's intelligentsia.

Thanks to its unceasing efforts aimed at consolidating its ranks on the political and organizational principles of Marxism-Leninism and extending its links with the masses, thanks to its resolute struggle against Right and "Left" opportunism and petty bourgeois nationalist distortions of the Party line, it has become a militant vanguard of the Mongolian people.

In all its political and day-to-day practical work the MPRP has been unswervingly guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism, fraternal solidarity and close cooperation with the great Leninist CPSU and other detachments of the international army of Communists, consistently coming out for the unity and cohesion of all revolutionary forces.

As the country nears the completion of the building of socialism, the resolution continues, the Party's leading role in all spheres of national life is growing. To facilitate the development of the country's productive forces and enhance the efficiency of social production, the MPRP is continuing its work to improve the methods of managing the economy and all other spheres of national life.

Socialism's place in history, stages and criteria of its development

The following is a summary of a seminar held in Prague October 8-9 under the auspices of **World Marxist Review** and attended by scholars from a number of socialist countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania and the USSR. The subject was: **Socialism's Place in History, Stages and Criteria of Its Development.**

The participants were welcomed on behalf of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee by its Secretary, Comrade *Jan Fojtik*. He was confident, he said, that the exchange of views would prove useful and would stimulate continued study and closer understanding of important theoretical and practical problems involved in the building of socialism and communism. These problems are closely linked with the current policies of Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries and are of doubtless interest to all other parties.

Referring to Czechoslovakia's experience, Comrade Fojtik noted that the Communist Party has initiated theoretical study of this experience in order to chart out the path for further development. When, in 1960, we proclaimed that socialism and socialism had triumphed, there was overestimation of some of the potentialities for further progress; there was no theoretically precise definition of the stage Czechoslovakia had reached, and no proper concrete analysis of the situation resulting from the building of the foundations of socialism and liquidation of the exploiting

classes. Some of the development goals set for the economy, the social system, the socialist state and democracy, were unrealistic. There was also the fact that the potentialities of socialism and of cooperation of the socialist states were not adequately utilized, either politically or economically. And there were other errors. All this was immediately seized upon by Right opportunist and revisionist forces to attack socialism.

The fight against revisionism and Right-wing opportunism, for creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its practical application, makes it incumbent on us (Fojtik said in conclusion) accurately to assess the economic and political stage each socialist country has reached, define, with maximum precision, its characteristics, and work out a uniform concept of the policy fundamentals of the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist lands. This will enable us to give a scientifically grounded assessment of the alignment of forces, which is highly important in choosing the forms and methods of our struggle for the final triumph of socialism and communism in individual socialist countries and on a world scale.

I. SOCIALISM: ITS GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

The first question discussed was socialism's place in history, its relation to state-monopoly capitalism on the one hand, and communism, on the other. This brought up such problems as the concrete historical genesis of socialism, its features that are common to all countries, the specificities of socialist development and the dialectical inter-connection of socialism and communism.

In examining socialism's place in history, Prof. G. Heyden (Berlin) said: our starting point must be that socialism is the only alternative to state-monopoly capitalism. Socialism cannot be a brief period, or a transitional society. The problems that arise after the assertion of socialist production relations are by no means confined to overcoming the survivals of capitalism and directly preparing the transition to communism. The pivotal task is the building of socialism's developed social system. This requires positive development of every sphere of public life along socialist lines. This fully corresponds with the definition of our era given in the documents of the 1960 and 1969 Moscow conferences of Communist and Workers' parties. And to concentrate attention on this central task (Prof. Heyden continued) we have defined socialism as a relatively independent social formation. The speaker set out some of the arguments in support of that definition.

The strength-balance between socialism and imperialism is a decisive factor in determining the tasks of building the socialist society and its role in the transition to communism. The successful development of the socialist world system has created an entirely new balance of strength, with socialism now the decisive factor in world affairs. This has compelled the imperialists to revise their strategy of combating socialism. One result of this has been to bring economic, ideological and cultural issues into the very center of the two-system confrontation.

Socialist construction and effective struggle against imperialism now call for a correct solution of the problems posed by the scientific and technological revolution. Nor are these problems merely technical or scientific; they are complex social problems and are not resolved simply by the existence of socialist production relations. And they can be solved only if we properly employ all the motive forces and

potentialities of socialist society. Among other things, this implies developing socialist democracy, perfecting economic planning and management, creating an integral education system, growth of socialist consciousness and a new pattern of human relations. In other words, solution of these problems requires modifying all social relations to bring them into a uniform and dynamic system.

In examining the place socialism holds in history, we should consider the fact that each socialist country is a component of the socialist world system and that expansion of the productive forces is increasingly becoming an international endeavor. This means that no country can, by itself, build the developed social system of socialism: there must be cooperation and integration, particularly in the economic sphere. This is an especially complex task considering that the countries concerned are at varying economic levels. Its accomplishment will, therefore, require a long time.

Imperialism is compelled to take up the challenge of world socialism. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 1969 Moscow Meeting that many important specificities of modern imperialism are due to the fact that it is compelled to adapt itself to the new conditions stemming from the struggle of the two systems.

We should bear in mind that imperialism, too, is working to solve the problems posed by the technological revolution, and in this area as in others is employing new methods of fighting socialism.

In defining the place socialism holds in history (Prof. Heyden said) we proceed from our experience of socialist construction. Following the victory of socialist production relations, simultaneous and comprehensive development of all facets of public life became the chief task of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Our experience in the GDR and scientific prognostication indicate that the building of the developed socialist system will require much time. And the problems arising out of the new situation lead us to conclude that the struggle of the two systems will cover a long period, too. Hence, the building of the developed socialist system should be considered not only from the standpoint of eliminating survivals of capitalism and directly preparing the transition to communism. Needless to say, the end

aim of the international working class is a classless communist society. But the road to communism passes through developed socialist society. That is why the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is concentrating the constructive effort of the people on building such a society.

Replying to questions, Prof. Heyden said it would be wrong to define developed socialism exclusively on the basis of one criterion, say, labor productivity. GDR experience has shown that a developed socialist society has to be built as an integrated system, as the alternative to state-monopoly capitalism. And by building such a system, the GDR is giving powerful support to the anti-monopoly struggle of the West German working class. If we want to make socialism an attractive goal, we must first of all strengthen it economically, assure its economic superiority. This, naturally, implies raising labor productivity. But the slogan of overtaking capitalism in productivity is only part of the task before us. In fact, it is a moot question whether socialism must match or surpass capitalist productivity in every economic field. We in the GDR have a concrete aim, namely, to surpass capitalist productivity in certain selected fields.

Prof. Heyden replied in the affirmative to the question: Should socialism be considered a relatively independent formation and, at the same time, a phase of communist society?

J. Aroio, Cand. Econ., (Sofia) dealt with some methodological aspects of the problem.

In countries where socialist production relations have come into their own, but against a background of relatively low productive forces, the task is to strengthen and consolidate these production relations while building the material and technical basis of socialism. This necessitates a special stage in building socialism, one that precedes the emergence of a developed socialist society. However, this is not an absolute must for every country.

In principle, the socialist productive forces should surpass the level attained by the leading capitalist countries. But socialist production relations can be developed even before that is achieved. The inherent logic of socialist development, the laws governing that development, should not be confused with the victory of socialism over capitalism, with the competition between the two systems. Decisive in the changeover to communist production rela-

tions is, of course, the building of the material and technical basis of communism, but the change-over itself is determined by perfection of the production relations.

Examining the content of such terms as "formation" and "phase" the speaker said they are used for qualitative definitions of social-development periods and their essential differences. Grouped in order of implications, these differences give us a closer understanding of each period. Besides "formations," we have also to operate with the term "phase" and within it, "stage." Each new phase in social development reflects essential and deep-going changes which, however, do not cancel out the basic and determinative factors of the existing pattern of production relations. In analyzing imperialism, Lenin wrote that it "emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristic of capitalism in general," but in the process "certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 265).

Dr. Aroio stressed that practice has fully confirmed the Marxist-Leninist classics' definition of socialism's place in history. The economic basis of communism, in the form of public ownership of the means of production, emerges already under socialism. But its maturity, and, hence, also the maturity of communist production relations, are still at a relatively low level. "Insofar as the means of production become common property," Lenin wrote, "the word 'communism' is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is *not* complete communism . . . In its first phase, or first stage, communism *cannot* as yet be fully mature economically and entirely free from traditions or vestiges of capitalism" (Vol. 25, p. 471).

The features common to socialism and communism shape the pattern of social relations in both phases. But this does not mean that there are no profound differences. "Politically, the distinction between the first, or lower, and the higher phase of communism will in time, probably, be tremendous," Lenin foresaw (*Ibid.* p. 470). Not to see the implications of these differences is not to understand the complexity of the tasks confronting us in the transition to communism. If it were merely a matter of building the material and technical basis of communism, then one could suppose that now, with the technological revolution, this would take a relatively short time. But actually it will take much

time to fashion communist production relations and the appropriate superstructure. Apparently, socialism will be a prolonged period, at any rate longer than we had imagined not so long ago.

The Marxist-Leninist classics proceeded from the qualitative sameness of socialism and communism, from the fact that the mission of socialism is to create its "own" basis for communism, which is not merely the material and technical foundations, but encompasses the entire mode of production. The transition from the lower to the higher phase entails expansion rather than abolition of the economic foundations of socialism, does not involve class struggle, etc.

Socialism's relation to preceding formations was the subject chosen by Prof. A. Butenko (Moscow). From the general sociological standpoint, he said, socialism is a system resting on new, progressive social relations qualitatively differing, from the very outset, from capitalist relations. And socialism reveals its fundamental superiority over capitalism, notably state-monopoly capitalism, not only by transforming and accumulating the achievements of the preceding, highest stage of capitalism and applying them in the interests of the working people, but also by considerably multiplying these achievements. In short, socialism is the immediate socio-economic ideal of the working people of all countries.

We know that socialism has been adopted by countries where state-monopoly capitalism had not reached full maturity. Regardless of the level from which the new system starts, it has a number of fundamental characteristics, intrinsic features and inalienable criteria that are common to all countries. Of course, these may be manifested in a specific form in each individual country.

A scientifically substantiated definition of the common features and criteria of socialism—those that reveal its very substance and superiority over capitalism—will help our ideological struggle against the many attempts by bourgeois and revisionist propaganda to divide socialism into "eastern" and "western" types. At the same time, such a definition would be a serious obstacle to those who, wittingly or unwittingly, belittle the achievements of the new system, or, conversely, are inclined to present the initial stage of socialism as its consummation. Only if we are guided by a general definition of social-

ism applicable to all countries, can we explain the differences in the concrete scope and content of the tasks being accomplished at various stages of socialist development in one country or group of countries. And here we must take into account the possible time differential in developing socialism, different organizational forms and different degrees in bringing the advantages of socialism to bear.

The speaker emphasized the value of Lenin's contribution to the scientific concept of socialism. In the 1920's Lenin concretized the propositions of Marx and Engels concerning the future communist society in its two development phases, and drew these concrete conclusions: socialist production presupposes state-owned, i.e., owned by the entire people, and cooperatively-owned enterprises; the transition to socialism does not completely eliminate commodity production, for socialism retains such categories as commodity, market, economic accountability, etc.; distribution is exercised not through direct product exchange, but through commodity-money relations, trade; socialist construction is stimulated both by moral and material incentives (See Vol. 29, p. 358; Vol. 33, pp. 58, 113-14; 467-75, etc.). These conclusions, carried further and concretized by the CPSU and fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, are embodied in the socialism of today.

Prof. Butenko remarked that socialism is not a brief stage without its own intrinsic features. It is a relatively independent phase of socio-economic development, its socio-economic nature differing fundamentally from mature communism. Socialism has its own system of objective laws and principles. This should not be taken to mean that some of these will not be valid in the higher, communist phase. But the point is that there is a definite complex of laws that are part of socialism and will not be operative in communist society.

Disregard of the specifics of the socialist phase, reducing its function solely to removing the "birthmarks" of capitalism and preparing the passage to communism can lead to the wrong idea that what distinguishes socialism from communism (planned commodity production, distribution, categories such as value, money, profit, etc.) is an unavoidable "evil" that should be removed with the least possible delay. That, in fact, is the erroneous foundation for extremist concepts and theories suggesting abolition of commodity-money

relations and material incentives in the process of building socialism, and denouncing these as "birthmarks of capitalism," though, in fact, they are a very essential part of socialism.

Can we formulate a general definition of socialism applicable to all its development stages? Prof. Butenko replied in the affirmative and suggested the following as a starting point for discussion; socialism replaces, in a revolutionary way, capitalism and other, precapitalist forms of social relations and has a number of common features and criteria. In the economic sphere, the basic feature is the socialist mode of production, which precludes exploitation and is based on the two main forms of socialist property, state and co-operative. Socialism rests on an industrial material and technical basis, in which machines predominate over manual labor and on centrally planned production in the interests of the people. It employs commodity exchange, economic accountability and material incentives, and socialist distribution employs the commodity-market mechanism. The system of economic laws provides increasingly fuller scope to operation of the central socialist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." In the socio-political sphere socialism is distinguished by the absence of class antagonisms, by the common socialist character of existing classes, popular government led by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party, democratic participation of the people in resolving fundamental social problems. In the ideological sphere socialism is distinguished by the prevalence of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, mastery of the progressive achievements of culture, diminishing influence of petty-bourgeois and religious ideology. Socialism goes through definite stages and grows into communism only upon reaching the appropriate degree of maturity.

Prof. G. Apostol (Bucharest) said that Marxism-Leninism has defined the basic features of the communist socio-economic system, demonstrating its fundamental difference from the capitalist system.

Fashioning socialism on Marxism-Leninism, on its universal principles, gives the new economy a number of characteristics common to all socialist countries. These are: public ownership of the means of production and abolition of exploitation; operation of the socialist distribution principle; centralized state economic planning

and management; leading role of the Communist Party; utilization of the total economic potential to raise living standards. All these should be considered in their totality. For instance, nationalization of the chief means of production considered outside of the context of other characteristic features cannot serve as a criterion of socialist production relations. It becomes such a criterion only in a wider social, political and economic context, given the other determining features of socialism.

At various stages in its development, socialism's criteria are enriched and concretized in line with the new tasks. At a certain stage of the revolutionary struggle, the capture of political power by the working class is the cardinal factor in the transition to socialism. In the next stage the chief criterion is prevalence of the new, socialist production relations. However, their extension to the entire economy, important though this is, cannot be taken as the consummating point in building the new society. In our view (the speaker said) assessment of socialism's every development stage must be predicated on organic unity of productive forces and production relations.

Marxism regards socialism as the first stage of communist society; the new production relations are based on modern large-scale industry. The productive forces exert a powerful influence on all aspects of the life of society. That is why in Rumania, as in other socialist countries, industrialization is an objective necessity, one that accords with the development laws common to all socialist countries, and also with the need to create an optimal economic structure in each of them.

Considering the sum-total of economic, social and political factors, and also the difficulties, that have to be overcome in preparing the transition to the new social system, it has to be said that the socialist stage of communism is a long one and requires much effort. It is a period in which it is necessary to develop, improve and modernize the productive forces in accordance with the latest advances in science and technology and ensure their efficient utilization.

In defining the main direction of Rumania's economic policy in the present new period, the 10th Party Congress emphasized that the building of a comprehensively developed socialist society presupposes intensive growth of productive forces; a

highly modern economic structure; uninterrupted progress in science, education and culture; conditions conducive to a steady rise in the people's material and cultural level; continued perfection of production relations and promotion of more active participation of the people in administering the affairs of state and developing socialist democracy.

Socialism possesses certain general features which characterize it as a key stage in the establishment and development of the new socio-economic system. In different countries these features, as well as the specific problems of developing socialism, acquire specific features. Socialism can exist only as a diversity of concrete historic forms. This means, as Lenin pointed out, that in the social, political and economic development of each country it is essential to take into account the concrete features which lead to differences between countries within the same historical epoch.

Socialism should be as the people who fought for it wished it to be. Socialism and communism derive their power and monolithic strength from the fact that they express the will, interests and most cherished hopes of each people. Socialist ownership of the means of production is the objective socio-economic basis of the new system in all socialist states, but in each one it exists within a specific national framework. Its active role is organically linked with concrete historical conditions as manifested in the features of each country. Socialist ownership as such grants only those who express the people's will—the Communist Party and Government of the given country—the right to draw up and direct the course of development and exercise sovereign control over the country's wealth.

In applying Marxism-Leninism to its specific conditions, each country promotes the general, explores the new world in original form, contributes something new to the extensive and complex work of building socialism. The general and the specific in the development of socialism are factors which cannot be contraposed; nor should they be seen as elements of a hierarchy.

With specific problems arising in each country at various stages of development, it is necessary to give full attention to the relationship between the national and international. The Rumanian Communist Party, the speaker said, is convinced that

there are no contradictions between the fundamental national and international interests of the socialist states, that the gains of each in building socialism strengthen the socialist world system as a whole. Vivid manifestation of this is the socialist countries' all-round economic, scientific and technological cooperation, which makes for rapid economic development and accelerated progress of each country, thereby contributing to the might and international prestige of the whole socialist system.

It is also important to keep long-term prospects in sight. Several decades ago elements which socialism encounters today in many areas of economic and socio-political life were non-existent or almost non-existent. Furthermore, under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution and other factors these elements are subjected to rapid dynamic development in which the qualitative aspect predominates. In Prof. Apostol's view, the criteria for evaluating the development of modern productive forces must still be clarified or, at least, cleansed of predominantly quantitative considerations. Today the concept "productive forces" acquires a new meaning deriving from extensive scientific and technological programs, from the need to raise the effectiveness of the economy, from the fast, far-reaching changes in the professional structure of the labor force. In our view (Prof. Apostol remarked), quantitative and qualitative aspects of socialist development should be dialectically associated.

Bourgeois sociologists have put out the theory that socialism's place in history is identical to that of state-monopoly capitalism: the two, it is argued, are but differing forms of transition to the "industrial society." I. Hruza, Cand. Phil., (Prague) made the point that propaganda of this concept leads to a patently wrong interpretation of the technological revolution, which is seen only in its technical aspects.

Many Czechoslovak sociologists of the revisionist school took the "industrial society" concept as the starting point of their theoretical disquisitions. They perverted Marxism, substituting for it the views of latter-day bourgeois sociologists. The same goes for "theorists" who reduced the whole theory of directing the economy to "socialist managerism." Paradoxical though it may seem, even politology was palmed off as "standing above" classes and parties. Some even maintained that there

was no need for a critical Marxist analysis of the work of Western politologists, wholly ignoring the fact that many of them are avowed anti-Communists. The "industrial society" theory was basic also to some trends in political economy, which absolutized the role of the market and insisted that the socialist economy develop spontaneously. The "industrial society" theory and its many derivatives were camouflaged by pseudo-scientific verbiage, an especially dangerous method of obscuring the essential differences between socialism and capitalism.

Propagation of various bourgeois anthropological concepts is still another method of distorting these differences. And here the argument has been that capitalism's negative features are not only carried over to socialism, but are even accentuated. That idea was trotted out by many Czechoslovak philosophers, notably Kosik. Arguing from positions of "pure democracy," they flatly negated the influence of popular rule under socialism and treated such categories as freedom from a subjectivist and idealist standpoint.

Closely linked with "anthropological" distortions were attempts to gloss over the distinction between the lower and higher phase of communism. The Marxist concept of developed communism was contrasted to Czechoslovak reality which the opponents of socialism argued, has demonstrated the ineffectiveness of Marx's concepts. This was sheer demagoguery, for Czechoslovakia had only laid the foundations of socialism. True, the anti-socialist forces were to a certain extent able to base their arguments on our past propaganda which, in stressing the superiority of the new society over capitalism, did not always draw a distinction between socialism and communism, did not always draw a distinction between socialism and communism. This simplistic approach, which sometimes occurred in our past propaganda, was utilized by our enemies in the ideological struggle.

The task now, an urgent one, is to analyze the main features of difference between socialism and communism. This will give us a closer understanding of the inner dynamics of socialist society, a necessary pre-condition for a serious analysis of its various development stages.

One of the key features of Communism is the high level of productive forces. Socialist society must be unremitting in increasing production. But that does not

mean that communism differs from socialism chiefly in level of productive forces. It will differ also by its vast expansion of democracy which, in the end, will even lead to liquidation of the state and its replacement by communist self-administration.

However, expansion of socialist democracy is not spontaneous: in assessing social phenomena and processes, such a view led to negation of the class principle, which was denounced as a brake on the development of socialist democracy and, consequently, an obstacle to the transition to communism.

The theory that reduces the entire transition process merely to expansion of productive forces, or expansion of socialist democracy, or some combination of the two, has undergone certain modifications. At first it was meant to "substantiate" the prospect of society advancing from the lower to the higher stage. Subsequently, it was restyled to accentuate the need to "improve" socialist society as such, communism being described as an unrealistic goal, even as the "alienated future."

The main difference between socio-economic formations (Dr. Hruza continued) lies in their economic basis. The difference between the various stages of one and the same socio-economic formation lies primarily in the degree of maturity of production relations. That must be taken into account in determining the difference between socialism and communism.

The notion that expansion of productive forces can automatically assure the transition from one stage of communism to another is sheer simplification. The growth of productive forces, if it is not oriented on creating the prerequisites for the change-over to communism, will not lead us to the desired goal. More, if we are guided by the bourgeois "consumer society" concept, it can lead us to a dead end. For expansion of the productive forces can facilitate the transition to communism only if it facilitates the change-over to the new, communist organization of labor.

Similarly, expansion of socialist democracy cannot, by itself, assure the transition to communism. Expanded socialist democracy, if it is not attended by progress in production relations, would only make for a wider differential in the participation of classes and social groups in public affairs. We would thus arrive at the very opposite of our desired goal. Expansion of socialist democracy can be

effective only if it accords with the development of the new production relations.

In the transition to socialism, capitalist production relations are replaced by socialist, i.e., not fully communist, production relations, and in small-scale production this is completed with the building of socialism's foundations. The qualitative definition of mature socialism is based on optimal expansion of socialist production relations as the groundwork for gradual transition to the replacement of the old by the new division of labor. Evidently, it is more difficult to distinguish between individual stages of socialist development than between socio-economic formations.

The Leninist concept of socialism has become the target of fierce attack by latter-day revisionists. They oppose to it a variety of anti-scientific "models" of the new society. Prof. G. Hoppe (Berlin) devoted his contribution to a critique of such "models."

Development of scientific theory by Lenin, he said, was always associated with principled struggle against petty-bourgeois notions of socialism. And Lenin believed it was especially important to disclose the underlying bourgeois substance of this bogus "socialism," showing that it disseminates politically dangerous superficial views and which are "in practice nothing but petty-bourgeois self-deception, or deception of the masses ('the majority') by the bourgeoisie, which is the same thing" (Vol. 25, p. 200).

The essence of the modern petty-bourgeois "socialism" stands out in all its clarity when we examine the "models" offered by Fischer, Goldstuecker, Kolakowski and other revisionists. They all share one and the same fundamental "demands": the working-class party must be deprived of political and economic power, inasmuch as it is but the "intellectual" or "spiritual" vanguard and is not supposed to plan, let alone direct, socialist society; there should be free "competition" of diverse interests, sometimes in an "organized form," and also opportunities for a legal opposition.

Prof. Hoppe then convincingly demonstrated that this political program fully accords with imperialist policy.

Petty-bourgeois socialism is incapable of understanding the character of the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism with its fierce class struggles of the two mutually-opposed social systems. Its exponents indulge in abstract disquisitions about the "future of mankind," an era of

"technology and science," "humanism," and so on. "Petty-bourgeois democrats," Lenin wrote, "are distinguished by an aversion to class struggle, by their dreams of avoiding it, by their efforts to smooth over, to reconcile, to remove sharp corners. Such democrats, therefore, either avoid recognizing any necessity for a whole historical period of transition from capitalism to communism or regard it as their duty to concoct schemes for reconciling the two contending forces instead of leading the struggle of one of these forces" (Vol. 30, p. 108).

Moreover, petty-bourgeois socialism is incapable of appreciating the link between socialist revolution and scientific and technological progress. The present scientific and technological revolution is impelling society towards socialism.

Petty-bourgeois socialists see their principal function not in participating in socialist construction, but in negative and destructive criticism of it. And that criticism is meant to vilify our experience in building the new society, negate the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and destroy the real, existing socialism. This petty-bourgeois orientation opens the door to bourgeois ideology and objectively serves imperialism's global strategy.

T. Namsarai, Cand. Phil., (Ulan-Bator) pointed out that mankind was passing to socialism not only from state-monopoly capitalism, but also from pre-capitalist production relations. We speak of the transition period from capitalism to socialism, but the transition can be made also by by-passing capitalism. That road was opened to backward countries by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The experience of the Mongolian revolution conclusively demonstrates that in the absence of modern industry and a working class, the peasants can play a decisive part in a country's progressive development if they work in alliance with the working class of a socialist country. Originally, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party was made up chiefly of peasants. By creatively applying Lenin's teaching and drawing on the experience of the CPSU, (while always reckoning with Mongolian conditions) and thanks to the advance and assistance of the Communist International, the Party was able to play the decisive role in the 1921 anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people's revolution and, in later years, in the building of a socialist society.

In his talk with a delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, Lenin pointed out that the only correct path for Mongolia was to work for political and economic independence in alliance with the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia. And there is abundant evidence to show that Mongolia's non-capitalist advance to socialism was possible only because of its close and all-round alliance with the USSR, the world's first socialist state. "It was this class alliance of Russia's victorious working class and the Mongolian peasantry," Comrade Y. Tsedenbal had said, "that assured the victory of our people's revolution and subsequently our advance to socialism along the non-capitalist path."

The leading role of the working class was manifested in this Soviet assistance—economic, political, military and cultural—which is largely responsible for Mongolia being able to by-pass capitalism on its way to socialism.

An international class alliance of backward nations and the working class of socialist countries is a crucial factor of non-capitalist development. This has been borne out by the experience of the Mongolian people's revolution.

It should be stressed, however, that such an international alliance of the working class of advanced socialist countries and the peasantry of formerly backward countries does not mean that—contrary to all the assertions of bourgeois historians and sociologists—the latter forfeit their political independence or historical initiative in resolving vital problems. The People's Revolutionary Party and government of Mongolia have always independently formulated and carried out their home and foreign policy. Nor does this contradict the fact that our Party and government always take into account the importance of the international alliance of the working class and peasantry and always draw on the assistance and support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The Mongolian working class took definite shape and form in the years of popular rule. The process was greatly facilitated by assistance from the Soviet working class. In the second stage of our people's revolution the working class became an independent political force, the vanguard of our working people and it has steadily strengthened its alliance with the toiling *arats* (peasants). Naturally, the working

class assumed an immense role in the life of the people and in their effort to build socialism.

The experience of the Mongolian People's Republic shows that the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction are operative also in the process of non-capitalist development. But they manifest themselves in a specific way in each country starting the advance to socialism from pre-capitalist conditions.

Another Mongolian speaker, U. Kambar, Cand. Econ., (Ulan-Bator) discussed socialism's place in history in the light of non-capitalist development. The essence of the transition to socialism from pre-capitalist production relations should be seen as the revolutionary replacement of a pre-capitalist by the socialist mode of production. And the transition is governed by the intrinsic laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction.

In other words, the non-capitalist path is not some third path, something intermediate between capitalism and socialism. Nor does it imply interaction of heterogeneous, even antagonistic, economic forms and class forces which, allegedly, can coexist peacefully and for a long time without the problem of "who will win" being solved. A country can advance to socialism not only by arresting capitalist development, but by by-passing capitalism altogether. The theory of the non-capitalist way is a component part of scientific communism, showing to backward countries the direction and prospects of progress towards socialism.

But the non-capitalist path entails a long and complex process. It is bound to pass through various stages, even intermediate stages. Engels, it will be recalled, spoke of a possible "short cut" to socialism for backward countries. That should not be taken to mean that the transition to socialism from pre-capitalist relations is quicker than from capitalist.

As other speakers have emphasized, to form a correct understanding of socialism's place in history we must reveal and analyze its common features and development trends as manifested in the specific condition of various countries. As socialist society becomes more mature, it more fully reveals its superiority over state-monopoly capitalism. Though a relatively independent and long stage, socialism ushers in a fundamentally new era of social development that leads mankind to communism.

II. STAGES OF SOCIALIST DEVELOPMENT

In examining the historic place of socialism, the participants in the debate singled out the question of the stages it passes through in its formation and development. This is an important problem, insofar as a correct definition of the stage and the socio-economic maturity attained by the new society has a direct bearing on the concrete tasks of socialist and communist construction. Questions raised in the course of the debate included the objective bases for classifying the stages of socialism, the main **milestones in the development of socialism**, the characteristic features of various stages and the correlation of the common and the specific in the advance of socialist society.

The formation of the new society commences with the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Of interest in this connection, Prof. G. Glezerman (Moscow) noted, is the question of the stages of development of socialism, of how it emerges from the transitional period and stands firmly on its own feet.

In the Soviet Union's experience the following stages can be singled out. First of all, the creation of the basis or foundation of a socialist economy. Chronologically this stage extends to the early thirties, when the socialist formation became dominant in the economy. In industry it accounted for the overwhelming bulk of the output, but in agriculture socialist changes had not yet been completed and a percentage of privately owned farms remained. In the economy the issue "Who will win?" had been resolved in favor of socialism, the exploiting classes had on the whole been liquidated, though remnants still remained and the medium that nurtured them had not been wholly eliminated.

The next stage is the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union, achieved in the latter half of the thirties. This was marked by the completion, in the main, of socialist transformation of the economy. Socialist relations were established on a nation-wide scale; small-scale commodity production, though still persisting, played no significant part in the national economy. The victory of socialism meant the complete liquidation of exploiter classes and all the causes of exploitation, the creation of a society of working people: industrial workers, farmers, intellectuals. Corresponding changes took place in the political superstructure, the social base of the working people's state expanded and socialist democracy ad-

vanced. In the ideological sphere the victory of socialism was characterized by the completion of the cultural revolution.

The victory of socialism concludes the transitional period and a new stage commences in which socialism is consolidated, brought to completion and all its inherent great possibilities are revealed and utilized. As it matures, the new society prepares the conditions for the gradual transition to communism. Experience shows that socialism is a long stage of social development.

Speaking of the problems that can and must be resolved in socialism and communism, Prof. Glezerman classified them in two groups: those that are solved with the construction of socialist society and those that are solved only in the transition to communism. The former group of problems include: liquidation of class and national oppression, political and economic liberation of the working people, making all the wealth of society the property of the people. Into this group, too, fall elimination of crises and their very possibility, ensuring the planned growth of the economy, subordination of industrial development to the welfare and development of man. However, complete affluence, complete equality and complete homogeneity of society are still lacking. These are achieved only in the evolution of socialism into communism.

Recalling that in "The State and Revolution" Lenin had pointed out that with time the political differences between socialism and communism would prove to be tremendous, the speaker noted that experience shows that the difference between socialism and communism becomes more and more apparent as society advances towards communism. Moreover, involved is not only the political sphere but the economic as well.

In defining the correlation between socialism and communism one must discern both the common features and the differences between them without canonizing either the one or the other. In Prof. Glezerman's view, the correlation between socialism and communism expresses more correctly the concept of two phases of the same socio-economic formation than does the concept of socialism as a relatively independent formation.

Differences in theoretical formulas, Prof. Glezerman stressed, should not, of course, obfuscate problems of immediate practical value. Leading among these is the question

that the advance to communism presumes the all-round development of socialism with the consistent implementation of its principles. Life shows that there is no other road to communism. Any attempt to by-pass this road can only distort communist principles and retard rather than accelerate their implementation.

A general law of socialist construction that holds equally for all stages is the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party.

Prof. Glezerman then dwelt on some of the theoretical aspects of this problem. In defining the place of Party leadership in the development of socialist society three aspects must be borne in mind: the Party's role as political leader, organizer, ideological force and educator of the people.

The Party's role as political leader derives first and foremost from the whole system of class relations in the world, which requires a political approach to the solution of social questions. On the one hand, there is a system of relationships with the capitalist world which makes it necessary to work out a correct policy in the interests of socialism and the world revolutionary movement. The relations between the two worlds constitute a battle-line in the class struggle, whatever the specific forms this struggle may take. On the other hand, today socialism is developing as a system of states, and the relations between them are also of a political nature. Finally, certain social relations exist within the socialist states as socialism is not a wholly homogeneous society and still retains class and social distinctions. The coming together of classes and social groups does not detract from the leading role of the working class and its political vanguard. This is a process in the course of which the working class wins the peasantry and intelligentsia over to its policies and ideology, and rallies the people around itself.

In the development of socialism the Party also has the role of correlating a wide diversity of interests. Although the fundamental interests of all social strata are identical, social distinctions persist and there are numerous specific interests which must be duly taken into account in policy decisions. Take, for example, the problem of balancing long-term and current interests. In the economy it finds expression in the correlation between accumulation and consumption. It has been amply shown that neither a one-sided consumer approach, which fails to take long-term interests into

account, nor neglect of the people's immediate needs can promote socialist construction. The Party stands in the van of society and as such is spokesman for the supreme national interests. In its policy it ensures that fundamental national interests are met, and at the same time sees to it that the specific, particular interests of social groups are not neglected. There are certain contradictions here, and it is the Party's task to reveal them in good time and determine the ways of resolving them most conducive to the unity of socialist society.

But the Party is not the only organizer of the people in the building of socialism and communism. There exists a whole system of organizations, state and public. The Party guides them towards the common goal but does not substitute for them. When such substitution does occur it is often used by revisionists to contrapose democracy to the guiding role of the Party. However, democracy without the Party's guiding role is tantamount to anarchy.

Degrees of political consciousness vary in a socialist society and it is the duty of the Party, as the leading, most politically conscious section of the people, to reveal the true import of the ideals of socialism to the masses at large. It is here that the Party's role as an ideological leader and bearer of Marxist-Leninist ideas manifests itself to the fullest.

The Party's role increases together with society's progress towards more mature stages of socialism. But this is not an automatic process. Theoretically speaking, it is a question of correlating spontaneous and conscious elements in the mechanism of regulation of the life of society.

Socialism, Prof. Glezerman said in conclusion, requires appropriate methods of leadership. The importance of scientific foresight and prognostication, methods of persuasion and correct organization of the nation's forces is greater than ever before. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union devotes much attention to questions of scientific guidance of society.

In analyzing the process of socialist construction, B. Szabo, Cand. Hist., (Budapest) emphasized, one should not lose sight of the fact that the new communist society, as Lenin wrote, "has its origin in capitalism, that it develops historically from capitalism, that it is the result of the action of a social force to which capitalism gave birth." (Vol. 25, p. 458). Sundry critics of socialism measure real socialism by an idealized model abstracted from the con-

crete historical conditions and then criticize it from this platform. Yet it was Marx and Engels who wrote in "The German Ideology," "Communism is for us not a *stable state* which is to be established, an *ideal* to which reality will have to adjust itself. We call communism the *real* movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence."

A tendency has come into evidence in the Communist movement to ignore and skip stages in the development of the new society. Some leaders of the movement failed to reckon with the fact that the building of socialism is a complex, many-sided process extending over a relatively long period of time. In this respect the building of socialism in Hungary provides some pertinent examples.

Like the working class in the other people's democracies, the Hungarian working class began building the new society in incomparably more favorable conditions than did the Soviet people. Hungary was not alone in a capitalist ocean and it relied on the economic, political, moral and military strength of the Soviet Union. The Hungarian working class' struggle was additionally facilitated by the fact that government of the workers had won out in most neighboring countries and formation of the socialist world system had begun. All this made possible a more considered and systematic transition to socialism. In a message to the Communists of Transcaucasia Lenin pointed out: "We fought to make the first breach in the wall of world capitalism. The breach has been made. . . . You . . . have no need to force a breach. You must take advantage of the favorable international situation in 1921, and learn to build the new with greater caution and more method" (Vol. 32, pp. 317-318).

Socialist construction in Hungary benefited from the fact that we had no civil war and the development of the revolution was peaceful and gradual. During the struggle for power the production facilities, far from suffering any damage, continued to develop. Rehabilitation of the war-ravaged economy proceeded swiftly, and by 1949 industrial output had surpassed the prewar level. As the democratic developed into the socialist revolution the workers and peasants gradually learned the art of administration, a large section of the intelligentsia and old specialists were drawn into socialist construction.

At the same time, the peaceful transition to socialism raised certain problems. The fundamental contradiction between petty-bourgeois and socialist democracy was not so clearly defined as in the case when armed struggle clearly demarcates the frontline. The peaceful, gradual transition helped to win over the masses but did not ensure their unswerving support once and for all.

The former leaders of the Hungarian Workers' Party, however, failed to take this into consideration. The favorable conditions led to erroneous conclusions that socialism could be built very quickly. This found expression in an industrialization policy that failed to take due account of the country's possibilities and set unrealistic tasks. Because of this the goals of raising living standards and developing agriculture were not achieved. The Party leadership's undue haste in transforming agriculture—primarily through administrative measures—was especially disastrous. Voluntarism, the view that, holding power, one can do whatever one wishes, began to dominate.

The grave consequences of this policy indicate that objective economic laws cannot be violated with impunity and the building of socialism cannot be regarded as a solely economic question. The creation of material conditions must go hand in hand with the formation of political conditions and the fostering of socialist consciousness.

Greater circumspection and system in the building of socialism, Comrade Szabo said, would have yielded better results than haste and a drive for speedy successes coupled with an underestimation of the importance of ideological work and the use of predominantly administrative methods in leading the masses.

The leadership of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party has taken this experience into account and resolutely rejected "Left-wing" views. The agrarian policy pursued since 1956 helped to improve the living standards of working peasants and stimulated smallholders to boost production. Within a short period the cooperatives grew stronger, which enhanced their attractive force. The HSWP has also done away with Right-wing opportunism, with views according to which the socialist transformation of agriculture is a spontaneous process. It rejected the point of view which regards the cooperatives as mere appendages to big industrial enterprises. The Party countered all these views with emphasis on the pri-

mary role of policy. It strictly adhered to the Leninist principle of voluntary association, which presumes comprehensive educational work, mass propaganda and all-round help and support on the part of the working class and other urban workers in the creation and strengthening of farm co-operatives.

The establishment of socialist relations of production in all branches of the economy, Com. Szabo went on, on the whole coincided in time with the creation of the technico-material base of socialism and the cultural revolution. This, however, does not mean that such coincidence is necessary. Thus, some countries embarked on the transition from capitalism to socialism with the material and technical base already there. There are instances where this base had to be created after the proletariat's victory, but this process did not coincide with the socialist reorganization of agriculture, which for objective or subjective reasons may still be some time coming. Finally, historical conditions may be such that socialist relations of production come to dominate in the economy, the cultural revolution is well advanced, yet the creation of the material and technical base still requires considerable time.

Rapid industrial progress in Hungary provided the material base for the socialist reorganization of agriculture. As a result of the cultural revolution, the former ruling classes' monopoly in education was liquidated, general educational and professional standards of the working people rose markedly, Marxism-Leninism prevailed in ideological life, and socialist social consciousness gained a firm foothold. In 1962 the Eighth Party Congress stated that the foundation of socialism had been built in Hungary and the Hungarian people, having won a new historic victory, had entered the epoch of the complete building of socialism.

As Comrade Janos Kadar pointed out at the Ninth Party Congress, at the end of 1966, to complete the building of socialism it is necessary to: strengthen and develop government by the working class, the people; strengthen and perfect socialist property relations; ensure the growth of the productive forces and promote their more rational utilization; ensure domination of the Marxist outlook and strengthen socialist consciousness and the spirit of collectivism; continue to reduce the difference between manual and mental labor, between town and countryside; increase labor

productivity, mainly by enhancing technological standards and improving organization of labor; increase the profitability of production in industry, agriculture and other main branches of the national economy; ensure the further enhancement of the level of professional knowledge and the general educational and cultural standards of the people; improve the system of distribution and boost consumption and living standards.

"Many years of work will be needed before we complete the building of a socialist society in our country," Comrade Kadar emphasized, "but the fruits thereof will be enjoyed by generations living today."

An integral part of this work was the enhancement of the Party's leading role, the reform of the system of economic management begun in 1968, as well as many adopted or planned measures aimed at developing socialist democracy.

Speaking further of the relation of the stage of socialist development, through which Hungary is now passing to communism, Comrade Szabo said that in his view the struggle for the complete building of socialism merged to a considerable degree with the creation of the prerequisites of communism. He cited Lenin's words that the great socialists' forecast that the higher phase of the development of communism will arrive "presupposes not the present productivity of labor and *not the present* ordinary run of people" (Vol. 25, pp. 469-70). Marx defined the criteria of the higher stage of communism as a high level of development of the productive forces eliminating man's subordination to the division of labor and the differences between mental and manual labor; labor ceases being only a means of existence and becomes a primary necessity of life. All this can be achieved as a result of a long development in the course of which man himself is so transformed that he gets used to obeying, as Lenin put it, the elementary rules of social life, known for ages and repeated for millennia in all canons, and to observing them without force, without coercion, without that special machinery for compulsion we call the state.

The advance to communism in the countries where socialism has already triumphed is greatly hindered by the aggressive policies of imperialist states, which compels the socialist countries to allocate a considerable part of their resources for military needs. Nor can it be denied that anti-communist propaganda and ideological sub-

version affects the consciousness of people and in some cases may even determinatively influence their thinking and actions.

The historical competition, the struggle of the two world systems is further complicated by the fact that in many instances socialism has triumphed in countries formerly economically underdeveloped. It requires considerable effort to overcome the heritage of the past. The process is difficult, at times agonizing, and the development is not all plain sailing. This too is exploited by bourgeois propaganda to distort the historic place of socialism and denigrate the socialist countries' achievements.

Asked whether Hungarian scientific literature made any distinction between the concepts "complete construction of socialism" and "creation of developed socialism," Comrade Szabo said that in his view it was a question of terminology; when we speak of the task of complete construction of socialism we mean building up a developed socialist society.

The term "stage," said Com. Aroio, makes it possible to define certain sub-stages in the development of a given phase. Differences between stages can be established by defining various aspects of the relations of production, the basic features of the phase within which the stages are defined remaining the same.

The development of capitalism and socialism shows that in different countries stages may be modified according to concrete historical, national, economic and other features. It is difficult to forecast the specific substages through which long-term social development may pass as this requires a very detailed analysis of the dynamics of relations of production and productive forces. If the distinction between the terms "stage" and "phase" were clarified this would enable a more precise definition of their socio-economic content of different substages in the development of society.

The victory of socialism concludes the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism. In Bulgaria this historic landmark was passed in 1957-58. But after the victory of socialism the maturity of socialist relations of production still remains incomplete. Their development constitutes the content of the stage of creation of a mature socialist society. As noted in the Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960, a number of socialist states entered this stage towards the end of the fifties and beginning of the sixties. In the

view of some Bulgarian sociologists, in Bulgaria the stage of creation of developed socialism commenced in the latter fifties. This, however, was, in Dr. Aroio's view, preceded by the implementation of a number of tasks aimed mainly at crystallizing the new socialist relations of production. It was only in the latter part of the sixties that Bulgaria faced the immediate task of building up a developed socialist society.

Dr. Aroio pointed out certain characteristic features which in present-day conditions mark the beginning of this stage and which determine some of its basic aspects. In the economic sphere the most important of these are, as shown by Bulgaria's example, development of industry in accordance with the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution, notably its automation, expansion of the social division of labor, introduction of a new system of economic management, etc. To these features can be added certain external economic factors such as the introduction of more mature forms of economic cooperation between socialist states, expansion of processes of international socialist economic integration, etc.

The stages "creation of a developed socialist society" and "transition from socialism to communism" differ. Building up developed socialism does not entail the establishment of communist forms of economy, though the prerequisites for this are being prepared. The difference between the two stages lies in their strategic objectives: the former sees the maturing of socialist forms, in the latter communist forms take root. But no sharp line can be drawn between the stages.

Answering a question concerning the terms "phase" and "stage," Com. Aroio said that in his view their content differed. Several stages can be distinguished within a phase, depending on historical, national and other peculiarities.

To the question, what served as a basis for asserting that socialism had triumphed, the establishment of socialist relations of production or some specified degree of their maturity, Com. Aroio said that socialism triumphs with the establishment of socialist relations of production in all sectors of the economy.

H. Cholaj, Cand. Econ., (Warsaw), examined the stages of socialist growth in agriculture. As Marx showed in "Capital," the stages of capitalist development are stages of technical progress and the rise of the productivity of social labor, and also

stages of transition from a formal to real subjugation of labor by capital. Marx demonstrated the organic connection between the stages of technical progress and the entire system of capitalist relations of production.

Lenin's approach to the material and technical basis of socialism was, in method, the same. Describing GOELRO (the Soviet national electrification plan) as the Party's "second program," Lenin pointed to the programmatic character of building the material and technical basis of socialism. Socialism, he stressed, presupposes productive forces greater than under capitalism, implying that socialism stands for technical, as well as social progress.

The connection between technical growth and the new social system is a dual one. Final victory and consolidation of the new socialist relationships are inconceivable without a new technical basis. However, the new system, too, exercises an influence on technological growth and its efficiency. Productivity of labor depends not exclusively on technology, but also on production relations. The form of ownership, the economic system, play a very important role, but cannot secure a decisive growth of production without the necessary technological equipment.

Although the most advanced from the standpoint of production relations, socialist agriculture cannot enlarge and improve crop and animal farming without the essential up-to-date technical equipment.

In Poland's agriculture, as in that of many other countries, socialism faces a dual task: building the technical foundations of modern, highly productive farming and at the same time securing socio-economic reconstruction, remodelling property relations, distribution, and the like. The present stage of the agrarian policy of the Polish United Workers' Party consists essentially in combining rapid expansion of farm production with socialist changes in the countryside. Implementation of both tasks proceeds simultaneously. This involves, in particular, not only transition from individual small-scale peasant farming to large-scale socialist production, but also transition from "manufacture" to "industrial" agriculture. Underway now is a fairly rapid growth of basic assets. Expanding the material basis of socialism here is essentially based on the growth of the engineering, chemical and building materials industry, on greater power consumption, mechanization, greater melioration facili-

ties, and the like. The process in Poland is specific in that it concerns not only the socialized sector (state farms), but also individually-owned peasant farms, thus adopting a multiplicity of forms.

At present, individual farms are not exclusively private. Their economic base consists of partly private and partly public means of production, with the public gaining priority. At the same time, there has come into being a specific "infra-structure of personnel." This applies to education, training of agronomists, operators of farming machinery and instructors who are forming a veritable army of competent organizers of farming on a public scale. This is an extremely important element in the gradual socialization of Poland's agriculture.

The attempt to reconstruct Polish agriculture in the early fifties, Dr. Cholaj holds, was unsuccessful. The policy was prompted by the aim of concentrating land through ordinary peasant cooperation without providing the required material and technical basis. The present conditions in Poland offer no evidence to bear out the idea that co-operation of peasant households is possible and necessary in any and all conditions, regardless of the level of the material and technical basis, and even in its absence.

The idea that socialist relations of production give impetus to the complicated process of modernizing a backward agriculture has not proved effective in People's Poland. After 1956 a different principle was advanced: reconstructing social relations in the countryside on the basis of a priority creation of the modern technical basis of farming. Technology engenders new productive forces in agriculture, the growth of which will create the necessity of change in the sphere of production relations, of property relations, appreciated and approved by the peasants themselves. The peasants, as we know, are practical in thinking and rational in adopting economic solutions. They are an important element in resolving the tasks of socialist progress. Lacking their approval, socialist transformation of the countryside is bound to fail.

Technological fetishism may very well impel a technocratic approach to the reconstruction of the agricultural pattern. Socialism does not spring automatically from technological progress any more than co-operation of farming does from modern agricultural technology. There is no reason to regard the program of technical develop-

ment in agriculture as an alternative to the program of socialist reconstruction.

Dr. Cholaj criticized the view that the "manufacture" stage of socialism in agriculture is obligatory for all countries. He argued that equipping agriculture with machinery prior to mass collectivization is not a latter-day variety of the "productive forces theory" of E. Bernstein, K. Kautsky, et al, demolished by Lenin.

The lines along which socio-economic development will proceed in the Polish countryside are predetermined, and doubly so because the existence of a powerful community of socialist countries prevents external enemies from inciting class struggle in Poland. Internal conditions, like the external, rule out the revival of capitalism on the basis of small-scale farming. The Party has assessed the present rate of reconstructing agriculture as realistic and effective in the Polish — and only Polish — conditions.

Although the diversity of forms of socialist transformations fully consonant with the specific national features of each country increasingly manifests itself in the course of socialist construction, it must be emphasized that absolutely all methods of creating the new society rest on common laws of development. Neglect of these laws, Com. Cholaj pointed out, leads to revisionism.

The objective laws governing the development of the different periods of the communist socio-economic formation are the same for all countries, U. Kambar said. Referring to the specifics of transition from pre-bourgeois relations to socialism in Mongolia, he said it was completed with the laying of the fundamentals of socialism. This means that Mongolia has become an agrarian-industrial country and the foundations of the material and technical base of socialism have been laid.

The country has built a single socialist economic system. The roots of the exploitation of man by man have been eliminated. A socialist revolution has been performed in the cultural and ideological spheres. Although it is still uncompleted, a new culture has emerged — national in form and socialist in content. Marxism-Leninism has become the dominant ideology.

With the laying of the foundations of socialism, the people's welfare has risen and the medical services have improved. In per capita production and consumption, socialist Mongolia is ahead of many African, Asian and Latin American countries.

The Mongolian people have become a socialist nation and their socio-political unity has been fully achieved. The MPRP, the nation's guiding and organizing force, is a Marxist-Leninist party. At present, workers constitute some 30 per cent of its membership.

We have not yet achieved the complete victory of socialism, Kambar said, and our people face the task of doing so in the near future. The 14th Congress of the MPRP in 1961 set the task of completing the building of socialist society and its material and technical base. In 1966 the 15th Congress of the MPRP endorsed a new Party program, envisaging the complete victory of socialism in Mongolia. In the long term, it sets the aim of completing the material and technical basis consonant with mature socialism; the country's development into an industrial-agrarian state; completing the cultural revolution; quantitative and qualitative growth of the national working class and technical intelligentsia, and achieving the economic and cultural niveau and living standard of the more developed socialist countries. Once these targets are reached, the country will begin building a developed socialist society.

E. Panfilov, Cand. Phil., (*Problems of Peace and Socialism*) stressed the great dynamism of socialism, a most important feature. Socialism, he said, should be gauged not only in a static condition, but in its dynamics. In "The State and Revolution" Lenin showed that socialism is not an immutable social condition, but a developing society that is gradually passing to communism. For Lenin it was important to "realize how infinitely mendacious is the ordinary bourgeois conception of socialism as something lifeless, rigid, fixed once and for all" (Vol. 25, p. 472). The development of socialism, Lenin pointed out, will have its successive stages, phases, and degrees of "economic maturity." Lenin's post-October works treat the relation of communism and socialism also from the standpoint of socialism's development, with communism described as the "highest stage of socialism" (Vol. 33, p. 404), as "socialism in its developed form," a "completed socialism" (Vol. 27, pp. 147, 148). Consequently, socialism differs from communism primarily by reason of its incompleteness, by the incomplete development of the economic basis of the new society. It is a fluid, developing system which acquires new qualities and the properties of a communist society.

However, for all its dynamism socialism is a qualitatively specific society with a relatively stable socio-economic structure, which, like any other society, has its own typical properties. This qualitative specificity is associated with the fact that in the socialist stage the laws governing the functioning and growth of the new society operate in inadequate material production conditions. The transition to communism does not occur after socialism, not even simply in the "thick" of socialism, but through socialism's development and the emergence and operation of all its advantages. Properties of socialism that may at present appear most essential will waste away in a higher stage. Naturally, the growth of the new society follows a definite order and encompasses a number of stages.

The concept "stage" is the basis for classifying countries as to the maturity of socialism, and is, therefore, of general methodological significance. The concepts, "building the foundations of socialism" and "building a developed socialist society" represent the general line of the socialist development of all countries. To determine in what stage of socialist construction a country is, we must analyze the aggregate of the tasks being fulfilled at the given time, then single out the basic ones, because they determine its content. It would be wrong to measure the processes of socialist growth by motion along a fancied curve of "socialistness" with given levels of production and culture, degree of democracy, and the like.

Examining degrees of growth, Marxists had earlier operated with such fundamental concepts as "transitional period," "socialist phase" and "communist phase." Later, when building the new society, it turned out that the concrete historical demarcation line between the socialist phase and the transitional period was mobile and relative. In the case of some countries socio-economic development showed evidence of factors of the socialist phase while the transitional period was not yet over. In other countries, private property had been converted into public before the completion of the material and technical basis conforming with socialism.

The concept, "building the foundations of socialism" helps register these differences, singling out the factors common to countries where the main contradiction of the transitional period, "who beats whom?" is already resolved in favor of socialism and the appropriate conditions have been se-

cured for the comprehensive building of socialist society. It stands to reason that in each case we should approach the question in concrete terms, taking full account of the real results of socialist development. The process of building the new society may be more phased in one country and less so in another, but all within the framework of the stages common for all countries. The same is true of the order of precedence in remodelling the various aspects of life. This dissimilar order of priorities from country to country was pinpointed by Lenin. "While the development of world history as a whole follows general laws," he said, "it is by no means precluded, but, on the contrary, presumed, that certain periods of development may display peculiarities in either the form or the sequence of this development" (Vol. 33, p. 477).

Summing up the factors on which the peculiarity of this sequence depends, we may single out the following: the resources of a nation for building the new society may differ substantially (highly developed industry or backward agrarian structure; a relatively high or low level of education and culture, etc.). Harmonizing the general line of economic and cultural development in the socialist countries takes much longer than converting private into public property. Due to this factor, coupled with chronological differences between socialist revolutions from country to country, substantial socio-economic disparities remain in the presence of more or less mature forms of socialism.

The sequence also depends on the stage in the development of the socialist system as a whole, on the world alignment of class forces. It is one thing, for example, to build socialism in a capitalist encirclement, and quite another to do so as a member of the socialist world community.

National features in the historically shaped economic structure, the geographic factor, size of territory and population, the national mentality, traditions, and the like, also exercise a strong influence on the order of priorities in the development of the new system. Relevant, too, is the course the class struggle takes. Though the general trend is the same in all countries, the class struggle becomes sharper at different stages depending on specific national conditions, the aggravation not necessarily occurring in the same stage of development from country to country.

Replying to questions, Panfilov said the

period of socialist construction, as he sees it, is divided into several stages. The initial stage is creating prerequisites for socialist construction by establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and placing the commanding economic heights in the hands of the state; the second—building the foundations of socialism, and the third—building developed socialism. It appears that the socialist phase does not end with the building of mature socialism; a still higher stage of socialist development lies ahead in the course of communist construction. The chronological limits of the transitional

period and the stage of building the foundations of socialism do not always coincide.

Speakers pointed out that the reason why the main stages of building the new society are obligatory for all is that socialist construction is governed by a set of common regularities and laws. The concrete historical conditions from country to country may, however, predicate a differing phasedness. In correct evaluations of the stage, bypassing objectively necessary stretches or degrees, may do serious damage to socialist development.

III. MATURE SOCIALISM—ITS CHARACTERISTICS AND PROPERTIES

"The socialist world," says the Document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, "has now entered a stage of its development when the possibility arises of utilizing on a scale far greater than ever before the tremendous potentialities inherent in the new system. This is furthered by evolving and applying better economic and political forms corresponding to the requirements of mature socialist society." To elaborate on this important thesis, speakers devoted many of their contributions to the criteria of mature, developed socialism.

The concept of developed or mature socialism, V. Dobriyanov, Cand. Phil. (Sofia), said, rounds out our conception of building the new society, its various stages and criteria. The transitional period is followed by a long stretch of further socialist construction, the full maturation of socialism. In this stage the development of socialist society follows the objective laws of the first phase of communism. This is a comprehensive and phased process.

The prerequisites for building mature socialism are: complete victory of socialist relations of production in agriculture, as well as industry; elimination of the exploiting classes in town and country and creation of a society comprising friendly classes and strata; consolidation of socialist sociopolitical institutions; victory of the proletarian Marxist-Leninist ideology over the bourgeois in the main areas and re-orientation of the entire ideological front in line with Marxist-Leninist principles.

Though fully formed as a comprehensive social system, socialist society continues to develop, improve and mature. The length of time this takes, Dobriyanov said, is not sufficient reason to regard socialism as a

relatively independent socio-economic formation.

It is one of the more substantive features of building mature socialism that the further development of the new society occurs on its own basis, the basis of socialist relations. In the previous stage socialism built up strength and grew while locked in irreconcilable struggle against capitalism. Now, positive tasks—the tasks of assuring an increasingly fuller operation of the specific laws and features of socialism—come to the fore. Building a mature socialist society is not only, and less, a process of purging it of survivals of the past, than of developing its own essential characteristics. To be sure, survivals inherited from the past still exist, and it is a vital task to combat them. But this is no more than a complementary task to the main one: the fullest possible development of the essentially socialist principles.

It may be pointed out by analogy that capitalism, too, began to develop on its own basis when the manufacture period ended, machine industry appeared, and capitalist production relations became predominant.

Construction of the developed socialist society comprises a number of sub-stages and stretches, each carrying it closer to peak maturity, at which begins the direct passage to communism. The sub-stages differ from country to country, depending on the level of development and various other objective and subjective factors.

Referring to methods of defining criteria of the developed socialist society, Dobriyanov outlined two approaches. In the case of the systemic approach, he said, the main criterion is rooted in the intrinsic laws of socialist development, and in

the comparative approach it is deduced from comparison with capitalism.

Combating petty-bourgeois views, Lenin had stressed that socialism cannot be built on a backward underdeveloped economic foundation. After winning power and expropriating the expropriators, the working class must forge new social relationships and push up the productivity of labor. It was by following this line that the Soviet Union became a mighty industrial power.

Socialist construction is taking place in the midst of the scientific-technical revolution. Using all its achievements and securing unintermittent progress in the realm of social relations is an important form of class struggle in the international context. Surpassing the labor productivity indices of the most developed capitalist countries, Dobriyanov held, is unsuited as a criterion of the developed socialist society. As he sees it, productivity is one of the criteria of the communist formation as a whole, not of its first phase. Despite a lower productivity of labor, socialism as an aggregate system is superior to the capitalist by the nature of its social relations, rates of extended reproduction, social and cultural advance, etc. Beyond question, however, the rate of material production and the productivity of labor of the capitalist world will be exceeded in due course.

The principal criterion of developed socialism should be a complex one, for the maturity of the new society does not depend on some single factor, but on the aggregate of interconnected indicators relating to the superstructure, as well as to the basis of a country and to its international ties. Socialism is no island isolated from the rest of the world. A socialist country may be regarded as a relatively independent social system, that is, a body of definite social relations, institutions, etc., and also as a system of associations with all the other socialist states and the rest of the world.

The socio-economic system of the developed socialist society is distinguished by a high level of the productive forces based on the latest achievements of the scientific-technical revolution and increasingly capable of satisfying the rapidly growing social and personal requirements; a rational structure of production; effective production, with a high productivity of social labor and high profitability, the appropriate forms of social organization in production and management, highly efficient concentration, specialization and coopera-

tion, expanding international socialist division of labor, and increasing economic integration of the socialist countries; the fullest operation of the economic laws of socialism and, among others, the principle of distribution according to work done; further blending and fusion of the two forms of socialist ownership—state and cooperative—into ownership of the whole people and the gradual conversion of farm labor into a variety of industrial labor.

Dobriyanov said that agro-industrial complexes are being built up in Bulgaria on the basis of total agricultural cooperation and saturation of farming with modern technology. This is seen as a way of gradually fusing the two forms of socialist property and converting agricultural into a variety of industrial labor.

The speaker listed a number of criteria of developed socialism in the social and spiritual domains, stressing the need for a sweeping improvement of the system of social administration. That the process is in train may be inferred from the continuing development of socialist democracy, the evolution of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people, the growth of the Communist Party into a party of the whole people, and from the expansion of the Party's leading role. All the facets of the social system in mature socialism develop harmoniously.

The high degree of integration of the socialist countries in the socio-political, as well as economic domains, is another typical feature of developed socialism, which, however, does not imply any erosion of national frontiers. Concluding his contribution, Dobriyanov noted that the criteria he had listed are a measure of the maturity of socialism, of its culminating stretch when all objectively necessary requisites are available for gradual transition to communism.

Speaking of the essence of developed socialism and its criteria, Prof. Butenko stressed that the problem is of recent vintage in both practice and theory, though the term, "developed socialist society," had been repeatedly used by Lenin (see *Complete Works*, in Russian, Vol. 36, p. 139; Vol. 30, p. 331). Examining the matter, one should bear in mind not only the historical niveau attained by the Soviet Union and the socialist gains of other peoples, but also the perspective of the further advancement of world socialism. The new society does not mark time. It advances from one point to the next, until it reach-

es a degree of maturity predicated its direct passage to communism.

Developed socialism is an order in which the advantages of the new social system, of its economic and political arrangement, are in full play: its objective laws and principles operate to the fullest and the new social relationships blend with the technico-scientific revolution. It is a key stage on the way to communism.

Assessing the maturity of socialism requires a multiple approach, covering all the aspects and spheres of social life. Some criteria are historical: applicable today, they will hardly be valid after a time, because the material and technical basis will acquire other features.

Economic indicators of the developed capitalist countries, Comrade Butenko held, are not valid as economic criteria of developed socialism; to determine the right criteria, he added, we must first determine the intrinsic features and characteristics typical of developed socialism. This does not eliminate the concrete need for comparing these economic criteria with the levels attained by the highly-developed capitalist states, because the material and technico-scientific requisites of socialism already exist in those countries.

Prof. Butenko went on to list what he held to be criteria of developed socialism. His concept of its material and technical basis implies use of the latest achievements of the technico-scientific revolution, the corresponding level of concentration and socialization, and the proper degree of internationalization of production. Developed socialism implies elimination of the essential disparities in the productivity of industry, agriculture, building, and the other principal spheres of production lacking which the basic principle of socialism, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work," would not be fully applicable. It should be borne in mind, of course, that the material and technical basis may have specific features from country to country and that detailing the overall picture is, therefore, difficult, in some cases even impossible.

The economic system of developed socialism is based on two forms of public ownership and is distinguished by a well-gearred mechanism of organizational and economic relationships securing the full operation and use of socialism's economic laws. The material welfare standard in the developed socialist society should, apparently, be higher than the average for the highly-developed capitalist states.

Going on to the socio-political sphere, Prof. Butenko enumerated the following criteria: far from having antagonistic classes, developed socialism witnesses the gradual eradication of some of the substantive distinctions between the essentially socialist social classes. Political power is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat, but the power of the whole people led by the working class and the Marxist-Leninist vanguard. The political system is people's power, guaranteeing and securing free expression for the masses and their participation not only in forming representative bodies, but also in working out and controlling the implementation of political decisions. The role of the Marxist-Leninist Party, which scientifically coordinates all elements of the body politic and assures the ideological and political unity of society in the advance to communism, is in no way reduced.

In conclusion, Butenko listed a few criteria in the realm of public consciousness, stressing that under developed socialism the Marxist-Leninist ideology becomes the outlook of all social groups and the scientific basis for all solutions and practical actions.

The general characteristics of developed socialism, its motive forces and advantages were closely examined by Prof. H. Koziolek (Berlin), who said that building it should be regarded as a process of developing all the main aspects of the existing socialism, and at once as the decisive condition for successful struggle against imperialism.

The developed social system of socialism, he said, is anything but static. Highly dynamic by nature, the new society is from the outset superior to the capitalist in many respects, but for all its benefits to unfold fully, a high level of labor productivity is necessary. "The developed socialist social system," Comrade Walter Ulbricht pointed out at the Seventh Congress of the SUPG, "has a high level and rapid rate of growth of the social productive forces, stably developing socialist relations of production, a powerful socialist state, all-round development of socialist democracy, a high standard of education and better living and working conditions. It is distinguished by the fact that socialist ideology and culture pervade all spheres of social life." Planning and the administration of a developed socialist society set qualitatively new demands on the

leading role of the working class, its Party, and the socialist state.

The main accent in building the developed socialist social system in the German Democratic Republic is on constructing an economic basis oriented on the fullest use of the productive possibilities of the new system, on the most up-to-date achievements of the scientific and technological revolution. The direct effects of the main economic law of socialism—the historically specific scale and universality of the manner of effecting the general law of time economy—show that socialism is the most rational and most humane mode of production ever known. By virtue of its law-governed development it leads increasingly to a rational organization of society and the reproduction of social life by and for man.

Socialism will not accomplish its social tasks on the basis of some mean productivity of labor. The socialist character of labor, the socialist way of life and system of education, require a high degree of productivity and effectiveness of production, and, in turn, influence them. Upbringing and education is inconceivable without a continually rising efficiency of social labor any more than a continually rising efficiency of labor is conceivable without upbringing and education. Marx regarded the spiritual richness of the individual as the most potent productive force of the future society.

Socialist economic development should be tied in closely with all other spheres. This necessitates qualitatively new methods in utilizing the economic laws of socialism. Self-evident, for one thing, is the need for prognostication in administering society; the long-term plan should be made the main lever of administration, and planning should be highly effective and closely associated with the development of socialist democracy. These days, Prof. Koziolk said, all spheres—the system of education, culture, law, democracy, politico-ideological work, etc.—should be advanced in conformity with the economic system of socialism. This will enable us to build a developed socialist society with the minimum expenditure and in a historically short time.

Referring to the advantages and motive forces of socialism, Prof. Koziolk said that conscious use of economic laws should secure an unintermittent growth of the productivity of labor and effectiveness of production. This is the fundamental problem of the economic, and hence poli-

tical, consolidation of socialism. All the advantages and motive forces of the new society must be made to work. This applies to combining the participation of working people in resolving the social tasks and in running the economy with consummate scientific planning and a rational organization of the economy and all social life on a national scale. It applies, too, to a concrete and effective combination of the material and spiritual interests of individuals and their groups with the public requirements.

The development of socialist society—especially in the setting of the technico-scientific revolution—sets new qualitative demands on administration and necessitates a continuous qualitative improvement of the system and method of government and of its scientific standard. These special requirements flow from the further socialization of production and labor, predicated the new basic tendency in the development of the socialist social system. As a part of this process, science and research are becoming an essential element of the large-scale socialist production, a part of social reproduction, pervading all its phases. Socialization also extends to the educational system, the planned training and improvement of personnel. Further socialization sees huge industrial complexes appearing in the GDR, forming a dependable basis for the socialist organization of science and the rapid use in production of the results of research, changing the material and technical basis of production, division of labor and organizational structure of the economic units, as well as the relationships among the working people, with all economic branches gradually encompassed by the new methods of industrial production and management.

The socialist socialization of science and production impels international economic and technico-scientific cooperation on an unprecedented scale, for the efforts to attain the highest possible labor productivity and effectiveness of production, are not likely to succeed unless there is a close alliance and the closest cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

A highly productive economy, Prof. Koziolk concluded, is not an aim in itself, but a means to advancing all other aspects of life in the socialist society.

G. Shakhnazarov, Dr. Law, Executive Secretary of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, spoke of the political and social cri-

teria of developed or mature socialism. The value of a criterion, he said, depended on how concrete it was. Despite reservations, he added, quantitative definitions were possible for the economy. Whether we speak of a labor productivity higher than in the developed capitalist countries or proceed from the degree to which the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution have been and are being introduced in production, or take our measurements from the degree of development of the productive forces satisfying scientifically grounded requirements of individuals and society as a whole—all these yardsticks are quantitative criteria, though not necessarily expressed in direct mathematical terms. More complicated is it to define criteria in the social and political domains where quantitative indicators are difficult, even impossible, to apply.

All the same, Marxist-Leninist science and the experience of socialist construction provide definite criteria of developed socialism in these two domains. Speaking of the political organization of society, we should refer ourselves to such factors as the broad participation of the masses in administering the state; the effective mechanism of public control, which detects and helps rectify—either in the practice of government bodies or in production—all departures from socialist principles or distortions of the political course set by the Party; the guarantees of legality, of public order, the social rights and political freedoms of the citizens; the system of institutions assuring the appointment of the most authoritative and dedicated people with the essential special qualifications to all public and government offices; and the solid democratic traditions, lacking which no institution can be effective.

To be sure, these criteria could be expanded, presented in greater detail, redefined, etc., with many other possible and necessary ones added.

Communist Party guidance is the decisive prerequisite, a law, for the growth of socialist society in all stages—from the victory of the revolution to the complete maturity of socialism and the building of communism. Communism cannot be built without Communists. It is concrete criteria that conclusively accentuate the role of the Party as organizer and guarantor of socialist democracy. The Party has the main say in setting up the democratic machinery and assuring the highest possible efficiency of government. This is the reason for the

greater role played by the Party in the stage of mature socialism.

It is proper to stress at this point, the speaker said, the need for well-argued criticism of the Right and "Left" opportunist conceptions of "separation from government" and "fusion with government." Though opposite at first glance, the two concepts are, in effect, likely to yield the same result: erosion of the Party's prestige and influence, loss of the socialist perspective and deformation of the socialist system. Socialism's interest requires strict observance of the Leninist principles of Party guidance, the main functions of which center on working out the political line and organizing its implementation, coordinating the activity of government and public organizations, and educating the people in the spirit of scientific communism.

Internal criteria should be complemented by the international one, without which development of the socialist society is inconceivable. What the international criterion amounts to is versatile political cooperation with fraternal countries, coordination of their foreign policies and joint international action in the common interest of the socialist world system, as well as the respective national interests.

The social criteria include the socio-political unity of society, equality of people and nations, and the advance towards a classless society, a gradual eradication of the disparities between town and countryside and between mental and manual labor.

Socio-political unity does not imply homogeneity. Although the process leading to social homogeneity is under way, it is a more remote aim, attainable in a communist society. So long as socialist society exists, there will exist different social strata and groups with their specific interests. These interests, since they exist, are bound to interact and may even conflict, though the contradictions cannot be antagonistic. Indeed, it is the main feature of socio-political unity that it allows for the resolution of all contradictions not through conflict, but through cooperation. And again, the decisive role in this is played by the working class and the Marxist-Leninist Party. The leading political force supported by all classes and strata, representative of their vital and common interests, the Party takes into account in its policy the specific interests of the various social groups, securing the unity of all society and averting social conflicts.

It is wrong, the speaker said, to make a fetish of criteria, to erect a mental pattern and draw conclusions on its basis that one country is developed, another more highly developed, etc. When defining criteria, and then using them, we may be tempted to fit some real experience into their framework. That, it appears, was what happened in interpreting the objective of a higher productivity of labor: since that objective has not yet been achieved—a fact that drops out of the general scheme—some say that it should, perhaps, be shifted to the communist phase, or that it should be re-defined.

This is hardly right, Comrade Shakhnazarov said. It overlooks the fact that developed socialism is a stage we can pinpoint at some fixed moment, but also a large stage. Consequently, some of the tasks may have to be worked on throughout the duration of that stage. Socialism has made tremendous economic progress, but the possibilities of the new system are not as yet fully utilized. We should remember that our system has existed a mere 50 years or so, while the capitalist formation took more than just one century to scale the peak, to display its potentialities.

Defining the features of developed or mature socialism, we should not scorn criteria of an indirect or, one might say, negative order. While enumerating what should be, we should also refer to what should not be in a developed socialist society: cult of the individual, voluntarism, etc. This does not mean that socialist society is totally immune to negative phenomena, but that the political mechanism of developed socialism enables us to react to, and rectify, departures from the socialist principles. We do not need the criteria to measure the living practice of socialism against any abstract ideal, but to help us get our bearings chronologically, to obtain a clearer picture of the main tasks and to work purposefully in eliminating everything unsocialist, everything traceable to survivals of the old system in the economy, politics, ideology, way of life, and the like.

As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, observed in his report, "Fifty Years of Great Socialist Victories," the Soviet Communist Party does not regard the construction of the developed socialist society, completed in the USSR, as culminating the work of developing socialism. It sets a number of tasks that can and must be resolved precisely in the socialist framework, alongside tasks relating to communist construction. These interlace,

so that at times they cannot be separated. This is the living dialectics of the development of socialism and the gradual emergence and maturing of communism.

The development of socialist society, said Comrade I. Mitran (*Bucharest*), Deputy Editor of the journal *Lupta de Clase*, is a complex process of transformation and improvement. In socialist society, especially when it is maturing, there takes place an intensive creative process of economic, Party and state building, of evolving more perfect forms of social organization and management, and lastly, which is very important, of moulding the new man, advanced in all respects. This is why fully developed socialist society is a stage at which a high level of development of the productive forces is coupled with a flourishing culture, science and education.

One of the main ideas of building a fully developed socialist society in Rumania is, according to the Tenth Congress of the RCP, steadily to perfect social relations and develop an organizational framework within which every citizen can prove his worth in social and political life and which will encourage increasing participation of the masses in administering public affairs, help extend the freedoms and foster socialist democracy. These requirements are met by consolidating socialist relations of production in town and countryside, through lasting achievements in building up the material and technical basis of socialism and the fact that the Rumanian people have definitively chosen socialism.

In the case of Rumanian experience, Comrade Mitran said, the obvious conclusion is that the socialist state has been developing in an atmosphere of a victorious offensive of socialism in every field. State power was the lever which helped to carry out socialist industrialization, put agriculture on a cooperative basis, raise the cultural standard of the masses and in this way thoroughly to reshape Rumanian society, in which hostile classes no longer exist. No longer can we speak of the socialist state—or any other socio-political category—in the same way as when the worker-peasant state was historically constrained to use part of its potential for settling the basic class issue of "who will win?" The social basis of the state today is homogeneous and united from the point of view of fundamental interests. This determines the evolution of its role and functions to a greater extent than in the preceding stages

as regards creative social, economic and political activity.

The forms of government and social organization are not immutable and socio-economic development, its pace and scale are conditioned by the ability of the state to adapt itself to progressive changes in society. A dynamic socio-economic life is incompatible with inflexible, rigid forms of organization. The totality of measures taken in Rumania is aimed, therefore, at introducing—as a means of improving the application of the principle of democratic centralism—a number of organizational patterns and methods of exercising political power that will make the state machinery more flexible and efficient and enable it to react promptly to the exigencies. The socialist state is the fundamental institution, at once solid and flexible, which can adjust itself to dynamic qualitative and quantitative changes in the basis and in the superstructure of society.

While socialism is maturing it is important that there should be a continuous improvement of socialist democracy, a socio-political system which can ensure constant and growing participation of the masses in administering public affairs and in working out and implementing programs for the development of socialism. By continuously extending direct and representative democracy, leading bodies at all levels can use the initiative and experience of the masses and the expertise of numerous specialists, verify the validity of measures adopted and take account of corrections suggested by collective wisdom. In Rumania this expresses itself, among other things, in the use of a number of forms of popular participation in the specification of the main lines of the state plan and local plans and in the approval of collective forms of administering economic and social affairs.

In the light of Marxist theory and social practice, we may list a number of objective factors which account for the need to lead socialist society on a unified basis as it advances to communism. These factors are the dialectical relationship between the objective and subjective elements in the development of socialism, the predominance of the conscious over the spontaneous, the necessity for a realistic estimation of possibilities and their adequate reflection in the political and, consequently, practical program, the scope of economic, social and cultural development tasks, and the complexity of present-day world relations forming the background against which social-

ism is being built. The objective conditions of a long period of history require dynamic action by the Communist Party, the only organized political force capable of appreciating objective social exigencies by creatively applying Marxism-Leninism in specific and constantly changing internal and external conditions, of translating them into a real program, of mobilizing the masses and convincing them of the feasibility of meeting these exigencies. Of special significance is it to improve the Party's work in summing up its own experience, that of other fraternal parties, and the general experience of public thinking, with the express purpose of resolving creatively all the problems that may arise.

As a political force uniting the most advanced contingents of the nation, the RCP, which frames its action program in a democratic spirit, contributes directly through its members and organizations to building a comprehensively developed socialist society.

I. Sedivy (Prague), Cand. Hist., stressed that, in his view, one of the criteria of developed socialism is a higher level of labor productivity than in the developed capitalist countries. True, one of the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism is that productivity cannot be the only, or decisive criterion. This, incidentally, is what sets Marxism apart from vulgar economism. Marxism insists, however, that labor productivity is one of the principal criteria of socialism, especially developed socialism. This is borne out by the practice of building the new society and the experience of the struggle against imperialism.

Lenin linked the attainment of higher productivity with socialism and not with communism alone, under which the productive forces must reach a qualitatively new level.

Comrade Sedivy held that the criterion of developed socialism—higher labor productivity compared with that of the developed capitalist countries—must not be reduced to comparing productivity in Czechoslovakia with the average of, say, 20 or 30 capitalist countries. What it should be compared with is productivity in West European countries, such as West Germany.

Labor productivity is not a purely economic matter. It affects every important sphere of social relations and the principles of socialism. It is a fundamental issue, too, because it indicates the solidity, specifically the political solidity, of socialism.

In the economy, as in the sphere of

ideology and politics, it is not merely a question of competition, but of struggle between socialism and capitalism. In 1960 socialism was declared to have triumphed in Czechoslovakia, and this was essentially so, for we had all the main properties of socialism. Why was it, then, Comrade Sedivy asked, that in 1968, after socialism had won, the very existence of socialism and the political power of the working class were called in question? And how was it that the workers' socialist consciousness was shaken, if only temporarily? The many reasons for this (primarily the subjective mistakes of our Party) include objective ones. There is no denying that among other things the counter-revolution made the most of Czechoslovakia's protracted lag in labor productivity behind its capitalist neighbors, traceable to a number of reasons. Doubt was sown among the working class as to socialism's advantages over capitalism. And since the Party had neglected its ideological work, counter-revolutionary elements and imperialist propaganda had no particular difficulty in corrupting a section of the working class ideologically and politically and thus jeopardizing the very existence of socialism.

The positions of socialism, its advancement and success in the fight against imperialism, may be consolidated if its development is based on the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution. It is in this field, and not all along the line, that we must overtake the capitalist countries. After all, even bourgeois theorists admit that the capitalist economy is heading for an impasse. We do not have to follow imperialism into that impasse. Our big theoretical task is to go on elaborating the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialist economics and of promoting the material conditions of life under socialism.

Speaking of methods of settling the issue of the criteria of developed socialist society, *Prof. Glezerman* stressed two points. First, the approach must be complex, treating the new society as an integral social entity. Developed socialism implies that every aspect of the life of society—economic, social, political and spiritual—is characterized by socialist maturity, which is indispensable for the first phase of communism, and that they accord with one another. For instance, socialist relations of production cannot be mature enough in the absence of a highly developed material and technical base. Without extensive socialist democracy the masses cannot show the creative activity

that is the soul of socialism. The revisionists reject this methodological approach and devise their own "models," dissociating the various aspects of socialism. Lenin criticized the subjective sociologists who regarded society as a simple, mechanical aggregate of institutions, a simple, mechanical complex of phenomena. This methodology is now used by the revisionists, who deform the ideal of socialism by supplementing it with various features of capitalism.

The model of "market socialism," for one, attempts a combination of public property with capitalist economic elements. The same is true of the model of "democratic socialism," whose advocates deny the need of the Communist party playing the leading role and insist on the need for opposition parties. The revisionists suggest combining some elements of socialist economics with a political super-structure of the bourgeois democratic variety. Yet this combination is unnatural. To combat revisionism effectively, we must consistently uphold the idea of socialism as an integral social system and proceed from the unity of the economic, political and cultural organization of society.

The second methodological requirement is to take a historical approach to the degree of maturity of socialism. One cannot settle this point without taking account of the level of world development. Lenin defined the material and technical base of socialism as large-scale machine industry. The Soviet Union built such a base by industrialization, but in estimating it at this time account must be taken of the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution. This also applies to the cultural progress of society. Socialism in our day is unthinkable without radio and television and modern mass media. The problem of out-stripping the capitalist countries in the economic field can be solved by different countries at different stages of socio-economic maturity of socialism. In any case, mature socialism implies a high standard and rate of development of every economic branch, the application of important achievements of science and technology, a high standard of life for the working people, and so on.

In the sphere of production relations, developed socialist society means that socialist forms must cover the entire economy and that the economic laws must be applied throughout society. As for the sphere of socio-political relations, the task

should be to bring all social groups still closer together and achieve a gradual eradication of the distinctions between them, although this process will not be completed in the first phase of communism.

As a result of all these social changes, we may also speak of the gradual development of the dictatorship of the working class into a state of the whole people. This process is completed in the Soviet Union, while in a number of other socialist countries it is only just beginning or is still to begin. There should be no undue haste in proclaiming a state of the whole people. The fact is that even after the exploiting classes have lost their economic positions the anti-socialist elements retain some means and possibilities of influencing events. This may be the case in countries where the socialist revolution took a relatively peaceful course. The existence in these conditions of a body of people who remain loyal to the old system may present definite dangers to the country's development, especially if mistakes of a Right-wing or "Left"-wing nature are made. Under socialism the class struggle ceases to be the motive power of the inner development of society and its focus shifts to the outside world. But this is a relatively long process and even under developed socialism we must combat survivals of the past in people's minds and re-educate those affected by them, which means that the ideological struggle must be continued.

Lastly, developed socialist society also presupposes highly developed culture and science and a well-educated population. This is particularly important because science is now becoming a direct productive force.

Prof. B. Zaharescu, member of the editorial board of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Corresponding Member of the SRR Academy of Sciences, said that the Tenth Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party had examined the program of socialist development for the next decade and set the task of building a comprehensively developed socialist society. What this means is not only building an advanced socialist economy equal in standard to that of the most developed countries, but perfecting every aspect of social life, raising science and culture to the highest level attainable in our time, expanding education to a degree to enable all our young people to receive at least a secondary education, steadily improving production relations in accordance with the productive

forces, fostering socialist democracy, extending civil liberties, encouraging every citizen to take an increasingly active part in government, and so forth.

What the RCP means by a diversified society is a socialist society in which all the aspects of social life develop in complete harmony. In such a society, economic development, for its part, should be diversified. Rumania has ample natural resources for this. Once it was a predominantly agricultural country. However, it was not natural conditions but difficult domestic and external social conditions that hampered industrial progress. A substantial segment of the ruling class upheld the concept of the so-called "agricultural mission" of the Rumanian people.

Rumania also has a large labor power which was used very inadequately in the past and is not fully used even today. The working class has proved equal to learning the most progressive production methods.

Would not a country's limited supply of raw materials restrict industrial progress? This notion is refuted by reality. All countries import and export raw materials, possibly with the exception of the poorest, and world trade in raw materials closely interlocks with trade in finished products.

Besides natural conditions and labor resources, which enable Rumania to develop its economy on a diversified basis, that is, to have a powerful agriculture and a ramified industry, there are social factors favorable to such development. Cultural, scientific and, in general, social progress is unthinkable without a diversified, many-sided economy, for science and culture, socialist democracy and development of the individual are closely linked with economic progress.

Rumania maintains economic, scientific and technological cooperation with all socialist countries. Many-sided economic development should not be mistaken for isolation or autarchy. Autarchic concepts are reactionary and utopian. No country today can meet its economic requirements from its own resources only, but must necessarily cooperate with other countries, both socialist and capitalist, on a vast scale. As a socialist country, Rumania needs extensive and diversified economic exchange primarily with socialist countries. This exchange, far from hampering many-sided economic progress, furthers it, for specialization and cooperation do not imply one-sided development. On the contrary, as economic cooperation between

socialist partners goes on it becomes necessary to specialize in numerous lines of production. Production today is growing fast and is becoming ever more diversified. The revolution in science and technology gives rise to entirely new industries. To drop out of this development would mean falling behind other nations. On the other hand, the socialist countries can organize cooperation and specialization in various fields, and the result will be a many-sided socialist economy. An advanced socialist country with a comprehensively developed economy strengthens the socialist community as a whole by contributing a big share to mutually beneficial economic exchange. Nor should we discount the international significance of such development. If we achieve rapid and harmonious progress in the economy, culture, living standards and democracy, the workers in the capitalist countries will be satisfied that it is well worth fighting for socialism.

In reply to questions Comrade Zaharescu specified that he had been speaking of diversified and not comprehensive economic development. Efficient production does not rule out a diversified economy. In fact, diversification makes for efficiency.

Developed socialism does not cover a **short span of time**, Comrade B. Ladygin, Cand. Econ. (Moscow), pointed out. There will probably be a substantial difference in the extent of its maturity at the beginning and the close of the period. It would therefore be of little use to take the statistical approach, that is, to use hard and fast quantitative indices like per capita output of certain products, the share of various industries in the economy, and so on, as an economic criterion of developed socialism. Socialism can bring its social advantages to bear even when it is still behind the developed capitalist countries in terms of productive forces. But it will be able to make full use of its advantages when it overtakes and outstrips the main capitalist countries in productive forces.

The speaker suggested a number of economic criteria reflecting, in his view, the present development level and the immediate outlook: The existence of an industrial economic structure and the achievement of up-to-date scientific and technological standards making for high productivity throughout the economy; highly dynamic economic growth, which should outpace the world average and exceed the growth rate of the developed capitalist countries put together, for this

is what ensures the future of socialism; intensive economic progress, with economic efficiency and productivity of social labor acquiring decisive importance, which calls for a developed scientific system of economic management; undivided socialist ownership of the means of production and well-organized economic development according to plan in the interests of the people; full application of the principle of socialism, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work"; participation in international socialist integration.

Elaborating, the speaker said that a developed socialist economy is also a stage of internationalization of the productive forces meaning a high level of international socialist division of labor. Developed socialism is a complex synthesis of two trends: a trend towards internationalizing production and setting up a common world economy, and a trend towards the national and political sovereignty of the countries concerned. Due to the socialist character of development, there are no antagonistic contradictions between the two trends. Socialist relations of production provide the basis for harmony between national and international economic interests.

Socialist integration accords with developed socialism as a form of internationalizing production and combining national with international interests. It is still in its early stage. There can be no developed socialism outside the world socialist system and advanced forms of international socialist division of labor. In the long run, the economies of the socialist countries will evidently become more and more integrated. Needless to say, it will be a planned process taking place on a strictly voluntary basis.

Mature socialism presupposes advanced forms of socialist internationalism in the economic and political spheres alike. The socialist countries are engaged in a sharp class struggle against imperialism. Hence the recognized necessity for jointly defending socialist gains and for promoting political, ideological and cultural cooperation along with economic cooperation. Hence also the need fully to coordinate activity on the government and Party level.

Docent Z Jarosz (Warsaw) dealt with aspects of socialist democracy. In the present stage, he said, the topic is particularly important and acute due to the objective factors of socialist growth and the

new confrontation with the anti-socialist forces.

The revisionist approach to the basic issues of socialist statehood is warped. It ignores Lenin's teaching on socialist democracy as a democracy of the new type. In effect, it borrows some aspects, principles and institutions of one social structure and tries to graft them onto another. It treats socialist democracy as a continuation (in the new stage and on a new social basis) of "democracy in general," taking the principles of liberal bourgeois democracy as the point of departure.

As the revisionists see it, democratization should, as a rule, use the method of borrowing certain institutions and principles from so-called "classical democracy." Demarcation of authority, departure from democratic centralism in favor of decentralization and "de-etatization," "political pluralism" and the right of opposition, the slogan of "liberalizing" socialism—those are some of the principles that would purportedly "enrich" the system of socialist democracy. Regardless of the subjective intention, they would, however, lead to a disintegration of society, erosion of power, weakening of state guidance in social and economic affairs, and to disruption and negation of the leading role of the Party, providing freedom of action for the anti-socialist forces. Revisionism and anti-communism aim their darts chiefly against the leading role of the Communist Party.

The question of the party-political structure is doubtless a key aspect of democracy, socialist as well as any other. Alongside one-party political structures, the socialist system has produced multi-party structures. In Poland, for example, the working-class party has been joined in an alliance by two other parties, which recognize the leading role of the Polish United Workers' Party and contribute to the building of socialism. To a certain extent this broadens the political basis of people's power in Poland. The Popular Unity Front also encompasses certain Catholic groups and organizations supporting the socialist construction program and Poland's state interests. This serves to show that the concrete business of shaping political structures under socialism is not restricted by any flexible set of rules. Yet everywhere the leading role of the Communist Party, a common objective law, is the supreme principle.

There is no place for "pluralism" and

opposition parties in the present-day political structure of the socialist countries. Experience shows, as the Theses for the Fifth PUWP Congress note, that "free play of political forces and competitive struggle of different parties would concentrate the anti-socialist forces around the opposition party, leading to strident demagoguery, the disintegration of society and anarchy in political and economic affairs." And that would jeopardize the vital interests of socialism and the development of socialist democracy.

The various anti-Marxist conceptions of socialism's political organization are countered by Lenin's teaching on the state and democracy. Lenin, it will be recalled, regarded democracy as a class phenomenon flowing from class domination in society. That was the angle from which he described Soviet power as "*a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic*" (Vol. 28, p. 248). This was the angle, too, from which Lenin always assessed various democratic institutions and principles. He tied in the function of state compulsion with regard to the enemies of socialism with the balance of class forces. Compulsion and restriction are to be used when necessary; also, when this is essential to safeguard the gains of socialism.

The class approach to socialist democracy and accentuation of its socio-political content does not mean under-rating its institutional forms and does not dismiss the necessity for their continuous extension and improvement. Lenin did not rule out the possible use by the working class of some institutions of bourgeois democracy in both the process of fighting for power and that of building the new system. However, he associated this with the concrete relation of strength, the test being whether the institution in question could be used for consolidating the power of the working people.

The institutions of socialist democracy are far superior to the bourgeois. They are considerably richer and more versatile, reaching out into diverse socio-economic and political spheres. Socialist democracy is distinguished by a developed system of institutions and forms of enlisting the people for direct participation in government. The workers' self-administration in Poland is a good example.

The principle of direct workers' participation in management and control, as we know, is promoted in one form or another

in the various socialist countries. In Poland we have a form of our own—conferences of workers' self-administration. More than a million people have gone through this school of self-administration in the past 12 years.

The socialist world system has gained vast experience in socialist democracy. The main task today, apart from fostering socialist statehood, is to carry forward and perfect democratic principles. To be sure, the concrete aspects of this task vary from country to country depending on the stage of development and degree of maturity of social relations. The development of socialist democracy is a dynamic process that does not end at any particular stage of socialist construction. The great diversity of specific forms contributes to the collective experience of building socialism, of its socio-political system, provided Lenin's theory of the general laws of socialist democracy is borne in mind.

Discussing mature socialism, participants dealt with important features of socialist development at the present stage and the dialectic of socialism gradually growing over into communism.

* * *

Comrade G. Shakhnazarov, speaking on behalf of the editorial board of the journal, concluded the discussion. He described it as informative and useful. The participants examined a wide range of topical questions of the theory and practice of socialism, heard diverse arguments and compared diverse points of view. The discussion revealed agreement on the substance of the issues under review.

Take, for example, the question of the place of socialism in history. All speakers stressed that socialism represents a long period of social development, that it has its own laws, characteristics and principles and should be regarded as an integral social entity. And while there are distinctions in the interpretation of socialism as a relatively independent formation and as a phase, all speakers agreed that socialism should be seen as a stage of communist society.

The discussion also brought out a common approach to the division of socialist development processes into periods. It was emphasized that some stages may manifest themselves differently in different historical and international conditions, that there may be sub-stages, etc. Besides,

there was no disagreement on the need to regard developed socialist society not as a static condition, but as a definite historical stage in which various production, socio-economic and political tasks are fulfilled, finishing touches added and improvements made. Closely linked with this conclusion was the discussion on the criteria of developed or mature socialist society. Many interesting considerations were stated that undoubtedly extend our notion of the problem and will enable us the better to specify the main characteristics of the stage of mature socialism. There is no need to say how important this is today, when a developed socialist society has been built in the Soviet Union, an effort is being made to perfect it and at the same time the building of communism is going on, and when Communist and Workers' parties in numerous other socialist countries set the task of building developed socialism.

By way of evolving criteria of developed socialism, speakers here put forward a number of interesting scientific ideas taking into account such factors as growing labor productivity, the efficiency of socialist production, the advancement of socialist democracy, the victory of Marxist-Leninist ideology, and so on. They also examined important international criteria of developed socialist society: participation in socialist economic integration, comprehensive political cooperation, coordination of foreign policy, united front action against imperialism.

Speakers also made important comments on the forms and methods of the Communist and Workers' parties exercising their leading role at various stages of socialist development. True, it was only some aspects of the vast and highly important theme of the leading role of the working class and its Communist vanguard that were touched on. Work on this theme should obviously be carried deeper.

The exchange of views revealed, naturally enough, distinctions in the approach to various phenomena, to particular problems of the present and future development of socialism. However, these distinctions came out against the background of unanimity on all key theoretical and political issues. The meeting may be said to have made its modest contribution towards strengthening the united theoretical front of science of the socialist countries.

One of the questions raised by speakers was criticism of non-Marxist concepts of

socialism. In a climate of sharpened ideological struggle on the world scene, the enemies of socialism make desperate efforts to defame the theory and practice of building socialism. Numerous anti-Communist concepts have been put forward to this end. Various reformist as well as Right- and "Left"-wing revisionist theories link up with them, and attempts are made to substitute diverse reactionary utopian, pseudo-socialist concepts for Marxism-Leninism, the only scientific theory of socialism, a theory tested through practice. Specifically, the revisionists oppose the thesis of the plurality of "models" of socialism to the Leninist principles of organizing socialist society. This thesis is intended to undermine the unity of the socialist countries and to weaken Marxism-Leninism as the only international theory

and ideological foundation of socialism. In these circumstances it is a particularly important and responsible task to defend the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialism and to carry it forward in a creative spirit.

Some comrades stressed the usefulness of international forums of Marxist scholars systematically sponsored by the editorial board of the journal. We thank them for appreciating our effort and assure them that we will strive to hold more meetings of the same nature in that they help solve challenging scientific problems through the collective effort of Marxist-Leninists from various countries. We hope the readers of the journal will benefit from this exchange of views. We will continue to discuss topical problems of socialist development in the journal.

Agrarian-industrial complexes — new stage in development of Bulgarian agriculture

IVAN ABAJIYEV

Bulgaria's agriculture has undergone far-reaching socialist changes on the basis of Lenin's cooperative plan as creatively applied to the concrete historical conditions obtaining in the country. These changes have also opened up broad vistas for further development. Dynamic processes are taking place in the countryside and they are studied and guided with **scientific foresight** by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party.

The primary task today is to produce more, better and cheaper food. The best way of achieving these goals is through large scale introduction of industrial farming methods, concentration and specialization of production.

The question was discussed at a plenum of the CC BCP. The main report by Comrade Todor Zhivkov contained a comprehensive critical scientific analysis of the requirements of socialist society, a statement of the Party's tasks in agriculture, and forward-looking proposals in the economic, socio-political and technico-scientific domains.

The new orientation is based on objective laws of development of the productive forces and on the high level of concentration at present obtaining in Bulgaria's agriculture.

* * *

Concentration of production is a natural process governed by objective economic laws. The character, degree and forms of

concentration depend on the level of the productive forces and the maturity of the relations of production. In agriculture the process obeys the same laws and it takes place both horizontally and vertically, through the formation of large territorial industrial enterprises and enhancement of their contributions to the gross social product. The technological revolution is a potent factor of concentration.

Under capitalism concentration in agriculture entails ruin and destitution for many small and medium enterprises, pauperization of the working people, growth of the main contradiction of capitalism and aggravation of the class struggle. All this was repeatedly pointed out by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin, attacking revisionism in the question of large- and small-scale farming, noted that every advance in science and technology inevitably and relentlessly undermines the foundations of small-scale production in capitalist society (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 35).

The concentration of agricultural production currently taking place in the developed countries of Western Europe, the United States and Canada under the impact of objective economic laws is ruining millions of smallholders and aggravating social contradictions. It is not accidental that problems of concentration are so widely debated in the mass media of the countries concerned. Thus, much comment was aroused by the Mansholt plan which analyzes the state of agriculture in the Common Market countries and provides for the "planned" elimi-

nation of five million small farms by the end of 1980.

Under socialism concentration of various branches of material production is conditioned and stimulated by socialist relations of production. It is directed by the state through the medium of a unified plan of socio-economic development which makes it possible to promote concentration of production, including farm production, in accordance with the development of science and technology and with due account of the continuously rising consumer demand.

In Bulgaria, as in other socialist countries, the concentration of agriculture did not entail the ruin of small private holdings with all the attendant economic, political and social consequences. Concentration came as the result of the peasants joining farm cooperatives. This, in particular, proved extremely important from the point of view of material incentives: the farmers regard the cooperative enterprise as their own vital concern and spare no effort to promote its expansion.

The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria stipulates that the land belongs to those who cultivate it, and they have the right to dispose of it as they see fit. In practice, however, land has long since ceased being an object of trade and there is no urge to acquire land for private use. This offers convincing refutation of bourgeois notions according to which large-scale production can develop solely on the basis of "sacred" private ownership.

Another aspect of concentration in agriculture in our country is the consistency with which it is pursued. To each stage in the building of socialism corresponds a certain level of agriculture.

First Stage (1944-1958): Smallholders join in cooperatives. Some 3,500 farm cooperatives embracing the bulk of the Bulgarian peasantry were formed. By the end of 1958 the socialist reconstruction of agriculture was practically completed, with 93 per cent of the nation's farmlands cultivated by farm cooperatives or state farms. The merging of small-scale farm producers into socialist cooperative enterprises represented a form of concentration of agriculture in the conditions of transition from capitalism to socialism.

In that period the concentration process entailed an acute class struggle in which the question "Who will win?" was resolved in the economic sphere, after it had been resolved in the political sphere on September 9, 1944. Certain mistakes were made in

the course of the cooperation movement: important decisions were often taken without a thorough study, experience was lacking, there was a shortage of experts. However, a beginning was made, the road was opened. From the historic aspect this stage of cooperative organization, concentration and specialization in agriculture was proof of the BCP's ability to tackle the difficult problems of socialist construction.

Second stage (1958-1968): Amalgamation of farm cooperatives. By 1959, 3,290 small cooperatives had merged into 972 larger ones, and the process continued.

The main prerequisite for the amalgamation of farm cooperatives was the creation of a material and technical base and the experience gained in farm management. Bulgaria had become an industrial-agrarian state, and had entered a new stage in its economic development. The annual rate of industrial growth averaged 13.6 per cent. New, modern industries appeared. The historic Central Committee plenum held in April 1956, at which the new Party leadership headed by Comrade Zhivkov was elected, drew far-reaching conclusions and defined the principal trends in the nation's development. The Party's new measures created wide opportunities also for the development of the productive forces in agriculture.

The two successive stages of concentration and specialization in agriculture provided scope for the introduction of modern machines, thus contributing to the economy's accelerated development.

What is Bulgaria's agriculture like today?

There are 795 farm cooperatives and 301 state farms. On average, one cooperative cultivates 4,136 hectares; 57.2 per cent of the cooperatives have more than 3,200 hectares each and account for 76.8 per cent of the cultivated area.

Average per-hectare yields in 1969 were: Corn—41.3 centners, wheat—24.7, and sunflower seed—18.9 centners. In yields of the principal crops Bulgaria ranks among the leading nations. Livestock production has expanded considerably. Bulgaria has become a major producer of all the main farm products, a large proportion of them for export.

Concentration has facilitated specialization both within farms and on a district and national scale. This is especially seen in animal husbandry and grain production.

Large specialized livestock farms are being set up in accordance with local conditions. Breeding of various species is being

contracted or, on the contrary, expanded on the scale of whole districts. Formerly, for example, all the cooperatives of Vratsa district raised cattle, sheep, pigs and poultry. Since the amalgamation drive and the resulting concentration the picture has changed markedly. For example, in 1959, 41 cooperatives in the district maintained 84 poultry farms; in 1969, 19 cooperatives maintained 28 poultry farms. Wheat and sunflower were concentrated in the most favorable districts: wheat in the north and southeast, sunflower mainly in the north. The redistribution of crops according to natural conditions saves farmland, increases farm productivity and enhances crop yields.

Third stage (commencing): Creation of agrarian-industrial complexes.

The rapid development of the economy and steady growth of living standards call for higher farm production, lower costs, higher labor productivity and better returns on investment in agriculture.

In these circumstances, as Comrade Zhivkov pointed out at the April, 1970 plenum of the CC, the farms, whatever their size, have exhausted their potentialities. A new degree of concentration is needed which will create better conditions for making use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and placing agriculture on an industrial basis.

Taking into account the objective and subjective factors necessitating further concentration in agriculture, as well as tendencies in the economy as a whole, the plenum recommended the organization of agrarian-industrial complexes as the most expedient form of concentration of agriculture.

* * *

The creation of agrarian-industrial complexes represents a qualitatively new stage in the concentration of agriculture in the period of building a developed socialist society. Such complexes make possible optimum horizontal integration through the amalgamation of groups of enterprises (cooperatives, state farms) within a given macrodistrict with the aim of introducing industrial technologies in agriculture. Such territorial amalgamation provides the best conditions for bringing farming and processing together, that is, for vertical integration.

The first experimental agrarian-industrial complexes were established in some districts a little over a year ago. Experience

has confirmed the advantages of the new system. This is seen in the initial achievements of two complexes in the Vratsa district. The Vratsa agrarian-industrial complex comprises seven farm cooperatives with a total of 38,700 hectares; the one at Mezdra, 10 state farms with 31,100 hectares. The farms merged in these complexes were on poor lands and therefore economically weak. The farms of the Mezdra complex, for example, had formerly been receiving state subsidies of 1.2 to 1.6 million leva a year to pay the farmers. After one year the complex grossed a profit of 518,000 leva, though a net loss of 898,000 leva had been envisaged. The gross output of the Vratsa complex totalled 5,248,000 leva, a gain of 3,615,000 leva over the preceding year.

The main factors contributing to these achievements were concentration, specialization and better organization of production and management. For example, formerly within the boundaries of the Vratsa complex wheat had been sown on 201 fields; now it is sown on 45 large fields; corn is now grown on 45 fields instead of 119. Concentration has also involved livestock, and today cattle are kept at 14 places instead of the previous 22.

Opportunities have been created for vertical integration within the complex. At Mezdra, for example, a fruit and vegetable enterprise was created comprising apple orchards, greenhouses, a cannery and a procurement and marketing organization. The integrated production-processing-marketing setup has resulted in better quality to meet market demands. The complex now has five such enterprises in different spheres embracing practically the whole range of farm production, all of them operating on a profit basis. Auxiliary industries formerly handled by small enterprises in the villages of the complex have also been integrated.

The management of the complex, which includes representatives of all the amalgamated units, handles basic questions such as investment and outlays, distribution of manpower and machines, establishment of production units, contracts and marketing operations. The respective cooperative boards, besides taking part in affairs of the complex as a whole, see to the implementation of decisions, control the finances and operations of the production units in their jurisdiction, etc.

Four more complexes are being created in the district, bringing the number to six.

Crop specialization and modern industrial technologies will be dovetailed to prevailing natural, weather and economic conditions. Thus, the Dunai complex (cultivated area 43,500 hectares) with its center in Oryakhovo will engage mainly in grain and animal husbandry with a well-developed viticulture. In animal husbandry emphasis will be on poultry, and the complex will produce all the eggs in the district.

The establishment of agrarian-industrial complexes creates new problems. They require changes in traditional organization and management structures, and with time the present cooperative-territorial organization of production will be superseded by organization according to type of production. Large specialized enterprises will eventually be created in animal husbandry, crop farming and other branches, integrated teams for industrial grain production will be organized and their fields will cut across existing farm boundaries.

Agrarian-industrial complexes open the way for the large-scale introduction of industrial methods in agriculture. By 1975 production of cereals, sunflower seed, poultry, eggs, pork and veal will be put on an industrial basis. The size of grain, sunflower and sugar-beet fields is being increased so that by 1975 the Vratsa district will have only 55 grain fields as against 763 at present, and 42 corn fields as against 535. Work has begun on large fruit, grape and vegetable plantations.

The work outlined will be carried out on a national scale, and by 1975 it is planned to concentrate 40.9 per cent of pork production at 32 enterprises, 62 per cent of egg production at 9 poultry factories, 95 per cent of poultry production at 16 poultry factories, and 52 percent of veal production at 21 enterprises.

Agrarian-industrial complexes open up great opportunities for introducing the newest achievements of science and technology. The use of fertilizers and of chemicals for combating diseases and pests will be placed on a qualitatively new basis. Each complex will have an agrochemical center as the main production and scientific base for the application of chemistry in agriculture. Unified grain bases are being created jointly with the state grain organization; grain will be transported to them straight from the field, and they will handle cleaning, storage and further routing.

The organization of agrarian-industrial complexes will accelerate the reshaping of agricultural management along new scien-

tific lines. Currently automatic electronic control systems are being designed for the complexes. There is a wide field for work here. Under a program endorsed by the government 10 computer centers are being set up all over the country to cater for the needs of agriculture and they will be linked with the computer center at the Ministry of Agriculture and the Food Industry. Each complex has dispatcher systems for operational management.

In the Vratsa district a computer center established several years ago is being used as the basis for further computerization. Eighty computer operators and programmers work there, new computers have been ordered, and the center is already handling data for the complexes.

Implementation of the plans for agricultural concentration and specialization in the Vratsa district will yield a substantial economic effect. By 1975 gross farm output is expected to increase 70 per cent over 1967, and net output by 90 per cent. Already now the launching of a broiler factory in the Vratsa complex has halved the cost of a kilogram of birdmeat as compared with the average for the district.

* * *

The Plenum of the CC BCP gave serious consideration to the basic principles to be used as a guideline in setting up agrarian-industrial complexes.

The first principle is that adherence shall be voluntary. The plenum stressed that each farm will be free to decide whether or not it should join a complex and if so, which, and after the complex has been formed, to participate in setting up common enterprises and production branches.

In setting up experimental agrarian-industrial complexes in the Vratsa District according to this principle, we encountered many difficulties in our explanatory work. However, discussion at the local level helped to find correct solutions. It would be wrong to imagine that setting up a complex is an "armchair" problem that can be dispatched without consulting the local leaders, cooperative members and state-farm workers concerned. Conviction and freedom of choice mean a great deal when a new experiment has to be carried out.

Secondly, the setting up of a complex must be scientifically warranted. To meet this principle, it is necessary to prepare relevant projects in several versions taking into account the effect of various factors

on economic indices. A complex may not be set up until proof is furnished that it will pay off economically.

Thirdly, the autonomy and organizational form of the cooperatives and state farms joining a complex must be preserved. This will enable us to use the experience of both the state farms and cooperatives. All the positive aspects of the cooperative system will be retained and carried forward within the framework of agrarian-industrial complexes.

The territorial unity of each complex is a fourth principle. It is necessitated by the nature of agricultural production. A complex should comprise farms situated in a definite soil, climatic and economic area, which permits greater specialization and the use of industrial technology. A complex encompasses both the cooperatives and state farms of the area concerned, irrespective of the form of ownership.

The fifth principle is democratic management. It means electing executives for a definite term, bringing workers and cooperative members into management, making the management accountable to the personnel and exercising popular control over its activity.

The functions of agrarian-industrial complexes relate not only to agriculture, but have a direct bearing on the economic, social, political and cultural life of the community. Work is under way, therefore, on a number of problems relating to the planning and prognostication of agricultural relations, working, social and living conditions, etc. We are probing into new working methods suitable for Party committees.

* * *

Agrarian-industrial complexes will open up new prospects for the gradual solution of important socio-economic problems, such as doing away with distinctions between town and countryside and transforming farm labor into a variety of industrial labor.

Under socialism the towns and rural areas develop on one and the same economic basis and have identical interests and objectives. However, there are social and economic distinctions between them due to the dissimilar level of economic development and the resulting lag of the countryside in the use of mechanical facilities, in cultural and living conditions and standard of life.

Extending and improving the material and technical base of agriculture is a

powerful factor for the gradual elimination of the distinctions between town and country. In the capitalist and socialist countries alike, the extension of this base is accompanied by a growing rate of concentration. But whereas in the capitalist countries this economic process makes for greater social inequality and aggravates the contradictions between town and country, under socialism an improving and expanding material and technical base and corresponding concentration lead to the gradual removal of distinctions between town and country.

The BCP has always sought to raise socio-economic, cultural and living conditions in the countryside to urban standards. Big and wealthy rural communities, modern farms on which a large proportion of labor is performed by machines, a high rate of remuneration (some cooperative members are paid as much as wage-earners in the medium pay bracket), pensions, extra pay for children, and other social and cultural gains are conditions we have already created for the solution of this historic problem. Agrarian-industrial complexes will unquestionably speed this development.

Machines will increasingly take over various operations as industrial technology is introduced into farming. There will be more tractor and truck drivers, electricians, combine operators and other mechanics, and new trades will come into being, such as that of mechanic-and-stockbreeder. On the large highly mechanized and automated livestock farms much of the work has already been reduced to control functions, which means that women can take over some of the more skilled jobs.

Changing production conditions are bound to bring about qualitative changes in the skill, cultural standard and requirements of people engaged in agriculture.

Estimates made in the Vratsa District show that by 1975 the proportion of people employed in farming will have decreased by roughly 36 per cent. Over 70 per cent of them will have received special training. Part of the released labor power will be given jobs in the country's fast-developing industries and the rest will go into the service industries.

Complexes will make it possible to modernize villages on a large scale. New, up-to-date public premises and roads will no longer have to be built by this or that village—they will be built by the complex concerned. Recently the government decided to establish district centers in charge

of designing agrarian-industrial complexes on scientific lines. Architects, engineers, economists and mathematicians will have a share in designing and approving each new item in the area of a complex.

Speaking at the close of the Central Committee meeting, Comrade Todor Zhivkov laid great stress on the key problem of developing property forms in agriculture.

We now have two forms of property, cooperative and state. Experience has shown that both forms are changing. Agrarian-industrial complexes will contribute to the interpenetration and rapprochement of the two forms. They will apply common pay rates for the cooperatives and state farms, a common set of standards for the

entire agricultural production cycle, a common self-sufficiency principle and common democratic principles. In other words, complexes will retain only some of the distinctions between state and cooperative enterprises, and this only for a time.

These, then, are the main characteristics of the new stage of development in our agriculture. To be sure, the new form of agricultural concentration has yet to take final shape. Its advantages will come out fully when agrarian-industrial complexes become the decisive factor for economic and political activity in the countryside. This form will be continuously improved and modified as new conditions and new tasks arise.

Ten embattled years

A Vietnam rocket squad, their guns slung over their shoulders, are operating from a small clearing in the jungle. Flashes tear through the quiet of the night, then the thud of explosions as the missiles hit their target, a U.S. base a few kilometres away, and then distant streaks of flame soar into the sky as planes and helicopters, munition and fuel dumps are destroyed.

Often reported in the world press, these surprise attacks on U.S. and Saigon airfields and strongpoints by mobile units of the South Vietnam Liberation Army are part of the war that has engulfed the entire country. The liberation fighters attack the enemy everywhere: in the jungle and rice paddies, in villages and provincial centers—even Saigon from time to time becomes the scene of fierce fighting.

The Vietnamese struggle for freedom and independence has won the admiration of progressives everywhere as a symbol of fortitude and bravery. It encourages other peoples in their efforts to break out of imperialist exploitation and oppression.

The people's heroism is inspired and organized by the South Vietnam National Liberation Front which this month celebrates its tenth anniversary.

In the closing weeks of 1960, a number of clandestine patriotic groups convened a congress of representatives of all South Vietnam organizations and groups opposed to the puppet regime the U.S. imperialists had foisted on the country. On the night of December 19 the congress, which met on liberated territory, decided to set up the National Liberation Front. Its charter members were 20 parties and organizations representing an organized following of some seven million. Gathered under the NLF banner were workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, representatives of the national bourgeoisie—in short, all true patriots regardless of social status, religion and political persuasion. The NLF action program called for an end to the pro-American puppet regime and its replacement by a national-democratic coalition government; peace and an independent economy, development of national progressive culture, normalization of relations between North and South and peaceful reunification. The program, expressive of the interests of all the political forces that make up the NLF, was finally adopted at its congress early in 1962.

The NLF has steadily increased its influence. It is now in control of most of the rural areas and is active in towns held by the intervention army and the puppet regime. Free democratic elections have been held in the liberated areas and in many enemy-held localities. Popular representative government has been set up at communal, county and provincial levels. The



Liberation Forces men inspect downed U.S. helicopter



Opening fire



Farmers ferry food for their army



Entertainers in the battlelines

process culminated with the proclamation, in June 1969, of the Republic of South Vietnam (RSV) and the formation of its Provisional Revolutionary Government.

Though operating in an extremely complex and difficult situation, the NLF has carried out far-reaching socio-economic reforms which have considerably improved the condition of the people. For instance, agrarian reform has given the peasants more than 2,500,000 hectares of farmland, and a beginning has been made on its collective cultivation—hundreds of thousands have already joined such cooperative projects. The NLF has also done much to provide better education and health services by opening schools for children and adults, starting training courses, medical centers, the publication of newspapers, journals, the organization of amateur art groups, and so on.

But, of course, the main function of the NLF is organizing the people to fight the invader and his puppet regime. And over the past ten years there has sprung up a



The older teach the young

popular armed force grouped around the well-trained, disciplined and politically-minded Liberation Army. All-round assistance by the socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union, has given it the modern weapons needed to fight the enemy, including mortars, mobile rocket launchers and AA artillery. Combining

able use of these weapons with mass heroism, the Liberation Army is dealing telling blows at an enemy superior both in numbers and weaponry.

According to American data, the U.S. had about 400,000 men in South Vietnam on November 1, plus 60,000 mercenaries from South Korea, Thailand, Australia and New Zealand. Besides, there is the Seventh U.S. Fleet (60,000 men) and the Saigon army of 1,100,000. All told, the enemy has over 1,600,000 men, several thousand bombers and helicopters, large numbers of tanks, heavy artillery and naval vessels.

But it is becoming increasingly clear that the imperialist "positions of strength" policy is neither realistic nor effective.

Vietnam furnishes conclusive proof of that. Last year's International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stated: "The struggle of the Vietnamese patriots shows that a people which consistently fights imperialism for freedom and independence and has on its side the Soviet Union and all other socialist countries and the peace-loving forces of the whole world, is invincible." Led by the NLF and the Provisional Revolutionary Government, the South Vietnam people have foiled many Pentagon plans in the past 10 years. The list is a long one: the much publicized "search and destroy" operation aimed at regaining control of the liberated areas; the "rural pacification" program, a purely police operation; the "strategic hamlets," a plan to drive the peasants into virtual concentration camps and prevent them from helping the Liberation Army; the "clean and hold" operation designed to consolidate the position of the puppet regime.

The NLF operation begun in the spring of 1969 and continued throughout the summer, forced the aggressors to take refuge in the towns, military bases and fortified areas.

Determined to hold back the tide of resistance, the U.S. imperialists have used genocidal methods, condemned a quarter of a century ago by the International Tribunal in Nuremburg. The U.S. Air Force has resorted to "saturation bombings," and has used napalm against whole regions. The American imperialists have outdone the Nazis, using various poisonous substances to destroy crops and to annihilate life. The "Black Book of American Crimes in Vietnam" published in France estimates that about 1,300,000 people have suffered, with hundreds of thousands more killed by bombs and napalm. This has generated more hatred of U.S. imperialism and more worldwide public protest.

Bogged down in their bandit war and pilloried by world opinion, the U.S. imperialists found themselves compelled to consent to peace negotiations. The Paris talks are in their third year without any progress having been made.

More than a year ago, in May 1969, the NLF submitted a comprehensive program for a political settlement. Its 10 points accord with the vital interests of the South Vietnamese people. The program was factually rejected by the U.S., which advanced "counter-proposals" that deliberately ignore the vital rights and interests of the South Vietnamese.



The enemy may attack any minute

Washington has been loud in proclaiming its desire to bring the war to an end. President Nixon keeps talking of a "phased withdrawal" of American troops. But behind these words the U.S. continues to escalate its aggression in an effort to achieve its neo-colonialist aims. One of its latest gimmicks is "Vietnamization." The idea is to make the Saigon army bear the brunt of the fighting while the intervention forces are gradually withdrawn from the battle areas. The double purpose is to reduce U.S. casualties, which have now topped the 300,000 mark, and mislead world opinion by assurances that the U.S. wants to quit Indochina. As part of the "Vietnamization" plan the Saigon army is being supplied more U.S. tanks, planes, helicopters and naval vessels and its numerical strength is being increased. At the same time, the U.S. has carried the war into Cambodia and Laos in an attempt to install Saigon-type puppet regimes there. The growing unity of the Indochina peoples is foiling all these plans.

In mid-September, the Republic of South Vietnam negotiating team gave another proof of its readiness to work out a peaceful settlement: if the U.S. undertakes to withdraw all its troops from South Vietnam by June 30, 1971, the Liberation Army will refrain from attacking these troops during the withdrawal operation. "The question of the Vietnam armed forces," the RSV delegation declared, "will be settled by the two sides in Vietnam."

These RSV proposals are reasonable, legitimate and constructive. Yet President Nixon, in his speech of October 7, turned them down, though they are eagerly supported not only in Vietnam, but in many other countries as well. Instead, Nixon came out with a "new" American plan, the substance of which makes it all too clear that the U.S. wants to achieve

through negotiation what it failed to achieve on the battlefield. The "new" plan suggests as a first step a cease-fire, with all the parties remaining on their present positions. After that, the complete withdrawal of American troops would be decided by Washington depending "on the enemy's level of military activity." It should be perfectly clear that the Nixon plan is virtually an ultimatum to the Liberation Army. In general, Washington's reaction to the constructive program of the NLF and the South Vietnam Provisional Revolutionary Government indicates that the aggressive faction in the U.S. does not want a peaceful solution that would accord with the national interests and rights of the Vietnamese people. Washington's actions show that it has not abandoned attempts to win a military victory, or at least turn the tide of the war so that it can dictate terms.

But nothing will compel the South Vietnamese people to give up the fight for independence, sovereignty and a brighter future. They know that they have the support of the key forces of our time—the socialist world system, the international working class, the national liberation movement—and the solidarity of the whole of progressive mankind. No matter how the U.S. imperialists maneuver, no matter what new plans they devise, they will have to recognize the legitimate right of the South Vietnam people to be masters in their own country and to settle their affairs without foreign interference. In the ten embattled years since the organization of the National Liberation Front, the South Vietnamese patriots have been steeled in the fight against a cruel and insidious foe. And they are determined to smash all imperialist plans and fight through to final victory.

A.B.



U.S. war veterans campaign for peace

The war comes to Cambodia

MONIKA WARNENSKA

My first visit to Cambodia, a several-week tour of the country in 1965, so impressed me that I decided to make a thorough study of its past and present as a preliminary to a book about all I had seen there. Cambodia then was relatively calm, although the flames of war kept flickering along its frontiers (with South Vietnam, Laos and Thailand). Despite domestic problems and imperialist threats, the situation was markedly different from South Vietnam or Laos. I entitled my book "The Apprehensive Oasis," and in the concluding chapter I wrote:

"I would like to re-visit the jungles of Rattanakiri and Mondolkiri provinces, the orchids of Battambang, the temples of Preah and Vihear, the remote villages of Pailin, where hunters for precious stones live, and again admire the indescribable beauty of Angkor Wat."

The second time I saw Phnompenh was in October 1969, first from the air, through the plane's portholes. Turbid waters, red-brown and pale-yellow tree-studded floodplains . . . It was the autumn flood season, and the Mekong, that "Father of Waters," had burst its banks; high water had filled the Tonle Sap lake and river.

I had come just before the traditional "water holiday." Who could have thought that it would be Cambodia's last peaceful holiday?

In mid-December I made a one-day trip from Saigon to Phnompenh. South Vietnam's biggest city had been stripped of much of its greenery to impede NLF operations, particularly lightning strikes against the U.S. aggressor. And many public parks had been converted into sprawling slums; they stand out in sharp contrast to the modern buildings being put up for U.S. personnel.

The Cambodian capital had its own worries, of course, but one didn't stumble into

barbed wire at every turn, nor bump into a sand-bagged police station, as in Saigon. "What a relief," I jotted down, "no Americans, not a GI in the streets!" There were Americans, of course, but they were unobtrusive or kept out of sight.

I toured much of the city and saw the new university buildings near the airport, the Independence Palace and National Museum, the famous Silver Pagoda and Phnom Wat Hill, the Tonle Sap embankment and the colorful marketplace.

I also visited old friends. The Polish Embassy had moved to a new building in Norodom Boulevard. Not far from the intersection of Phnompenh's two main thoroughfares stood the Embassy of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, opened in 1965 (before that the DRV had had only a trade office). In Samdech Pann Street I saw the Legation of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, which had been elevated to full embassy status. Nearby were the offices of the South Vietnamese Liberation news agency.

But storm clouds were gathering. The reactionary faction was bringing pressure to bear on Prince Sihanouk's government. I discussed the situation with friends, but none of us could have predicted the turn events were to take several months later.

* * *

In January 1970, Prince Norodom Sihanouk and his wife left for a rest cure in France. The Prince had been on similar trips before, and this time there might have been political negotiations. At any rate, he stayed longer than planned. And during his absence the Right extremists staged a coup d'etat.

I anxiously followed the Cambodian events from Saigon. Banner headlines an-

nounced the overthrow of the head of state and formation of General Lon Nol's government. "Sihanouk Is Ousted," screamed the headline in the *Saigon Post*, the puppet regime's English-language paper. Vice-President Nguyen Cao Ky hastened to express the hope that friendly relations would soon be restored between his regime and the new Cambodian administration. There was no dearth of praise for Lon Nol and strident calls to "fight communism, the common enemy." They drowned out the voices of more sober-minded politicians, such as Khieu Thien Ke, Vice-Chairman of the puppet parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee, who warned that the fighting could spread to Cambodia, engulfing the whole Indochina peninsula in war.

This was not long in coming. As the new regime's hopes for a swift and easy victory faded, overtones of disquiet and uncertainty began to appear in the press. The deposed head of state launched a spirited diplomatic campaign which won him the support of a number of countries and public opinion. Within Cambodia, the regime was unable to build up a united front against Sihanouk. There were reports of clashes between Lon Nol's units and loyal troops and other supporters of the Prince. Phnompenh airport was closed to civilian aircraft as American arms were airlifted for the Lon Nol regime.

Saigon newspapers carried a France Presse news item that the Polish Embassy in Phnompenh had closed down and its staff had departed. A skimpy denial appeared later, but not before this piece of false information had been spread by UPI. At the time I wrote in my diary: "The France Presse Saigon correspondent offers this naive explanation: he had been misled by a news item about the departure of Vietnamese diplomats and their being seen off by the Polish Embassy staff in Phnompenh. But the 'error' is hardly accidental."

An earlier item said the "legation of a friendly Communist state" had provided shelter to Vietnamese diplomats manhandled by a mob incited by reactionaries; this legation was, I learned, the Polish Embassy.

* * *

This was one of the reasons that prompted me to try to reach Cambodia at any cost. I was lucky, for my entrance visa was still valid, and although the Phnompenh airport continued to "close down"

frequently for unspecified periods, I decided to risk it. After surmounting many hurdles, I finally boarded an Air Vietnam (South Vietnamese airline) plane on a scheduled Saigon - Phnompenh - Bangkok flight.

Superficially, Phnompenh seemed much the same as before, but soon I sensed the atmosphere of tension and uneasiness. Flowers blossomed as before in the parks and streets, but the familiar clock on Phnom Wat was now showing the time of war. Soldiers in pancake berets and uniformed members of paramilitary organizations patrolled the main streets and intersections. In schoolyards youngsters marched about singing martial songs.

In Monivong Street I saw the sacked and gutted building of the DRV Embassy. It was a terrible sight. The gates had been broken open and the courtyard was littered with rubble and trash, a battered refrigerator, tangled ribbons of cine film, a broken telephone, charred tatters of magazines, newspapers and books. (I picked up an English-language booklet on the Warsaw uprising printed in Poland). Fragments of broken crockery and glassware were strewn all over the place. The walls inside and outside the building were covered with anti-Vietnamese slogans in black paint. There were similar inscriptions on the Embassy of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam in Samdech Pann Street.

I thought of its staff. They had recently come back from fighting the aggressors in the South Vietnam jungle, and they were to continue the struggle for Indochina's liberation on the diplomatic front. I thought of the misled people who had taken part in the pogroms and had painted the anti-Vietnamese inscriptions. Who stood behind them? Those who wished to divide the peoples of Indochina.

From eyewitness accounts, I tried to reconstruct the tragic events, sparked and guided by Right-wing pro-imperialist elements.

From the windows of the Polish Embassy people saw smoke billowing up over the part of Monivong Street where the DRV Embassy stood. They hurried to their aid, but were unable to penetrate into the ransacked building. When they finally did get in, they found the Vietnamese diplomats beaten up and covered with blood, while all around hoodlums were demolishing and looting everything they could lay their hands on.

The Polish Embassy staff did all they could for their Vietnamese comrades, and some forty persons were given shelter in the Ambassador's residence. Two weeks later they left for Hanoi in a plane of the International Control Commission flown specially to Phnompenh.

I am describing only a small portion of the human tragedies that are part of the Indochina war unleashed by aggressive imperialist forces.

But it has to be said that many in Phnompenh abhorred this instigated hate frenzy and there were many examples of integrity and courage. Shortly before these events, a member of the Republic of South Vietnam Embassy staff had met his son and daughter whom he hadn't seen for ten years, ever since he had left home to join the guerrillas. The children came to Phnompenh through a round-about route from war-torn South Vietnam. On the day of the pogroms the boy was out on a sight-seeing tour. He was unable to return to the beleaguered Embassy building where the rest of the family were staying. Vietnamese were being hunted all over the city and the boy was in danger; luckily he met a Khmer youth who sheltered him. More, the young man found out where the Vietnamese diplomats had taken refuge and in the evening under cover of darkness brought the boy home.

Groups of young people in civilian or semi-military clothes roamed the streets with jars of glue and rolls of paper. Within a few hours Phnompenh was plastered with posters, leaflets, streamers with slogans denouncing Sihanouk and the Vietnamese. The organizers of the pogroms used the most despicable demagoguery to fan anti-Communist hysteria—that was the purpose of every drawing, every slogan. For example, a leaflet pasted on walls, trees—even tombstones and historical monuments—read: "The Viet Cong (as bourgeois propaganda calls the NLF) is worse than the plague. It must be wiped out." It was obvious that the poster campaign had been prepared as thoroughly as the pogroms. In fact, it was rumored that the whole thing had been stage-managed by CIA-trained "experts." In any case, the events in Cambodia served only the interests of imperialist forces and ruling U.S. circles which, though officially denying any share in the coup, had a very definite share in its organization.

I left Cambodia with a heavy heart. The Mekong rolled its waters on. Oleander and

hibiscus shrubs in blossoms adorned Phnompenh's streets. Old and new buildings in typical Khmer style sported brightly painted roofs. Buddhist priests in saffron-colored togas walked staidly beneath grey umbrellas protecting their shaven heads. I cast a glance at the small house of the fishermen's suburbs. Many of its inhabitants had not ventured out for days. Many of the several hundred thousand Vietnamese living in Cambodia fled the country to avoid persecution.

The imperialists are fomenting discord in Indochina. That is part of their plan, but they will not succeed. The future of Indochina will be decided by its peoples, by their unity in fighting the common foe, U.S. imperialism.

* * *

In August 1965 I had had an interview with Prince Norodom Sihanouk in the Royal Palace in Phnompenh. I spoke to him again in Hanoi in June 1970, during his state friendship visit to the DRV. He remembered the previous interview and readily agreed to this one. We spoke mainly of the war and the Cambodian people's liberation struggle.

"The struggle continues and expands," Sihanouk said. "The interventionists miscalculated in hoping for a swift and easy victory in Cambodia. Things have worked out quite differently: the liberation movement has grown stronger in South Vietnam and is gaining strength in Cambodia. All this has had an impact on other Southeast Asian countries. Ours is not a government in exile. We have liberated districts in Cambodia, and they are being expanded. There are guerrilla bases and a national administration is being formed. Ministers who hold key posts in our government are working in the zones controlled by the United National Front of Cambodia. Lon Nol exercises no effective control. His rule is restricted to the capital, and even there it is extremely questionable. When South Vietnamese Vice-President Cao Ky visited Phnompenh he wanted to make a helicopter tour of the city, but Lon Nol told him he could not guarantee his safety."

Prince Sihanouk spoke of the comradeship-in-arms of Cambodians, Vietnamese and Laotians and of the common front of the peoples of Indochina against the imperialist aggressors. It is being strengthened in joint struggle. Of course, there are still many obstacles on the common road the Indochinese peoples have chosen. But

their patriotic movement, which goes back to the joint struggle against the French colonialists and is now continued in joint

resistance to the U.S. aggression, is growing in strength and scope. Its reverberations extend to every part of the world.

NATO against Cypriot independence

ANDREAS FANTIS

The socialist world system is going from strength to strength. Class battles in the capitalist countries are gaining in intensity. The national liberation movement is making rapid progress. Colonialism is on the way out and the capitalist system as a whole is in deep crisis. In these conditions anti-communism, and above all its main variety, anti-Sovietism, has become the alpha and omega of monopoly capital's policy and ideology.

The reasons for this are historical. The military and political defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism were not the only results of World War II. The victory of the anti-fascist forces, with the Soviet Union in the lead, helped a number of European and Asian countries to break away from the capitalist system. The Cuban revolution gave rise to a socialist state in the Western Hemisphere.

A historic result of World War II was the disintegration of colonial rule and the liberation of hundreds of millions from age-long oppression.

The national liberation movement, which developed between the two world wars under the direct impact of the October Revolution, went some way towards undermining imperialism. Nevertheless, imperialism retained its hold on a vast colonial empire. Indeed, the colonies, semi-colonies and dependencies in 1938 accounted for 59.9 per cent of the world's total area and for 63.6 per cent of its population. By 1968 their share had shrunk to roughly four per cent and 1.1 per cent respectively. More than 70 sovereign states arose in what had been

colonial possessions. The Cypriots' persevering fight against the British colonialists brought into being the Republic of Cyprus, a small state with 590,000 people, 80 per cent of whom are Greeks and 18 per cent Turks.

These developments dealt a crippling blow to imperialist rule; the imperialists no longer shape the destiny of mankind, but they are not giving up. The main purpose of their policy of aggression is to check the irreversible decline of capitalism. This also explains their increasing recourse to anti-communism.

There is nothing new about anti-communism. It was used as a pretext for countless moves against the newly-established Soviet state in the form of military intervention, economic blockade and attempts to isolate it internationally. Fascism was reared and the way for World War II paved under the motto of anti-communism. The same motto was used to fan the cold war and to carry on nuclear blackmail and political and ideological subversion against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

After the war, anti-communism expressed itself in steps to build up international tensions, specifically by forming the aggressive NATO bloc under the aegis of U.S. imperialism. The result was that some West European countries became strategic bridge-heads and their policies were geared to U.S. interests.

On the plea of staving off the alleged "danger of communism," NATO plans and carries out military conspiracies and coups. The same pretext is used to encroach on

the sovereignty and independence of Cyprus. Neo-colonialist intrigues, particularly by NATO and its agents, are disrupting normal life in Cyprus. They block the peaceful settlement of differences between Greeks and Turks within the framework of one state. Aggressive NATO circles try to provoke internecine strife to provide an excuse to interfere in the affairs of Cyprus and to rob it of its independence.

It is no overstatement to say that the Republic of Cyprus has been a NATO target from the very start. NATO plans against Cyprus are part of U.S. and British imperialist designs in the Eastern Mediterranean, and they follow the Prometheus pattern, which brought the colonels to power in Greece. These plans endanger the very existence of the Cypriot state. They jeopardize peace and security in the Eastern Mediterranean and affect the situation in the Middle East.

In 1964 an attempt was made to occupy Cyprus. It miscarried because the government and people of the republic, backed by peace-loving countries, above all by the Soviet Union, resisted the imperialists. Thereupon the U.S. State Department put forward the Acheson Plan providing for the establishment of a NATO base, or a NATO country in Cyprus, the abolition of the republic through *Enosis* (annexation by Greece) and appropriate "territorial compensation" to Turkey. Although the Cypriots rejected the plan out of hand, various versions of it are still peddled as a basis for the "solution" of the Cypriot problem invented by the NATO warlords.

The Athens military junta, aided by NATO, plots against Cyprus and meddles in its affairs. With help from the CIA it planned, under the code name of *Astrapi* (Lightning), a military coup to overthrow the Cypriot government and to put the Acheson Plan into effect.

To aggravate the situation and dislocate public life in Cyprus, NATO uses a clandestine organization calling itself the National Front as a fifth column. The organization is linked with the Athens junta and reactionary Greek officers still holding key posts in the armed forces of Cyprus. Recently its activity was exposed by the Cyprus government and some of its members were arrested. This subversive and terroristic organization of paid agents of imperialism and extreme fascist elements wanted to implement a secret double *Enosis* plan by NATO aimed at partitioning Cyprus between Greece and Turkey, NATO

allies of the American and British imperialists. One stage of the plan was to have been a coup leading to the removal of President Makarios. The terrorists' plan was to paralyze Cyprus (hence its name, "Paralysis") and then subject its freedom-loving people to NATO.

Aggressive NATO groups taking their cue from the U.S. imperialists approach the Cyprus question from the standpoint of their economic and strategic interests in the Middle East, where they are losing ground as the Arab liberation movement advances. This is why NATO leaders are so hard pressed to "settle" the question. The latter was dealt with at the Rome session of NATO last spring and was also an important item on the agenda of a meeting of U.S. Ambassadors to Mideast and Mediterranean countries called by Nixon in Naples during his recent tour of Europe.

The "good offices" of the United States regarding Cyprus, which R. Davis, Assistant Secretary of State, offered during his lightning visit to Cyprus this year, were intended to patch up the "unity" of the southeastern flank of NATO shaken by the Greek-Turkish discord and to strengthen U.S. positions in the Eastern Mediterranean. While backing Israeli aggression more and more heavily, the United States would like to secure another "unsinkable aircraft carrier" for its Phantoms and another anchorage for its floating police force, the Sixth Fleet, so as to step up the fight against the Arab friends of Cyprus, eliminate progressive Arab regimes and restore imperialist domination.

This imperialist policy is thoroughly hostile to the national and state interests of Cyprus and endangers other peace-loving nations of the Mediterranean.

Events in Cyprus show again that the existence of foreign bases and troop contingents there and the anti-Communist activity of NATO and its agents make for permanent tension. Nor is it only a question of bases put at the British government's "sovereign" disposal in 1959 and now manned by some 20,000 crack troops. Greece and Turkey, for their part, keep troops there which "in case of need" will have the "right" to interfere in the domestic affairs of Cyprus. Besides, the United States has powerful radio stations on the island operated by 1,500 U.S. "experts."

The imperialists' anti-Communist activity, which is coupled with the threat of force, is designed to divide our people and isolate them from powerful and reliable

friends and defenders—the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union. However, it is not succeeding.

In an effort to disrupt the Cypriot people's patriotic unity, the imperialists have put about the myth about the danger of Cyprus being turned into a Mediterranean Cuba, and about the Communists lording it over Cyprus. Allegations about plans to establish a Communist regime in Cyprus were widely used by the imperialists before and during the general election last summer. However, the overwhelming majority of the electorate identified itself unmistakably with our Party's policy of consolidating national independence, promoting non-alignment and encouraging friendship with all peace-loving countries. It was a fitting rebuff to international imperialism and home reaction.

Needless to say, plots of this nature, like any plan to liquidate the Cypriot state, are also directed towards suppressing the democratic movement in the country and doing away with AKEL (Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus), which upholds the people's interests.

Our people know about the criminal schemes of the imperialists, who made an attempt on President Makarios' life because his government follows a policy of national independence, and planned to assassinate the General Secretary of AKEL and other political leaders. The Cypriots counter the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet hysteria and all imperialist plots with the demand:

"Freedom and independence for a democratic Cyprus!"

The Cypriots emphatically condemn imperialist intrigues calculated to dismember the country or set up a puppet regime at the beck and call of NATO. For years progressive Cypriots have been fighting against interference in the affairs of Cyprus by NATO countries—the United States, Britain, Turkey and Greece.

As it marches in the van of the Cypriots' unremitting struggle to attain full independence and to foil imperialist plans, AKEL is striving to achieve patriotic unity of the people. It calls on them to safeguard and uphold the unshakable unity of the people, army and government in line with the country's announced policy.

AKEL's patient political and ideological work among the masses is a strong weapon against the anti-communism of the enemies of Cyprus. Equipped with the invincible theory of Marxism-Leninism and with patriotic policy and tactics, our Party effectively exposes the anti-Communist propaganda and conspiracies of the imperialists and their agents.

Militant anti-Communism, a concentrated expression of imperialist policy and ideology, will not help imperialism restore its monopoly in deciding world affairs. It is more evident than ever before, as the international Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties noted, that imperialism "can neither regain its lost historical initiative nor reverse world development."

Blackpool, 1970

Hotels strung along the seafront; dolls—clowns, lions, gnomes, bathing beauties, astronauts — perched on metal poles; brightly lit trams plastered with advertising; crowds winding in and out of restaurants and nightclubs. Such was Blackpool, on the west coast of England, where the Labor Party held its 69th annual conference September 28-October 2.

But let the reader know that that is not an introduction to a report of an event of three months ago, nor to a profound analysis of the Labor Party and its policies. The sole purpose of this article is to share with thereader some impressions and thoughts on the Labor Party conference.

ON THE QUESTION OF DEMOCRACY

The conference was carefully prepared. Delegates, guests and journalists were generously supplied with printed matter. In addition to the agenda, the list of resolutions, the Executive report and other official documents, there was a wide choice of leaflets, advertising material, propaganda pamphlets, even the Labor Party Song Sheet listing *The Red Flag* as No. 1 and the *Internationale* as No. 3. And there was a choice of public meetings and discussions. For 2/6d. you could hear Lord Caradon and others on the problems of peace and the Labor movement. Or Jan Mikardo, Vice-Chairman of the Party's Executive and other Labor MPs on "African Freedom—Britain's Betrayal?" At a tea Mr. Mikardo could also be heard on Social Democracy in Israel; here the charge was five shillings which included tea.

On the eve of the conference, September 27, the Party's General Secretary, Harry Nicholas, explained Conference arrangements to newsmen — what resolutions would be discussed and when, what would be the seating order on the platform, and so on. We learned, for instance, that Harold Wilson would be third on the right of the chairman and the Deputy Leader, Roy

Jenkins, fourth on the left; copies of the seating order were handed out.

In short, there was no need for questions, everything was clear. But there were two questions: Would European security be discussed? The answer was that it was not on the agenda but might crop up in the debate. How do the Party leaders regard Labor's defeat at the polls? The questioner was advised to wait for conference to pronounce its judgement. This caused a good deal of laughter. Mr. Nicholas intervened to remind the newsmen that procedure would be decided by the conference itself, for it alone was authorized to rule on such matters. This too evoked some laughter.

The morning of September 28. The Empress Ballroom in the Winter Gardens is filled with delegates and guests. Tunes from "The Donkey Serenade" and "My Fair Lady" over the loudspeakers. The Chairman takes his seat and the opening ceremony gets under way. After that the conference gets down to work. The atmosphere is rather informal—those who do not care to listen to the speeches gather in the lobbies or sit down to a quiet cup of tea. At times the hall is half empty. The conference discusses inclusion in the agenda of a supplementary resolution. A young woman begins a passionate speech against racial discrimination, insisting that a resolution on the subject be brought up for debate. There is some applause. The chairman intervenes: she is out of order. She objects, but Mr. Mikardo is adamant: an attractive girl on the platform is always welcome, but in this particular case he feels obliged to ask her to go back to her seat.

And she has no choice, the rules have to be observed. And as one watched the observance of the rules and the general atmosphere there was no getting away from the impression that the proceedings had been carefully stage-managed and were directed by a firm hand. Even the

casual atmosphere seemed part of the scheme. The tested mechanism of bourgeois parliamentary democracy was working without a hitch.

This was perhaps most clearly demonstrated by the elegant method with which the Labor leadership controls the process of decision-making.

One of the main trade-union demands, supported by the Left and the rank and file, was for an end to the disregard the Parliamentary Labor Party and the Labor government showed for conference decisions. Mr. Wilson and his colleagues were accused of setting themselves up as a privileged elite, with little or no respect for the voice and will of the movement. They were, it was claimed, competing with the Tories in operating a policy that strengthened capitalism. There were a number of resolutions on this theme, and they were not couched in the usual parliamentary lingo, but were a straightforward demand that Party leaders abide by Party decisions.

The leadership retaliated by using its soft-pedalling mechanism. On the opening day, the delegates were given a list of composite resolutions. And they were a masterpiece of "compositing": nearly all the words of the original resolutions were retained, but now, in composite form, they lacked clarity, sharpness. They were no longer decisions but pious wishes, no longer verdicts, but requests. The following is a typical example:

"This Conference believes that the Parliamentary Labor Party leaders, whether in government or opposition, should reflect the views and aspirations of the Labor and Trade Union Movement, by framing their policies on Annual Conference decisions.

"While appreciating that the Parliamentary Labor Party must deal with matters arising in Parliament which have not been the subject of Annual Conference decision, it deplores the Parliamentary Labor Party's refusal to act on Conference decisions."

Actually, this concerns a basic principle of democracy. But the Labor Party leaders did not accept even this conveniently streamlined obligation. They even risked the prestige of the Party leader, who persuaded the resolution's authors not to insist on its second paragraph. Mr. Wilson's main argument was that the Prime Minister is responsible to the House of Commons and cannot, in his day-to-day work, be guided by instructions from quarters other than Parliament.

Soft-pedalling was followed by pressure.

But this time it did not work: the resolution was passed on a card vote by a slim majority: 3,085,000 to 2,801,000, one of the rare instances when stage-managing went wrong. Chris Muir of the Manchester Labor Party, which had tabled the resolution, was loudly applauded when he said: "We are not like the collection of fashion-conscious exhibitionists who attend the Conservative conference to see how long they can stand up and cheer their leader as he tells them what to do."

This was said with a feeling of pride. But the day before Harold Wilson had been given a standing ovation after his main speech.

"WHY DID WE LOSE?"

Wilson is not the kind of speaker who can inspire people to storm palaces. He was rather nervous on the platform, his delivery was rapid and somewhat monotonous. He left the impression of an intelligent technocrat, or of a company director addressing a board meeting. His speech was well balanced and he kept his audiences's attention not so much by rhetoric as by apt comparisons and witticisms.

Witticisms are an essential ingredient of any political speech in Britain. And there was much laughter and encouraging applause at Wilson's caustic remarks about the Conservative government. True, he remarked that "Britain had no government"—there's been nothing like it since the Hans Anderson story of the Emperor parading through the streets without clothes, "only this time it is the clothes that have no Emperor." Or this bit, borrowed from the *Financial Times*: The government is in the back seat but it is watching the driving mirror to see what others are doing. Or this: "I am not going to embark on a considered attack on the Conservative government's economic policy, because I don't know what it is—any more than they do."

Humor can be a deadly weapon against political opponents, but only if it is not made an end in itself. In listening to the ex-Prime Minister and joining in the laughter, one could not get away from the impression that it was lightweight humor, not deadly. References to the Hans Anderson story cannot cancel out the fact that there is a Conservative government and that it exercises effective power. Even if Mr. Heath does not have an economic policy, its absence is in itself a policy. But

he has a policy and its effects are being felt by the British worker. No wonder trade union delegates were so insistent on a resolution instructing the Party leadership fully to support the trade unions in the fight for the workers' interests and against "the policy of the Conservative Government's proposal for the reform of industrial relations which is designed to interfere with the internal affairs of trade unions and can only have the effect of impairing the efficiency to represent the interests of the workers."

The adoption of this resolution, the *Morning Star* said in an editorial, "was not only in total opposition to Tory policy on these issues, but also to that of Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Castle and the Right-wing Labor government leaders when they were in office."

The Left Labor *Tribune* said that it was probably the most important resolution a Labor Party conference had adopted in the past ten years.

Much was made of the Labor government's achievements in such matters as prices and wages, housing, education and the health service. And there were many warnings to the Tories of the ruinous consequences of their policy. Mr. Wilson said he had "told parliament . . . warned the country." With the exception of the Labor Government's veto on arms to the Rhodesian racials, international problems were conspicuous by their absence in Mr. Wilson's speech: there was no mention of Vietnam, the Middle East or European security.

The ovation over, the chairman gave the floor to a guest—the Prime Minister of Mauritius, who declaimed to a half-empty auditorium: the delegates were in the lobby, comparing notes. By what one could judge from casual conversations, retorts and exclamations, the consensus was that the leader had evaded the main issue, "Why had we lost the elections?"

During the intermission, a group of delegates crowded around one of the party chiefs. "Haven't you read the National Executive statement?" he asked. "The reasons are four: first, the tremendous difficulties we found in focusing public attention on the real issues in the campaign; second, the vastly superior financial backing which the Tory party enjoyed; third, the widespread lack of understanding of Labor's program of achievement; and four, the unpopularity of some measures taken by the Labor government to balance the budget and straighten out the economy."

"Any more questions?"

"Yes. Why did we lose?"

WHAT ABOUT SOCIALISM?

The answer to why Labor lost, however, will hardly be found in the leadership's statements. More likely, it is given in the agenda, which contains drafts of Conference resolutions. Here is a fair sampling of them:

"This Conference, recognizing that General Election campaigns based on the personal qualities of political leaders can never promote radical change declares that the Labor Party must re-establish a clearly defined sense of purpose if it is to gain the enthusiastic support of the working class.

"Conference therefore instructs the National Executive Committee to prepare a program designed to:

"a) secure greater equality in the distribution of national wealth and income;

b) extend social ownership and control of industry;

"c) develop industrial democracy and the role of the Trade Union Movement in industrial and economic affairs" (submitted by the National Union of Public Employees).

Next:

"This Conference calls for a return to the principles of Socialism in formulating future policy for the Labor Party. It views with dismay the failure of the Parliamentary Labor Party to boldly and courageously implement Socialist policies in recent years, with the resulting absence of real social change and progress in this country . . ."

Significantly, the amendment to this resolution requests that future appeals to the electorate should never again be based on a "modified Conservative program."

Next:

"This Conference declares that . . . the General Election has clearly demonstrated that the failure of a Labor Government to follow a full Socialist economic policy leads to a failure to retain the support of our traditional voters . . ."

Next:

"This Conference, in view of the June Election, calls on the Labor Party in Opposition to pursue Socialist policy based on Clause 4, whereby the workers will get the benefits of the Labor Government in office instead of the anti-working-class policies pursued by the late Labor Government."

It will be recalled that Clause 4 of the

Labor Party's Constitution, which sets out its aims, envisages more equal distribution based on social ownership of the means of production.

A few dozen more resolutions stress that Labor's defeat was due to "the attempt to rescue a British economy in crisis by orthodox capitalist methods," "the failure of the 1970 General Election Manifesto to draw a clear distinction between the two parties (Labor and Conservative—J.P.)," and to the Labor Government's policies being "dictated by the monopolies and big financial interests." Nearly all resolutions exhorted the party to revert to Socialism, to work for social ownership, socialist economic planning, socialist methods of production, distribution and circulation.

They did not call for revolution, it is true, but were marked by expressions of rancor and indignation, and faith in the ability of the working class, a readiness to fight and awareness that a radical change in Labor's policy was long overdue.

What then? In a certain passage of the composition the call of the bugle gave place to the sweet sound of the flute. Two more composite resolutions were brought into the world. One of them with indeterminate pleas for greater equality, more social ownership, a bit more industrial democracy. That was the one that was passed. The other—no summons to the barricades by a long shot—was black-balled all the same by means of the pressure machine. We read it attentively, seeking to apprehend why it had evoked displeasure. The reason was probably this: it contained certain concrete elements, suggesting the preparation of a program "to take real economic power by bringing into public ownership the 280 monopolies, private banks, finance houses and insurance companies."

This does not mean to say that the present Labor leadership is opposed to Socialism in general. Mr. Wilson and his colleagues made liberal use of the term "Socialism" in their utterances. Some newspapermen even acclaimed this as progress. More, aware of the rank-and-file sentiment and eager to reassure the membership that its leadership was abreast of the times, the National Executive Committee produced a special document, "Building a Socialist Britain," from which one learned that "society's major problems must be solved by cooperation for the common good rather than an appeal to individual self-interest," that Labor must

work "towards an extension of common ownership and a better balance between the public and private sectors of the economy," and that Britain's problems would only be solved "by the application of thoughtful, collective, progressive and essentially socialist principles."

But we should be wasting our time leafing through the documents for an in the least meaningful explanation of the socialism Britain was to get from the Labor leaders, and what they meant by the term. Little or nothing, too, could be learned on that score from the party leader's speech, which says in so many words: "The individual identity, the rights of a man and his family can only be restored and enhanced if individuals join together to control the apparatus they have created. This is Socialism. That is why, if Socialism had never been thought of before, it would have to be invented. This is why the Socialism of the Labor Party is more relevant and more needed now than ever before."

If that is socialism, then it isn't even mini, but rather bikini-socialism. By paraphrasing Voltaire's famous words ("If there were no God, He should be invented"), the speaker unwittingly betrayed his disdain for the rich legacy of socialist thought, for socialism as science and practice.

The Labor movement, as we know, has never associated itself with the Marxist, scientific socialism. From the outset, this pre-determined its ideological weakness, absence of a clear class program, the vagueness of its aims. Yet the Labor movement stems from the class struggles of England's workers for their interests and has absorbed the national traditions of socialist thought and the revolutionary movement—from Thomas More to Robert Owen and from the Diggers to the Chartists.

Where, then, is the source of the insipid conception of socialism the Labor movement is now being saddled with, falling short of even the program aims of trends it had integrated, such as the Christian Socialists and the Fabian Society?

The answer is obvious: the source is not in the socialist ideals and aspirations of the working class, of all other working people. It is in the liberal-reformist sentiment of a part of the ruling strata of the bourgeois society. In the 19th century liberalism outbalanced reformism. Compassion for the workers there was, but no special zeal to improve their condition. In the 20th century reformism came to the fore—and less for altruistic considerations

than for sheer pragmatism: the working class had grown into an imposing force and had to be met half-way to avert a revolutionary outburst.

All the same, the marriage contract between liberalism and reformism could in no circumstances produce socialism, save that wretched concept of it outlined above.

THE CHANGES AHEAD

In January 1924, the newspaper *English Review* published an article reflecting the bourgeoisie's dread of a Labor victory (Labor won 191 seats in the Commons):

"We now stand at a moment when the sun of England seems menaced with final eclipse. For the first time in her history the party of revolution approach their hands to the helm of State, not only, as in the seventeenth century, for the purpose of overthrowing the Crown, or of altering the Constitution, but with the design of destroying the very base of civilized life."

Somewhat later, the Duke of Windsor described the reaction of his father, King George V, to Labor's forming a government: "My father . . . was in considerable doubt as to how the Socialist leaders would conduct themselves towards him in their new role as Ministers of the Crown. Many of them, in their youth, had publicly scoffed at the Monarchy. And my father was not only apprehensive that some of his new Ministers might refuse to participate in State ceremonies, but he also had some grounds for believing that they might even refuse to wear Court uniforms. Fortunately Mr. MacDonald proved to be a reasonable man; the new Prime Minister and his Cabinet in due course made their debut at Court colorfully clad in the uniforms of Ministers of the Crown—a blue, gold-braided tail-coat and white knee-

breeches with sword—a courtesy that went far to reassure my father."

The Duke of Windsor also refers to the following entry in his father's diary:

"Today, 23 years ago dear Grandmamma (Queen Victoria—J.P.) died. I wonder what she would have thought of a Labor Government?"

Dear old Grandmamma's reaction is no concern of ours. Certainly, neither knee-breeches nor sword will prevent a real Labor leader from being a labor leader, unless the Court dress and knighthood go to his head, altering his thinking, and he begins (consciously or not) to imitate bourgeois politicians, forgetting his duty to his class.

After Blackpool some progressive commentators saw far-reaching changes in the offing for the Labor Party. Beyond question, it passed a number of good resolutions. A sizeable segment of delegates acclaimed the interventions of Jack Jones, Tom Jackson, Lawrence Daly, Hugh Scanlon and other trade-union leaders, expressive of the militant sentiment that is running high among the workers. It is quite true, too, that Labor's Right wing was compelled to give ground here and there.

But by and large there is hardly any reason to think that the Labor movement has crossed into a new era. Blackpool 1970 is hardly destined to occupy a place of prominence in Labor's history. When two million votes squashed the resolution calling for the expropriation of the monopolies, one of the lady delegates observed caustically: "People might say that Labor came to power with pretensions to change the world. The world changed them."

Yet one day Labor will have to re-chart its course. That is inevitable.

Jan PRAZSKY

Philosophical relevance of Leninism

ANDRAS GEDO

I.

The most observant of our adversaries have taken note of the fact—perhaps ahead of some Leninists—that in the past 10 or 15 years philosophy has forged to the fore in the *theoretical* sphere of the class struggle. This applies to the *international* rather than national or regional dimensions of the controversies, the determinative tendencies of which do not necessarily—and certainly not at once—surface in the ideological process of individual countries or regions. In the Third World, for example, philosophy is obviously not the prime aspect of the ideological battle. Generally speaking, too, the *immediate* impact of philosophy on the masses is limited; the philosophical element in the social collisions is not distinct at all, any more than the social purport of the philosophical controversies, because the relation between philosophy and political action is complex and mediate, and often contradictory. Neither is the philosophical content always distinct in the ideological struggles within the revolutionary movement. The petty-bourgeois ultra-revolutionary nationalist conception represented by the “ideas of Mao Tse-tung,” for one, is based on a subjectivist and metaphysical revision of Marxism, no matter how much its exponents may invoke dialectical materialism, but projected mostly in the sphere of political theory and strategy.

Yet the contemporary theoretical discussions *about Marxism*, gaining momentum or dormant until suddenly breaking out, are essentially philosophical not merely in the sense that the ideological battle for or against Marxism *always* and necessarily

includes a philosophical aspect, but also in the narrower and particular sense that the *philosophical content* of Marxism is one of the *basic areas* of theoretical debate. Lenin wrote early in the century: “The controversy over the question as to what is philosophical materialism and why deviations from it are erroneous, dangerous and reactionary *always* has ‘a real and living connection’ with ‘the Marxist social and political trend’—otherwise the latter would not be Marxist, would not be social and political, would not be a trend. Only narrow-minded ‘realistic politicians’ of reformism or anarchism can deny the ‘reality’ of this connection. . . . In Russia before the revolution, the aspect that was particularly stressed was the application of the economic doctrine of Marxism to Russian reality; during the revolution, it was Marxist politics; since the revolution it is Marxist philosophy” (Vol. 17, p. 75, 76). The special accent on philosophy in the post-1905 theoretical controversies was *directly* due to the *defeat* of the *Russian* labor movement in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, precipitating a spiritual crisis among a considerable section of the intelligentsia favoring or joining the revolution. However, 1905 also represented a historical turn—the gradual ending of the relatively peaceful liberal period of capitalism and the beginning of a revolutionary uplift in the *international* working-class movement. And the battles Lenin had fought in the realm of philosophy, his philosophical works, anticipated and summed up the results of this international change of periods.

Some present-day features of the ideological struggle are the same as those of

the early century. There is a revival of god-seeking under the slogan of "renovating" Marxism, and a right- or "left"-leaning cult of subjectiveness is reappearing in the ideological life of the labor movement (or on its fringes). Those who want to "integrate" Marxism and bourgeois thought are again straining to push Marxist materialism into the shade, to obscure or de-fuse the theory of reflection and the idea of social determinism. And just as in the early century, this is evidence of fairly definite trends; theoretical differences are again centered on philosophical problems. The concepts of practice and cognition, object and subject, the dialectical law and social action, and of alienation and freedom in general, concern the essence of Marxism as a whole. However, not only the link between philosophy and politics, which is typical of the history of Marxism, but also the historical specifics of the *situation as it is at present*, predicates the fact that this philosophical struggle absorbs and expresses the confrontation of divergent concepts of the socialist system and the prospects of the class struggle, the role of the working class and the pertinence of the revolutionary party and its organizational principles. The similarity of phenomena and tendencies betrays historical continuity; however, the reversion to the old formulas occurs in a new situation and should not be divorced from it. The question of the philosophical relevance of Leninism is a point of intercrossing for all contemporary philosophical controversies.*

The present controversy between Leninism and idealistic interpretations of Marx did not originate from a defeat of the revolutionary working-class movement. The philosophical debate is, first and foremost, a reflection and component of socialism's international progress; the material and spiritual powers of the socialist world are in evidence in what would seem to be the most abstract of theoretical collisions, causing the collapse of the old bourgeois tactics that either ignored or completely renounced Marxism and impelling the continuously growing interest in Marxism. The philosophical content of the theoretical struggle also reflects the contemporary

contradictions and the local reverses and retreats of the revolutionary process. The intensity of the class struggle, the relation of the opposite forces, the awareness and activity of the classes, are dissimilar in the international context and in the various periods in the history of single nations. There has been no evidence of an immediate revolutionary situation in the developed capitalist countries in the past two decades: though polarizing class antagonisms, state-monopoly capitalism has also created new opportunities for bourgeois influence to spread among the working class and the middle strata. In the minds of intellectual groups aspiring to progress in the developed capitalist states this blends with the remote, yet exciting, experience of armed conflict between the national-liberation movements and imperialism. They conceive the general crisis of capitalism chiefly as a universal instability, a universal spiritual and moral degradation. That is why the philosophical content of negations and dreams plays a special role in their various notions. The difficulties in the Communist movement tend to accentuate trends contending against the philosophical foundations of Marxism-Leninism and interpreting idealistically the Marxist doctrine. In the minds of those who regarded and accepted Marxism as an article of faith, the collapse of their illusions was refracted as the collapse of Marxism; for them dialectical materialism stands for dogmatism; voluntaristic mistakes violating socialist practice (and theory) they relate to Leninism, which, to be sure, is completely consonant with the illusions that accompanied the voluntaristic fallacies. These politically and spiritually shipwrecked seek salvation in bourgeois thought, chiefly in individualistic subjectivism elevated to the status of a philosophical principle; and along with them they bring the debris of their former convictions. That some national contingents of the revolutionary working-class movement experience temporary crisis situations is secondary in relation to the worldwide historical progress of the socialist revolution; yet it substantially influences the theoretical struggle and usually gives rise to the appearance of different variants of Marxism.

In some ways the postures in bourgeois ideology are being retailored: criticism of Marx interlaces increasingly with idealistic interpretations of Marx, and the appeal of the "philosophy of life," of the *Lebensphilosophie*, as an alternative (and complement) to neo-positivism increases; new

*The philosophical relevance of Leninism is here discussed in relation to the polemics between Leninism and "neo-Marxist" interpretations of Marx (we are not concerned at the moment with the other essential aspects of the matter). Accordingly, all references to differences in outlook, to divergent approaches and to theoretical controversies imply divergencies of principle between Leninism and opposing trends, and not divergent standpoints that necessarily arise in the course of the development of Marxism-Leninism.

varieties appear of the synthesis of neo-positivism and the "philosophy of life." Modern bourgeois economic theories fath-ered by positivism, the "industrial society" concept which makes a fetish of technol-ogy, are complemented by existentialist myths of technology and freedom. In this set-up, the deficiencies of Marxist theoret-ical activity are more strongly felt and more easily incorrectly interpreted. For "neo-Marxism" the unresolved problems appear as an ideatic vacuum and lags in theoretical thought as symptoms of abso-lute stagnation and sclerosis. In contrast to dogmatic self-satisfaction, Marxology and Marxization, and acceptance of the ideas of bourgeois philosophy have an air of novelty and diversity.

To deny the philosophical relevance of Leninism is to question its existence. If Lenin is recognized *merely* as a gifted tactician (at best a strategist) of political struggle related to a past "model" of re-volution, then Lenin's teaching is made relative and treated merely as a historical episode in the variety of interpretations of Marx; Lenin's achievement is then essen-tially reduced to a purely Russian pheno-menon, with the sole concession that his theory of imperialism is of a somewhat more general interest. If, as the idealistic interpreters of Marx contend, "Material-ism and Empirio-Criticism" continues the tradition they reject, a tradition they re-gard as a projection of Engels' "Anti-Duehring," the sense of which, they hold, is that Marxism is "not only a method of contemplating social phenomena and a methodology of historical initiative but also the world outlook of scientific thought" (see E. Fischer, Fr. Marek: "Was Lenin wirklich sagte," Wien-Muenchen-Zuerich, 1969, S. 167) *, then we may regard the dia-lectical materialism in the thoughts of Lenin either as outdated or, even, negative from the beginning; his political and economic ideas are then stripped of intrinsic coher-ence and of every trace of general effec-tiveness outside of particular or singular situations: through this prism Leninism is a heap of theoretical debris. Whether overtly or covertly, the controversies over the relevance of Leninism place in question the wholeness, the integrity, of Leninism.

II.

"Historical necessity and freedom, class

*This concept totally rejects Lenin's dialectical material-ism and strives to present him as a, albeit inconsistent, hesitant and groping exponent of the "philosophy of practice" as opposed to dialectical materialism.

and party, the class in itself and the class for itself, similarity in conditions and awakening of self-apprehension; these con-ceptual antitheses immanent in the Marx-ism of Marx, enable all professed Marxists and anti-Marxists to produce an interpre-tation consonant with their own philoso-phy, with the turns in history or with the practical requirements of the day or age. There already has been Marx the Kan-tian, Marx the Hegelian, Marx the Saint-Simonist and Marx the existentialist. Now there is Marx the structuralist" (R. Aron: "D'une Sainte Famille à l'autre. Essais sur les marxismes imaginaires." Paris, 1969, p. 301). With the self-righteousness of the outspoken anti-Marxist, Aron sets forth the basic formula of the Marxizational and revisionist philosophical interpretations of Marxism: these must from relativist posi-tions disrupt the theoretical integrity of Marxism, ignore its intrinsic unity, in order to adapt or subordinate Marxist doctrine to *another* philosophy. The concepts of his-torical necessity and freedom, class and party, the class in itself and the class for itself, of objective conditions and self-ap-prehension, are pregnant with antinomy and fragile ambiguity, with possible wholly different interpretations, only if taken out of the historical continuity and theoretical unity of Marxian thinking and approached from the standpoint of bourgeois philo-sophical concepts. *The point of departure and basis* of the different interpretations of Marx's philosophy are not traceable to any separate aspect of the Marxian theory. Absolutization of some historical phase or some theoretical aspect in Marx's thought is merely a consequence flowing from the trend of bourgeois philosophy taken as the point of departure and the basis of the particular interpretation. The typo-logical variants of the interpretations of Marx's views are conditioned by the typo-logy of bourgeois philosophy. Yet to ap-prehend the need for that kind of "model" of Marx's theory one must first by public polemics or tacit rejection "render harm-less" and jettison Leninism. Thus, philo-sophical interpretations of Marx reflect the relevance of Leninism in the mirror of polemics; Leninism is the foe of all Marxo-logical, Marxizational and revisionist in-terpretations of Marx which this polemics reduces to an objective common denomi-nator for all their diverse and often con-flicting intents and tendencies.

The construction of an existentialist and structuralist, phenomenological and positivist Marx is premised on rejection

of dialectical materialism (or interpretation divesting it of its essential content). Hence the tendency common to all the diverse philosophical interpretations of Marx — their *common negation*, in the context of which the borderline between Marxology and Marxization and between Marxization and revisionism,* between ultra-revolutionary and reformist interpretations, becomes no more than relative. On the other hand, trends which *approach* the Marxist philosophy differ from Marxization in both social and theoretical terms, although in the life of individuals, in their thinking and activity, these tendencies often cross and combine. Already in the capitalist environment a segment of the intelligentsia comes under the influence of Marxism; social practice and the expansion of scientific knowledge breeds aspirations which, in the objective sense, and often for subjective motives, lead to dialectical materialism. In the process of espousing Marxism, of assimilating it intellectually, of its personal acceptance, there usually occur periods when Marxist impulses mix with elements and reminiscences of idealistic philosophy (with many failing to transcend these transitional stages). However, in contrast to Marxization, the retention of some elements of bourgeois philosophy is not in this process a motivation for new interpretations of Marx; it is a concomitant of Marx-inspired scientific investigation; in this case not rejection of dialectical materialism, but its influence, albeit incomplete, predominates.

Some Marxizationalizing intellectuals strive to come closer to Marx and Marxism. However, the predominant *objective* tendency in the interpretations of Marx contrasted to, or by-passing, Leninism, is

*By **Marxology** we designate the trend for which interpretation of Marx is, first and foremost, criticism of its teaching, a trend that sets itself apart from Marxism. The **Marxizers** claim that they are followers of Marx and make it their purpose to re-discover and restore his true ideas; they stand deliberately aloof from the Communist movement and contrast their own interpretation of Marx's views to Leninism. **Revisionism** is here treated in the narrower sense, connoting interpretations of Marx divergent from Leninism; they keep surfacing within the Communist movement and—at least for a time—profess allegiance to Marxism-Leninism. Marxology unfailingly registers the conclusions of Marxization and revisionism, summing up and publicly formulating ideas covertly presented or not taken to their logical conclusion. However, at present the main path leads from Marxology, and especially from Marxization, to revisionism. Marxization exercises its influence on the revolutionary working-class movement not only via revisionism, but directly too; revisionism paves the way for it, among other things, by erasing the distinction between Marxization and Marxism. It follows from the objective logic of the ideological and political struggle that revisionist conceptions sooner or later come openly to grips with Leninism and turn into variants of Marxization (sometimes even of Marxology).

to depart from rather than to come closer to the philosophy of Marx. The real implication of the slogan, "BACK TO MARX!", is that Marx is *theoretically obsolescent*. Objectively, in the final analysis, these conceptions tend to reject or ignore Leninism, the Marxism of the *present day* and present-day Marxism. In the philosophy of Leninism they regard as unacceptable elements *common* to the thinking of Marx and Lenin and those in which Lenin elaborated upon the philosophy of Marx: the objectiveness of dialectics, the theory of reflection, the idea of historical determinism, the class character of philosophy, and the accent on struggle between materialism and idealism. In the philosophical "neo-Marxist" interpretations Marx's political economy is usually dealt with as an illustration — of abstractly historical interest only — of the concept of alienation or as empirical material for a philosophico-structuralist theoretical "model," whereas Marx's concept of revolution is, as a rule, dismissed as outdated. Habermas, for one, maintains that the basic content of Marx's theory (materialism, the labor theory of value, basis and superstructure, the concept of proletarian revolution) is no longer valid, that as dialectical materialism Marxism has "congealed into a world outlook"; he treats it as a unique philosophy of history interpreted and reconstructed in the spirit of the "critical" theory of the Frankfurt school" (see J. Habermas: *Theorie und Praxis. Sozialphilosophische Studien*. Neuwied am Rhein und (West) Berlin, 1967, S. 162 ff.). And Marxologists say of the common essence of "Western" interpretations of Marx that they "agree to the utmost degree that Marxism as a doctrine is outdated" (N. Lobkowitz: *Karl Marx 1966*. In: *Wort und Wahrheit*, No. 6-7, 1966. S. 423).

Seen from this angle, idealistic interpretations making a fetish of the "young Marx" are a transitional phase on the way to accepting bourgeois philosophy: the *bourgeois thinking* "integrated" in Marx assimilates the object of the interpretation — the Marxian system of ideas — and moulds it in its own likeness. The end result can only be *integration of Marx in bourgeois thinking*. Fetscher, too, endeavors to show the "distance, even the rift" between "the humanitarian aspirations and theories of the early Marx and the ideologies of the Second International and orthodox Leninism." As he sees it, therefore, "it is necessary to double back along the road that led from Marx to the Soviet

ideology; without this Marxism cannot regain its critical force, cannot purge itself of the dirt that has stuck to it. A simple regeneration of Marx's thinking is, of course, far from sufficient; at the same time it is necessary to absorb in theory and transform in practice the changed social and economic situation. At present, Marxist theory is capable of neither" (I. Fetscher: *Karl Marx und der Marxismus. Von der Philosophie des Proletariats zur proletarischen Weltanschauung*, Munchen, 1967, S.9 ff.). But the "proletarian philosophy" of the young Marx, too, Fetscher holds, is a vision that "has proved to be obviously unrealistic" (ibid., S. 144). In the Marxizational domain and in revisionism this next step in interpreting and criticizing Marx is expressed (but also concealed) by an affirmation of faith, by myth and utopia. Denial of the theoretical totality of Marxism leads to total denial of Marx's theory. The first step in the Marxizational interpretation of Marx detaches Marx's "true" aspirations from Leninism; the inevitable second step attests to the philosophical (and generally, theoretical) unity of Marxism and Leninism. Marx interpreted without and despite Lenin is stripped of Marxism.

III.

If any general affirmative tendency expressive of a certain common line among the different, often conflicting notions, exists in the "new" philosophical interpretations of Marx in addition to the negation of dialectical materialism (or what is ultimately the same thing: subjectivization of dialectical materialism), then it is the acceptance or reproduction of the basic structure of the modern bourgeois philosophical consciousness. *Omnis negatio est determinatio*: the common negation of dialectical materialism contains a conditional and relative unity of notions. The interconnection between subjectivist relativism and fideism, positivism and mythification pin-pointed by Lenin, is inescapably reproduced in the correlation of the main trends of "neo-Marxism" and in its intrinsic development.

It is seemingly right that "neo-Marxist" ideas form two basic trends. One, styling itself the "humanitarian philosophy of practice," more or less directly accepts the "philosophy of life," a dominant school in decadent bourgeois thought. The other is a positivist retailoring of Marxism, which, as a rule, blends with a subjecti-

vist philosophy of ethics. (See I. Fetscher: *Zur gegenwaertigen Philosophie-Diskussion im Ostblock*. In: *Wissenschaft in kommunistischen Laendern*. Hrsg. von D. Geyer, Tuebingen, 1967). Exponents of the "humanitarian philosophy of practice" decry dialectical materialism for its alleged positivism and scientism, while the positivists deprecate it for being metaphysical. The two trends are complementary, as well as alternative: positivist notions are complemented and crowned by a "philosophy of man" conceived usually in the spirit of the "philosophy of life," while the "humanitarian philosophy of practice" encompasses — as premise or immediate component — a positivist conception of scientific cognition. Both tendencies dismiss the idea of scientific philosophical cognition and the laws of dialectical materialism in favor of a covert or overt acceptance of positivist notions and seek in the spirit of the *Lebensphilosophie* a common "human project," an appreciation of the intrinsic content of "historical initiative," the universal purport of history and life outside science. Present-day Marxological, Marxizational and revisionist interpretations are caught up in the vicious circle formed by the alternative (and complement) of the "philosophy of life" and positivism. There may be different variants of the synthesis of the "philosophy of life" and positivism — ranging from the "humanized" Marxism with its cult of the subjective to the "theoretical anti-humanism" of the philosophico-structuralist interpretation of Marx. Often these conceptions clash: with each other and with various types and elements of the "philosophy of life" and positivism, excluded from the interpretations of Marx. But as long as they fail to break the vicious circle of positivism and the "philosophy of life," their debates and differences are secondary in relation to their polemics against dialectical materialism.

That it is possible to externally combine positivism and the "philosophy of life" is due to their intrinsic connection: the "philosophy of life," which in compressed form retains some essential positivist aspects, is inevitably a continuation of positivism. "We incline towards the mystical," Wittgenstein wrote in his early notes, "because science leaves our desires unfulfilled. We feel that even if all the possible scientific questions are answered, our problem will still be untapped" (*Tagebuecher 1914-1916*. In: L. Wittgenstein: *Schriften*, 1, Band, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1961, S. 142). Wittgenstein's outspoken

mysticism embarrassed some exponents of logical positivism, whose prophet he was. In his own way, however, Wittgenstein was a consistent thinker: he knew that the positivist conception of science and the leaning towards the mystical are interconnected.

Logical positivism concentrates on science, while positivist "scientism" restrains it; he who accepts the positivist conception searches for the philosophical world outlook beyond the bounds of scientific rationale. He *must* search, because the social reality, the course of the class struggle, compels the consciousness to tackle *problems* the legitimacy of which positivism cannot dismiss until they are banished from its conception of science, until it "purges" science of the dialectical reflection of the motion of reality, turning it into an exclusive world outside history. Again, more clearly than before, the crisis of neo-positivism reveals a "leaning towards the mystical." Positivism tends to accept the "philosophy of life," which, in turn, from the outset (Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Dilthey) accepts the positivist (and related Kantian) view of scientific cognition. Heidegger, too, despite his anti-positivism, proceeded from the neo-positivist conception of science when endeavoring to bring home the philosophical impotence of scientific cognition (see M. Heidegger: *Vortraege und Aufsaeetze*, Pfullingen, 1954, S. 61 ff.). Philosophy, he contended, will not reveal the true essence of being and man, of history and cognition, will not be capable of "thinking," until it rises above science.

The idealistic "renovations" of Marx, some directly contiguous with Heidegger's philosophy, engender the illusion that they go *back* to the "true" Marx and at once *forward* to the limitless and undivined future. In fact, however, far from simply retracing the path back to the young Marx, they interpret and criticize him in the spirit of *decadent* bourgeois philosophy. For all the "newness" of the "neo-Marxist" interpretations, however, it is Leninism that is truly, historically and theoretically *new*.

IV.

The crucial area in the present-day differences relating to the philosophy of Leninism is the conceptualization of *practice*. In the beginning of the century, the debate concerning the philosophical foundations of Marxism was concentrated in

the theory of knowledge. And if today conflicting trends clash over the concept of practice, this is due ultimately to the practical materialization of socialism. The epistemological character of the differences survives, directly interlaced with the philosophical concept of society. The category of practice, in fact, is the area where the knowledge and the philosophical conception of society intercross (at the same time, practice is the category in which interpretations of Marx expounding the positivist concept of science also cover some aspects of the "philosophy of life"). The "neo-Marxist" conceptualizations of practice isolate it from the interconnection of the laws and categories of dialectical materialism and strip it of the aspects that connect it with the idea of the objectiveness of dialectics, the theory of reflection, historical determinism. By so doing they not only modify the content of *one* category, but also alter the integrity of the entire *philosophical concept*. Whether reducing dialectics to the mere interaction of subject and object or connecting practice deprived of material quality with an "anthropologico-ontological" category of being, or whether denying the existence of the subject and history of Marxist philosophy, that is, in effect, dialectical materialism, in favor of a structuralist "philosophical practice" — all these different conceptions display a common tendency towards idealistic alteration and absolutization of the concept of practice.

Dialectical materialism does not splice the positivist concept of science with the "philosophy of life" world outlook. It bypasses this alternative of modern bourgeois philosophy, including the actual living process of society in the object of philosophico-scientific cognition and treating it in the context of the interconnection of the wholeness of material reality and reflection; it regards cognition from the standpoint of objective law-governed social practice. Like Marx, Lenin does not regard practice as the activity of the subjectiveness of an abstract man independent of nature and the universal process of history. "In his practical activity," Lenin writes, "man is confronted with the objective world, is dependent on it, and determines his activity by it" (Vol. 38, pp. 187-188). The dialectics of cognition (or consciousness in general) and practice is, among other things, that consciousness — as the reflection of reality — also transforms and creates objective reality through the medium of practice.

However, the *subject* of practice is not *subjectiveness* in the epistemological (and psychological) sense, although the latter element is always in evidence. The subject of an action is the social man who, as a biological being, represents part of the natural reality; his vital activity, however, is associated primarily with *social objectiveness*, whereas consciousness (subjectiveness) is a reflection of the material reality independent of him and primary in relation to him, and, consequently, also the reflection of the material being of society. In the process of history, cognition leading to the objective truth and stimulated and checked by practice, *transcends and retains* the element of subjectiveness. It transcends this subjectiveness, because the reflection of the "logic of things" is determinative in relation to the subjective elements in the choice of the subject of cognition, in the one-sidedness and relativity of particular results. And it retains, and in a sense augments, the subjective element, because the objectiveness of cognition is never complete and final, while the historical process of reflection includes the development of an activeness of cognition. In scientific cognition, the apparent departure of theory from reality, the multiple degrees of abstraction, the greater role of the interconnection between premises and results of cognition, and the like, are components of a more adequate reflection of reality. *Activeness of cognition* is not beyond the limits of the dialectics of reflection and is part of the history of apprehending and developing the objective truth. *Practical activity* and, among others, revolutionary activity, being one of the forms of the objective process, cannot evade the laws of the motion of social reality, because these are the intrinsic necessary connections of practical activity and, consequently, of revolutionary action.

Lenin defended and developed upon the ideas of Marx and Engels in the changed situation: struggle for dialectical *materialism*, particularly in the realm of *gnosiology*, gained priority in *philosophy*, and organization of revolutionary activity came to the fore in *politics*. In philosophy, Lenin fought what was essentially one engagement in two directions: he criticized not only the concessions afflicting the materialism of Marxism, or leading to its neglect, but also neglect of dialectics. His philosophical examination of the state of affairs in the labor movement and of the revolution in the natural sciences led to his conclusion that Marxist materialism

cannot be defended without a systematic elaboration of dialectics. Accordingly, in political theory, strategy and tactics he opposed not only economism and fatalism, which tend to deaden revolutionary activity, but also voluntarism. Like economism and fatalism, he renounced voluntarism from the standpoint of dialectical materialism. There is no demarcation line in his works to separate philosophy from politics. "The fundamental task of proletarian tactics," he wrote, "was defined by Marx in strict conformity with all the postulates of his materialist-dialectical *Weltanschauung*" (Vol. 21, p. 75). In this regard too, Lenin followed Marx. He determined the ways of revolutionary action with the help of scientific cognition of the objective necessity and of the implicit possibilities and alternatives. Lenin's fight for dialectical materialism was not the antipode, but the prerequisite and component of organizing revolutionary political activity.

V.

Classes and strata, generations and individuals, arrive at Marxism in their own way. Among intellectuals taking proletarian class attitudes the experience of class struggle and its conceptualization, often through philosophy, engenders and impels a process leading to conscious association with the socialist revolution, to acceptance of Marxism-Leninism. But that is only one of the possible ways. In the mass assimilation of Marxism, philosophy is not usually the first step: the majority do not go from dialectical materialism on to Marxist economics and politics, but rather from politics to philosophy. The mass assimilation of Marxism thus does not conform with the theoretical structure of Marxism.

In the totality of the class battles priority goes to politics. None but the doctrinaires demand an illusory "philosophical purity" from masses coming into revolutionary motion. The socialist revolution "cannot be anything other than an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry oppressed and discontented elements. Inevitably, sections of the petty bourgeoisie and of the backward workers will participate in it — without such participation, mass struggle is impossible, without it no revolution is possible—and just as inevitably will they bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors. But *objectively* they will attack *capital*, and the class-conscious vanguard of the

revolution, the advanced proletariat expressing this objective truth of a variegated and discordant, motley and outwardly fragmentated, mass struggle, will be able to unite and direct it, capture power . . ." (Vol. 22, p. 356). Lenin's conception of revolution includes alliance with the vacillating masses, as well as struggle against vacillation and reactionary fantasies, because the movement of the masses may be led astray or into *cul-de-sac* if the revolutionary working-class party comes under their influence and changes its spiritual image to fit theirs. The objective truth of the mass struggle leading to socialist revolution can be expressed only by the organized political force which preserves and applies the principle of the objectiveness of the truth, which organizes revolutionary activity with theoretico-scientific awareness. That is why Lenin considered it politically necessary to fight for dialectical materialism and to criticize idealism. Not "temporary political motivation," not pragmatic intent was what moved Lenin in his philosophical activity, as Korsch alleges (see K. Korsch: *Marxismus und Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1930. S. 27; K. Korsch: *Karl Marx, Frankfurt-am-Main-Wien*, 1967. S. 148), but the conviction that the revolutionary "usefulness" of dialectical materialism follows from its scientific truth.

As the "neo-Marxists" see it, the unity of dialectical materialism and socialist revolution weighs heavily on Leninism: "The Russian revolution and the institution of the Soviet system — that is *that* which obstructs a systematic discussion by and with Marxism" (J. Habermas: *Theorie und Praxis*, S. 164). Not only is this an outright refusal to *understand* the theory and practice of Leninism, but — regardless of the private sentiments of its exponents and despite their controversy with exponents of outspoken anti-Marxism and conservatism — grinds the axe of the social forces working *against the socialist revolution*, who regard as acceptable, even useful, theories that espouse Marx, provided they may be pitted against the existing socialism. Nor can this connection be made to vanish by simply ignoring it. "Neo-Marxism" behaves as though it does not come under the laws of the class struggle; when it turns out, however, that the motion of the class forces conflicts with the illusory dismissal of the social necessity, subjective philosophy morally denounces the

objective process of history. Like Wallenstein in Schiller's tragedy, it shifts the blame for its defeat, inescapable from the outset, on "the forces of evil."

The truth of Leninism was vetted against and confirmed by the objective development of the class struggle (in which the revolutionary movement acquires strength), the development of socialist society, and the world revolutionary process. And the present-day differences concerning the philosophical relevance of Leninism will, *in the final count*, resolve themselves in the same way. Yet philosophical struggle has to be waged on its own ground, by its own means. The "neo-Marxist" trends revive and renew ideas against which Lenin argued in the past. Positivism and God-seeking, modern forms of the cult of subjectiveness, are akin to trends already toppled by Lenin. Just as Lenin never confined himself to merely reproducing the views of Marx and Engels, so criticism of the present-day anti-Leninist views should not confine itself to mere repetition of old arguments. Defense of the theoretical and social integrity of dialectical materialism is, at once, its renovation: not only are particular outdated theses brought up to date in the historical process of the "change of forms" of Marxist philosophy, but the concrete universal content of the laws and categories of dialectical materialism is filled out with new elements; their interconnection changes; the set of these laws is not immutable. On the basis of the practical change of reality and of its cognitive assimilation, Marxist philosophical thought poses new problems and draws new generalizations, discovering new applications. Time and again, Lenin went back to the as yet unsolved *problems* of dialectical materialism, to the *uncompleted* character of Marxism traceable to its *topicality and relevance*: dialectical materialism inherently contains the necessity and the theoretical premises for its own development. Marx's theory is an objective truth: and according to Lenin the only possible conclusion from that is that by following the *path of Marxian theory* "we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it)" (Vol. 14, p. 143). It is in this context that we have to battle for the philosophical relevance of Leninism in each new situation; that relevance is neither made-to-measure, nor immutable, and constitutes the permanent task of knowledge and struggle.

At the sources of the Bolshevik Party

Seventy-five years ago, in the autumn of 1895, the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class was formed in St. Petersburg, then capital of the Russian Empire, a city with a large proletarian population. As often happens in history, the true significance of this event is revealed more and more as time passes and the labor movement develops.

The League was initiated and headed by V. I. Lenin, who described it as *the embryo of a revolutionary party* (see *Coll. Works*, Vol. 2, p. 341). And, as in an embryo, in it were programmed many qualities of the future party of Russia's working class. That is why the history of the League's foundation, the methods of work it adopted and the goals it set itself are not mere history. Much in the League's history and experience is of topical political interest today and can be useful to Communists in their struggle.

The League of Struggle was the first organization in Russia to engage in practical efforts aimed at injecting ideas of scientific socialism into the labor movement. Until then, Russian Social-Democracy had been, in Lenin's words, "at the embryonic stage of development" (Vol. 5, p. 517). In the conditions of Russia it was only natural that political thought at first developed in small study groups that engaged in ideological and theoretical debates in which Marxism gradually began to gain the upper hand. Lenin, who had come to St. Petersburg in August 1893, contributed decisively to the critique and ideological defeat of liberal Narodism and "legal" Marxism, to the strengthening of ties between revolutionary intellectuals and working people.

The time was ripe for comprehensive, systematic work in the midst of the work-

ing class. This had to be done in a country which, though possessing some impressive revolutionary traditions, had not a single political party, no trade unions or other labor organizations. In November 1895, the Marxist study circles of St. Petersburg merged in a political organization, which in December received the name League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. Its first leaders were V. I. Lenin, V. V. Starkov and G. M. Krzhizhanovsky.

Organizationally the League consisted of a leading center (a small group of people) acting as a city committee, three district groups (in effect district committees) and 20 or 30 Social-Democratic study circles. Lenin wrote at the time: "Without a strengthening and development of revolutionary discipline, organization and underground activity, struggle against the government is impossible" (Vol. 2, p. 349). Centralism and clandestinity were the rules of the League's activities, but at the same time democracy was observed as far as possible, and general meetings of representatives of the working-class districts to discuss leaflets and plans of work were held not less than twice a month.

The League's avowed purpose was to head the proletariat's class struggle, and it did much to promote that struggle. In addition to their propaganda work in the study circles the League's members carried on agitation at factory-floor level. In Lenin's words, the League's leaflets and propaganda pamphlets roused amongst the workers of St. Petersburg a passion to expose the capitalists and the tsarist government. Lenin himself wrote a leaflet in connection with a strike at the Thornton factory in November 1895, as well as a pam-

phlet, "Explanation of the Law on Fines Imposed on Factory Workers," printed in December 1895. He also supervised all the League's publications.

The League's propaganda and organizational work was an effective contribution towards the mounting strike movement. Especially important was an impressive strike of St. Petersburg textile workers in May 1896. In a comment on it the newspaper *Vorwaerts*, central organ of the German Social-Democrats, wrote: "Events in St. Petersburg indicate that socialism is making headway amongst the masses.... Credit for this goes mainly to the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, which is working tirelessly to disseminate the fundamentals of socialism in Russia."

At the beginning of December 1895, Lenin and a group of leaders of the League were arrested. The League, however, continued to function until August 1896 when, after another series of arrests, the leadership was taken over by people who proceeded to water down the League's militant, revolutionary character.

The creation and activity of the League of Struggle is a stage in the emergence of the Bolshevik Party. Lenin's purpose was to speed up the creation of a militant revolutionary organization capable of leading the working class and toiling masses to the decisive clash with the regime, and he spared no effort to forward it. As he wrote in an article at the time: "And so, to work, comrades! Let us not lose precious time!" (Vol. 2, p. 347).

The revolutionary fervor that permeated Lenin's work in the League of Struggle did not prevent him and his comrades from moving forward with the greatest forethought. To this day there is much to be learned from Lenin's methods and approach to the solution of revolutionary problems in the conditions of the time.

Already then Lenin was deeply concerned with the social base on which the future party was to be formed, with who would play the decisive role in it. Socialism, Lenin held, does not develop spontaneously within the labor movement, it must come as the result of purposeful work aimed at winning the working class over to socialist ideas and fostering a body of politically conscious workers capable of carrying these ideas into the midst of the proletariat. To Lenin, a young man at the time, these tasks were so obvious, and he promoted them so purposefully, that none of the factory workers with whom he as-

sociated saw anything at all speculative in his approach or felt that Lenin had to surmount some invisible barriers to get closer to them.

Summarizing the League's experience in his article, "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats," Lenin wrote: "Our work is primarily and mainly directed to the factory, urban workers. Russian Social-Democracy must not dissipate its forces; it must concentrate its activities on the industrial proletariat, who are most susceptible to Social-Democratic ideas, most developed intellectually and politically, and most important by virtue of their numbers and concentration in the country's large political centers" (Vol. 2, p. 330). And here are some facts: the League was connected with workers at 70 St. Petersburg factories, 22 of them employing more than a thousand workers each, and 17 employing 500 to 1,000. In effect, the League managed to extend its influence to the bulk of the city's industrial proletariat.

Lenin and other revolutionaries spared no efforts to help the foremost workers master Marxist ideas, develop their class consciousness and advance the proletariat's movement themselves. Lenin noted after the first Russian revolution that "a new type of Social-Democratic worker, who is taking the affairs of the Party in hand, has already appeared" (Vol. 16, p. 388). The first steps towards this had been made by the League of Struggle.

A workers' corps, which would later play an extremely important part in building up the Bolshevik party, was a very important, but not the only objective occupying Lenin at the time.

Thus, while emphasizing the need to carry on propaganda work among the workers in study circles, he at the same time called for widespread agitation in the factories. The desire to reach out to all sections of the working class, even the most backward, often resulted in "the demands and interests of the given moment" being put 'into the foreground' and "the broad ideals of socialism and the political struggle" being pushed back (Vol. 4, p. 279). Lenin clearly discerned this danger, gave ample warning of it and combatted it, giving credit to the League of Struggle for the "fact that, although the early Social-Democrats of that period zealously carried on economic agitation . . . , they did not regard this as their sole task. On the contrary, from the very beginning they set for Russian Social-Democracy the most

far-reaching historical tasks, in general, and the task of overthrowing the autocracy, in particular" (Vol 5, p. 376).

The League put out leaflets regularly, but Lenin kept insisting on the need to launch a newspaper, the *Rabocheye Dyelo* (Workers' Cause), prototype of the all-Russia publication, the *Iskra*, of five years later. He prepared several articles for the first issue, including an obituary on Frederick Engels. The issue, however, was confiscated by the police before it could be published. As G. M. Krzhizhanovsky, who took part in launching the paper, notes, "the very first issue called the correct tune for Social-Democratic work for a whole decade."

If revolutionary activity is to spread new people must be continuously drawn into it; at the same time underground activity requires that the circle of people involved be as small as possible. Lenin saw the way of resolving this contradiction by having the various groups and individuals specialize in different restricted aspects of work. "The aspects of revolutionary work," he pointed out, "are extremely varied" (Vol. 2, p. 349). By then Lenin had essentially defined the ways and means of correctly combining legal and illegal work, without which a revolutionary party could not exist in Russian conditions.

Shortly after the League's formation Lenin travelled abroad to establish contacts with the Emancipation of Labor group and get some first-hand knowledge of the labor movement in Western Europe. After returning home he visited Vilno, Moscow and Orekhovo-Zuyevo with the purpose of getting in touch with local Social-Democrats. Lenin was planning to link up the organization of the St. Petersburg proletariat with other Marxist organizations. Arrested towards the end of the year, in prison Lenin wrote the "Draft and Explanation of a Program for the Social-Democratic Party," continuing the preparatory work for the creation of a broadly based influential revolutionary organization.

Recalling the organization and work of the League of Struggle, Lenin wrote with characteristic self-criticism, "I used to work in a study circle that set itself very broad, all-embracing tasks; and all of us members of that circle suffered painfully and acutely from the realization that we were acting as amateurs at a moment in history when we might have been able to say, paraphrasing a well-known statement, 'Give us an organization of revolutionaries, and we will overturn Russia!'" (Vol. 5, pp. 466-7).

The history of the world Communist movement has its landmarks and milestones. One of these undoubtedly was the year 1895. Frederick Engels had died and for a time it seemed that opportunism, which was gaining strength, would succeed in considerably eroding the revolutionary spirit of Marxism. However, the revolutionary ideals were carried on. As Jacques Duclos notes in this connection, "Engels fought opportunism in the Second International to the last days of his life. But in 1896 the London congress, taking advantage of the fact that Engels was no longer alive, pushed through an opportunist policy clothed in revolutionary phraseology. A year earlier, in 1895, Lenin founded in Russia the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, and together with others waged an uncompromising struggle against opportunism" (WMR, No. 4, 1970).

The most efficacious weapon forged by Lenin in the struggle against opportunism was the new type of party he created; the road to it lay through the League of Struggle.

One of the members of the League, M. A. Silvin, recalls that at that difficult time Lenin had encouraged him in terms which today appear truly prophetic:

"You will see, soon we will grow into a real party. The revolution will come and we shall emerge to light as a Communist Party ready to carry out its task."

A. MASYAGIN

Iranian communist traditions

ABDULSAMAD KAMBAKHS

Fifty years have passed since the founding of the Iranian Communist Party (ICP) and 90 years since the birth of Heydar Khan Amu Oghly, who led the ICP in the closing years of his life.

There was a long period of struggle by Social-Democratic groups and organizations before the ICP was founded. The First Congress of the Party, held in Enzeli (now Pahlavi) in June 1920, was attended by 48 delegates, many of whom had been Social Democrats for 10 to 15 years.

The Iranian Social Democrats appeared on the political scene at the turn of the century. They were directly influenced by the Russian and Transcaucasian Social Democrats, the Bolsheviks. As early as 1901 Iranian Social Democrats took part in collecting material for *Iskra* and in sending it to Baku via Iran. Iranian workers employed in the Baku oil-fields played a big role in forming Social-Democratic groups in their country. Baku was a proletarian centre and numerous Iranian workers there had a schooling in class struggle. The concentration of Iranians in the Baku oil-fields, where they were the worst-off as well as the most active contingent of workers, made it easier for the Social Democrats to work among them. In 1904 Iranian workers formed the Hemmat party group on the Bolsheviks' initiative. Hemmat founded a newspaper of its own. Its members joined in many actions by Iranian workers and put forward political demands on a number of occasions.

On returning to their country, Iranian workers contributed to the revolutionary struggle of Social-Democratic groups. These groups played an active part in the 1905-1911 revolution the outstanding event of which was the heroic defense of Tabriz in 1908. Lenin thought highly of the revolu-

tionary effort of the Iranian Social Democrats and workers. "A revolutionary movement," he wrote in his article "Inflammable Material in World Politics," "that can offer armed resistance to attempts at restoration, that compels the attempters to call in foreign aid—such a movement cannot be destroyed. In these circumstances, even the fullest triumph of Persian reaction would merely be the prelude to fresh popular rebellion." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 183.)

In 1917 Iranian workers founded the Adalat (Justice) Social-Democratic Party. The climate for that party's activity improved tremendously after the October Revolution. Between 1917 and 1922 Adalat set up a ramified network of organizations in Transcaucasia, Turkestan and northern Iran. In June 1920, it held its First Congress and resolved to rename itself the Iranian Communist Party (Adalat).

The Party had to operate in a situation in which the British imperialists were carrying out a plan to seize Iran and indeed, the whole of oil-rich Transcaucasia. The Vosugh ed-Daula government signed an onerous treaty with Britain that virtually turned Iran into a British colony. The widespread protest movement against the treaty was brutally suppressed by both the Iranian government and British troops.

The Red Army offensive in southern Russia and the establishment of Soviet rule in Azerbaijan, which led to the retreat of British forces from Baku and northern Iran, provided new opportunities for the revolutionary movement.

Gilan Province became the base of the revolution. Guerrilla units led by Kuchek Khan captured Resht, the provincial capital. On June 4, 1920, a mass meeting in Resht proclaimed the Gilan Soviet Repub-

lic under Kuchek Khan. The coalition government formed somewhat later included Communists.

The First Congress of the ICP made a fairly accurate appraisal of the situation. It called on the Communists to preserve the united revolutionary front so as to expel the British imperialists and overthrow the regime backed by the feudal lords. This task was never accomplished, however, for it was not long before extremist trends brought on serious differences in the government. Kuchek Khan, a spokesman of the liberal landowners and bourgeoisie, would not hear of meeting the pressing needs of the working people of town and country. On the other hand, the "Left" Communists, whose adventurist platform had been defeated at the Congress, insisted on premature socialist changes on the strength of an incorrect analysis of the stage reached by the revolution. As a result, there was a split and ill-considered and ill-prepared military actions that led to heavy reverses.

The Congress of the Peoples of the East held in Baku in 1920 was a turning point in ICP policy. The Iranian delegation to the Congress established contacts with Comintern representatives and met with Lenin. The Party leadership was renewed in order to eliminate political mistakes. Heydar Khan Amua Oghly, a militant worker who had taken part in the revolution of 1905-1911, was elected secretary of the Central Committee. The theses submitted by him and approved by the Central Committee determined the Party's general line.

The theses made a detailed analysis of the class composition of Iranian society and the politico-economic situation. They pointed out the untimeliness of socialist change and called for the unity of all progressive forces, including the national (middle) bourgeoisie, against the foreign (specifically British) imperialists and the Shah's regime.

By adopting a new, realistic policy, the ICP resumed cooperation with Kuchek Khan and other revolutionary groups. The result was the setting up in May 1921 of the Revolutionary Committee, a coalition which decided to form united armed forces. However, the unity restored on the Party's initiative did not last long. The ICP was the only consistent champion of the adopted program. It resisted both adventurist plans for an untimely offensive against Teheran and the policy of inaction and opposition to reform.

The ICP began to carry out reforms de-

spite opposition from the breakaway group. Working people's councils were set up in town and countryside. The armed units controlled by the Party gained strength. Led by Heydar Khan, they were able to defeat the government troops.

However, ICP gains and the advance of the revolution alarmed Kuchek Khan, who engineered the assassination of Heydar Khan. The Revolutionary Committee fell apart and the ICP found itself leaderless. Government troops took advantage of the disarray in the revolutionary camp and crushed the revolution. Kuchek Khan was killed.

The ICP was the life and soul of the Gilan revolution. Although defeated, the revolution played a prominent part in the national liberation movement of the peoples of Iran, the expulsion of the British, the denunciation of the 1919 Anglo-Iranian Treaty and the official recognition of Soviet Russia.

With the Gilan revolution defeated, the ICP centered its activity on Teheran. Real power at the time was wielded by Reza Khan, the War Minister, whose ambition was to become Shah.

The ICP benefited by Reza Khan's flirting with progressive elements to further its organization and propaganda work. Party cells sprang up in numerous towns and Communist groups were formed in progressive organizations. A network of ICP-controlled trade unions came into being. The ICP group in Ejtema'iyune Ammiyun, a relatively numerous party at the time, was very active. The ICP founded cultural and educational societies. There appeared a Party and trade union press advocating Marxist ideas.

But as Reza Khan came closer to his goal, the persecution of progressive organizations was stepped up, and after he had raised himself to the throne repression became massive. Ejtema'iyune Ammiyun was banned and the ICP forced underground.

The new situation demanded that the Party take a stand on the Reza Shah dictatorship.

The debate on the attitude to the regime bred serious differences in the Party leadership and organizations. The Second Party Congress correctly described the regime as an anti-popular one, as a regime whose policy was spearheaded against the Soviet Union.

Experience proved the Congress analysis correct. In pursuing his anti-Soviet policy, Reza Shah had looked to Britain

at first, but subsequently he banked on Hitler Germany, seeing it as a more aggressive enemy of the Soviet Union.

After its Second Congress, in the face of terror, the Party carried out organizing work and propaganda on a reasonably large scale and strengthened its local organizations. In 1931 Reza Shah, alarmed by its increased activity and the establishment of a printing center abroad from where literature was brought to Iran, had parliament enact an anti-Communist law that is still in force. However, the regime went even further and instituted a reign of terror.

The ICP was admitted into the Comintern soon after the latter was formed. Iranian delegations attended all Comintern congresses from the Second Congress onwards, and some particularly important plenary meetings of the ECCI. The Comintern repeatedly concerned itself with the situation in the ICP. It helped settle important questions of Party work, and its advice on strategic and tactical points provided the basis for ICP activity.

The ICP made a special effort to establish a united front against imperialism in the East and fascism in Europe. In 1941 the People's Party of Iran (Tudeh) was founded. It became the direct successor of the ICP. It took a series of measures to establish a united front that resulted, among other things, in the formation of the Freedom Front (1943), an alignment including prominent politicians and the editors of half of the country's newspapers.

Today as in the past, the PPI (Tudeh) concentrates on the problem of a united front against home reaction and imperialism, primarily U.S. imperialism.

The Iranian Social Democrat forces fought and matured under the direct influence of the Bolsheviks, who imbued them with proletarian internationalism. The Social-Democratic Adalat party said in its program that it regarded itself as a component of the proletarian world camp, considered it necessary to maintain close links with proletarian parties and would make common cause with them on all matters of world significance.

The ICP and People's Party of Iran (Tudeh) have invariably fought as loyal adherents of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This expressed itself in unbreakable fraternal bonds with Lenin's glorious party, the CPSU, and other Communist parties, with the national liberation movement and the struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries. It also expressed itself in the PPI's (Tudeh's) firm stand against the threat of division in the world Communist and working-class movement, in the maintenance of Marxist-Leninist principles and in struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

The ICP played a big role in the progress of the working-class and national liberation movement of the peoples of Iran. The PPI (Tudeh), which adopted its traditions, has trained numerous fighters for the cause of the working class and for national liberation and independence. The labor and peasant unions and women's and youth organizations founded by the PPI have made an indelible imprint on our society.

Our Party is compelled to operate deep underground. Loyal to the Marxist-Leninist cause, it perseveres in the struggle to realize the lofty ideals of socialism.

Breaking through the darkness

SULEYMAN USTUNGEL

The Communist Party of Turkey is celebrating its 50th anniversary. Its foundation came as the logical sequel to a long period of proletarian struggle in the course of which Turkish progressives learned from their difficult and tragic experience the truth and efficacy of Marxism-Leninism. Turkish Communists are proud to continue the rich revolutionary traditions of a people which time and again rose to fight imperialism. And they appreciate that the development of the national liberation and revolutionary movement in Turkey was directly influenced and assisted by the Russian revolutionary movement.

The Turkish workers entered the political arena in the opening years of the century, at a time when the Ottoman Empire was a typical semi-colony of imperialism. This, Lenin wrote, condemned the country to "a long painful decline and disintegration, particularly painful for all the toiling and exploited masses of the people" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 8, p. 540). The young Turk revolution of 1908—one of the Eastern revolts generated by the 1905 Russian revolution—did not change the situation. Progressives were increasingly turning to Marxism, and in 1910 the Ottoman Socialist Party was founded and sought to bring scientific socialism into the labor movement.

Turkey's participation in World War I was calamitous for the people. The country was made a pliant weapon of German aggrandizement, a purveyor of cannon fodder for German and Austrian imperialism. Turkey's defeat led to the occupation of major areas, including Istanbul, the then capital. The loss of national independence was a very real danger.

The Great October Socialist Revolution created an entirely new situation. Its ideas influenced the powerful national liberation

movement that led to the defeat of the intervention. The first legal and underground Communist organizations came into being at a time when Turkey was going through the difficult initial period of the anti-intervention movement, then concentrated in Anatolia.

The Communist Party of Turkey, the Anniversary Appeal of its Central Committee says, "was born in the crucible of the national liberation movement begun in our country under the direct impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution."

The underground Communist organization in Istanbul played a major part in the rise and growth of the Communist Party by working for contacts and unity between the workers and all opponents of imperialism. Many of its members were active in the German revolutionary movement and in the German revolution of November 1918.

It was in these years, too, that a number of Left Socialist groups were formed among Turkish prisoners of war in Russia and worked in close contact with Bolshevik organizations. The first chairman of our Communist Party, Mustafa Subhi, said: "This contact with the Russian Bolsheviks began in 1915. Communist literature was eagerly read by Turkish prisoners of war."

Mustafa Subhi, an outstanding representative of the Turkish people, began his revolutionary career in France as a student at the Sorbonne. Back in Turkey he organized a revolutionary group and began publication of a progressive newspaper. In 1913 he was sentenced to 15 years' exile in Sinop and in 1914 he fled to Russia, where he was interned as an enemy alien. In 1915, together with other comrades, he contacted Bolshevik organizations in the Urals and joined the Bolshevik party.

After the October Revolution Subhi directed the translation and publication of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and of Soviet government statements. Another factor in bringing together the Turkish Left Socialists was publication of the newspaper *Yeni Dunya* (New World).

In 1918, Mustafa Subhi succeeded in uniting the various groups of Turkish Left Socialists, many of whom joined the Red Army and fought in the Civil War. Subhi was among them and later worked in the Central Bureau of Communist Organizations of the East, was one of the speakers at the First Congress of the Communist International, where he met V. I. Lenin. By 1920 the Turkish Communist movement had reached a point where it was possible to call an inaugural congress. Permission to hold it in Angara was refused and it met in Baku.

It opened on September 10, 1920, with 32 full delegates and 42 with voice but no vote. Of the 74 delegates, 51 represented Communist organizations in Anatolia and Istanbul. The Congress sent messages to the Communist International, the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and Lenin.

It endorsed the decisions and activity of the Communist International, gave a class appraisal of the national liberation movement in Turkey, declaring that "the Communist Party will endeavor to extend the anti-imperialist movement, but at the same time will work to lay the foundations of government by the working people."

The Congress did much to further the Party's political, organizational and propaganda work and to increase its influence among the masses. This did not go unnoticed by the reactionary element which had long wanted to destroy the Party once and for all. An attempt in that direction was made in the autumn of 1920, when police stooges set up a bogus Communist Party with the obvious purpose of betraying real Communists and sympathizers to the police and sowing discord and confusion in the Communist and progressive movement. It did not work — the bogus party was exposed and had to be disbanded.

Provocation having failed, the reactionaries turned to outright terror. On January 28, 1921, the Party's chairman, Mustafa Subhi, its General Secretary and head of the Istanbul organization, Ethem Necat, and 13 other leading Communists were murdered in Trabzon and their bodies dumped into

the sea. Mass arrests and murders were also perpetrated in Ankara, Istanbul, Izmir, Adana, Zonguldak and other towns. The Party was officially banned in 1923, but neither this nor continued persecution could break the will of Turkey's Communists, and the Party continued to lead the fight against imperialism, intervention and exploitation. Its influence in the working class and among broad sections of the population increased markedly. Despite all the harassment and terror it organized a number of major working-class actions in the twenties and during and after the 1929-32 crisis. By 1931, when it adopted a new program, it was a well organized illegal party, with workers making up 90 per cent of the membership.

Throughout its history, the Communist Party has fought for genuine democratic and progressive development. It has exposed imperialist intrigue, notably the role of foreign capital and foreign military missions. It has upheld the workers' demands for a fundamental improvement of their position. To achieve these ends, it has called for a united front of all patriotic, progressive and peace-loving forces, of all opposed to imperialism and foreign tutelage — of all who want to see Turkey living in peace and democracy. These ideas are meeting with stronger response from workers, peasants, students, intellectuals and the youth. Despite all the efforts of revisionists, splitters and "Left" extremists, and despite incessant slander and persecution, the Party is winning the hearts and minds of the people.

Our Party has by its consistent work in strengthening the anti-imperialist forces won an authoritative position in the world revolutionary movement. It faithfully upholds the policy of the world Communist movement and is actively working for its unity and cohesion.

Turkey's history over the past 50 years fully confirms the correctness of our policy and activity. Things have changed substantially, of course, but they have not removed the pressing need for far-reaching socio-economic and political transformations. Now as never before, the Central Committee's anniversary appeal emphasizes, the need is for unity of all genuinely anti-imperialist forces to combat imperialist and foreign military domination and all those who cooperate in this.

Turkey can solve its vital economic and political problems in the interests of the

working people only through genuine democracy.

With about 75 per cent of the population engaged in agriculture, there is a crying need for agrarian reform that would benefit those who till the land. And our Party has been pressing for such a reform from its very inception, for continuation of the present agricultural structure can only perpetuate backwardness, poverty and chronic unemployment.

As in the early twenties, the working class still lacks the right to organize independent trade unions, freedom of assembly, demonstration, the press, the right to strike and, last but not least, legality for its true champion, the Communist Party.

Tax reform is still another unsolved problem. It is not right that the working people should bear the main burden of taxation, which has been rising from year to year as Nato-prescribed military spending increases.

There must be an end to the chauvinist policy of the ruling element vis-à-vis the

national minorities, especially the Kurds who should be given full rights. There must be fraternal unity of all the peoples of our country against imperialism and foreign and Turkish exploiters.

The record of the past half-century shows that capitalist development cannot solve any of Turkey's fundamental problems.

The Turkish Communists always emphasize that their principal aim is to build socialism. And today, with all the contradictions of capitalism becoming more acute, they point to the sure path of liberation from imperialist exploitation, the sure path to the new society. And in this struggle the working class is being joined by the middle strata, the Left wing of the national bourgeoisie, a large segment of the peasantry and the more patriotically-minded elements in the Army. The unity of all national forces is the earnest of the victory for which the Turkish Communists have been fighting for half a century. They draw inspiration from the words of the great Communist poet, Nazim Hikmet: "United, we will break through the darkness."

Short notices

TODOR PAVLOV, "Leninizmyt v bitka za choveka." Sofia, Izdatelstvo na Bylgarskata Komunisticheska partiya, 1970, 271 pp.

Nowadays questions of socialist humanism are gaining increasing practical importance, and Marxist-Leninist philosophy is elaborating their theoretical foundations. An important contribution is "Leninism in the Battle for Man," a collection of articles and papers published in the sixties, mostly in the last two or three years, by Todor Pavlov, the eminent Bulgarian philosopher, dealing essentially with the philosophical content of the Marxist-Leninist concept of humanism and man, and its place in the ideological struggle.

Marx and Lenin, the author stresses, held that humanism could not be considered in isolation from dialectical materialist philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism, and that man's problems are not to be separated from the practical revolutionary activity aimed at bringing down capitalism and building up a communist society. They laid the methodological and theoretical foundations of socialist humanism.

The author criticizes abstract anthropological theories and elaborates on Marx's and Lenin's ideas that the problem must be approached dialectically, within a concrete historical framework. Human essence must be analyzed on the basis of socioeconomic ties and relations that are formed between men in the course of their practical work of transforming the world.

Analyzing the epistemological aspects of the problem of man, the author shows that in Marxist-Leninist philosophy the creative nature of human activity, freedom and responsibility of the individual, the laws governing the moulding of the individual, etc., are based on the Leninist theory of knowledge and linked with its focal concepts: practice, reflection, image. Pavlov examines the achievements of modern science, notably cybernetics, and points up

the fallacy of mechanistic and irrational models of man, which either negate the active nature of consciousness or ascribe to it occult qualities.

The author refutes bourgeois and revisionist views, notably attempts to contrapose so-called "humanized Marxism" to Marxism-Leninism. Criticism of dehumanization and alienation under capitalism, he points out, can be effective only if directed against the foundations of the system from the standpoint of the working class, whose labor is the main source of all material values.

Todor Pavlov's book is an important contribution to the theory of socialist humanism.

O. JUNS

"Party Building. A Study Course." Moscow, Politizdat, 1970, 430 pp.

Compiled by a group of authors, headed by N. A. Petrovichev, the book sets forth the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory on the Communist Party and the Leninist norms of Party life and principles of Party leadership. It is a balanced exposition of the theoretical foundations and principles governing the organization and functioning of the Communist Party — a new type of political party.

The development of the norms of Party life and principles of Party building are examined against a historical background as stemming from the objective requirements of the class struggle. The prolific factual data present a comprehensive picture of the CPSU and other Soviet public organizations. The book is addressed to Soviet Communists studying questions of Party building and will also be of interest to foreign readers.

A. MASS

"Geschichtsbewusstsein und sozialistische Gesellschaft." Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1970. 232 pp.

"Historical Consciousness and Socialist

Society" is a collection of papers presented at a German Historians' Union conference in Berlin in November 1969, prepared for publication by the Institute of Social Sciences, CC SUPG. Their broad approach to socialist consciousness enabled the authors to show the role and functions of historiography, historical fiction and school and Party instruction in history. The papers contain theoretical generalizations of the experience gained in disseminating historical knowledge and examine the ways of ensuring a still more effective and purposeful development of historical science, enhancing the place of history in the socialist education of the people.

The issues are important in the present ideological confrontation. Study of the experience and lessons of history, especially that of the labor movement and its revolutionary traditions, on a Marxist-Leninist basis, is an important way of fostering socialist convictions. As noted in the foreword, the book contains only the first results of research. And it is incontestably a successful beginning.

I. WARNAWSKI

S. S. JOSH, "Baba Sohan Singh Bhakna. Life of the Founder of the Ghadar Party." New Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1970. XXIV 81 pp.

Sohan Singh Josh, writer and Communist, presents an engrossing historical contribution to a scientific assessment of the development of the revolutionary and Communist movement in India. The biography of Sohan Singh Bhakna, one of India's outstanding revolutionaries, is an illustration of the historical continuity in the Indian liberation movement, from the struggle for independence to the Communist movement. Furthermore, it strikes a blow in support of a correct attitude towards the revolutionary heritage, which occupies an important place in the work of the Indian Communist Party.

Sohan Singh Bhakna (1870-1968) was a leader of the Ghadar Party, the stated aim of which was to achieve India's liberation by armed rebellion. During World War I the English sentenced him to death, later commuting the sentence to life imprisonment. Influenced by the October Socialist Revolution, Sohan Singh Bhakna turned to socialism. Released after 16 years behind bars, he rejoined the revolutionary struggle. Though arrested and re-arrested by the colonial authorities and after independence, he was true to the end to the ideals of

proletarian internationalism. Shortly before his death at the age of 98, when gravely ill, the veteran revolutionary and Communist dictated his last statement, which says in part: "I am pained that now there are differences in the international Communist movement. I wish that these differences should come to an end, so that the death of capitalism may be brought nearer" (p. 75).

E. GEORGE

Vigencia del leninismo hoy y en la Argentina. Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1970. 269 pp.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Argentina has set up a Marxist-Leninism Study Center. This is an important event in the political and ideological life of the Party, forced to work underground and constantly persecuted by the police. As the CC CPA points out in its decision of April 20, 1970, the Center "is designed to coordinate work in the ideological sphere; facilitate more comprehensive research on the basis of Marxism-Leninism; promote collectivism in scientific work; sponsor debates and conferences, lecture courses and seminars; attract new people to research and ideological work through the organization of special committees; disseminate Marxist-Leninist theory and the results of its creative application in Argentine conditions."

The Topicality of Leninism in the Modern World and in Argentina, is the Center's first scientific publication, dealing with the importance of Leninism as a method of revolutionary thinking in analyzing the situation in the country and defining Party policies. It comprises papers presented by prominent Party members at the "Lenin Readings," sponsored by the CC in December 1969: R. Ghioldi, F. Nadra, P. Gonzalez Alberdi, J. Fuchs, R. Olivari, A. Cohen, O. Arevalo, F. Edelman, O. Ghioldi, and A. Fava. The authors concentrate on problems of state-monopoly capitalism in Argentina, the anti-imperialist struggle and the agrarian question, various aspects of the ideological struggle against Right and "Left" opportunism and revisionism, questions of Party history and the Leninist principles of Party construction.

The content of this volume is indicative of the diversity of subjects investigated by the Marxism-Leninism Study Center.

J. PEREIRA

R. P. FYODOROV, *Anonymous Power. Class Organizations of Monopoly Capital in the FRG.* Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, 1970. 320 pp.

Some 80 per cent of West German businessmen are members of various unions or alliances, which play a prominent part in maintaining the rule of monopoly capitalism. In recent years, Marxists studying state-monopoly capitalism, especially its West-German variety, have been scrutinizing this development. A contribution to this is R. P. Fyodorov's monograph, which presents an outline history of German employers' unions, analyzes their organizational structure and exposes their political activities.

Two types of unions hold first place in West Germany. On the one hand, organizations designed to ensure that state policies take due account of their demands. Leading among this type of organization is the Federal Association of German Industry. The author examines the various channels employed by such unions to influence the government and demonstrates that the interests of monopoly capital are reliably represented in all government bodies.

On the other hand, employers organize on a national scale to promote united policies in opposing the demands of workers and trade unions. This is the function of the Federal Alliance of German Employers' Associations.

R. Fyodorov traces the extent of the influence of employer groups, in particular by analyzing concrete manifestations of covert rivalry and cooperation between the monopoly oligarchy and party and government bureaucracy since the last war. He also points out a new development on the political scene: businessmen's unions, which traditionally regarded the Social-Democratic Party as an enemy, are now endeavoring to use it in their interests.

The author makes an interesting attempt at defining the place of West German employer groups in the system of state-monopoly capitalism and showing how monopoly forces are merging with the state

authority into a unified machinery of control and suppression. Some of the questions raised are debatable.

E. JORGEN

D. N. PRITT, *Employers, Workers and Trade Unions.* London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1970. 174 pp.

D. N. Pritt, lawyer and scholar, presents a masterly analysis of English labor legislation from the mid-fourteenth century to the last legislative acts of the late Labor government in 1966-1969. It is the first part of a larger treatise, "Law, Class and Society," in which the author proposes to analyze the political and sociological aspects of English law and answer such questions as: "How has it come to be as it is, what forces have shaped . . . it, and what use is made of it . . . by the various elements which hold power in the modern state?" (p. 5).

In capitalist society, Pritt shows, law is a product of the class struggle, and while remaining an expression of the will of the ruling classes, it also reflects the gains wrested by the workers from their employers over centuries of struggle. The right to organize into unions, the right to strike and other rights won by the working people are an important means of promoting their interests in the face of capitalist encroachments.

The author analyzes labor legislation since World War II and exposes the Right-wing Labor leaders who have betrayed the fundamental interests of the working class and are doing their best to "run capitalism better than the capitalists" (p. 125). Many vivid pages tell the story of how the workers' struggle frustrated the ruling classes' anti-labor intentions.

The book also examines some legal and social aspects of labor-capital relations (collective bargaining, sub-contracting, etc.) By and large, it is an interesting piece of research summarizing the rich experience of the British working class struggle for its rights and interests.

D. GIBBS

DOCUMENTOS POLITICOS

— REVISTA DEL PARTIDO COMUNISTA —

Under this title the Communist Party of Colombia has been publishing a theoretical and political journal for 14 years now, longer than the life of any other government or opposition party journal of the same type.

Documentos Politicos was started at a time when the Party was driven underground. It continued its work of organization, education and propaganda in the teeth of the ceaseless persecution and harassment begun by the reactionary government in 1948, and despite the official ban of the Party in 1954. Gradually all legal opportunities were wiped out.

It was in this situation that our Central Committee, many of whose members were in prison or were being hounded by the police, decided to intensify its theoretical and political work. One way of doing that was to publish a journal that would generalize the revolutionary struggle, help train our cadres, and indicate the path to national and social emancipation.

That was the origin of *Documentos Politicos*, a bi-monthly journal the first issue of which appeared in December 1956. Its object was spelled out in an editorial in the initial issue: "This journal is for the Party, for all progressive and revolutionary sections of our people. We hope it will help towards closer study of international experience and more correct understanding of the problems confronting the Party . . . We know only too well that the journal's potentialities are limited and its circulation moderate. But the fact that it is being published illegally is in itself a vast achievement. However, that is no justification for shortcomings, and we invite criticism of the journal's contents and make-up, and suggestions for improving both, from Communists and progressives generally."

The first six issues were mimeographed, but beginning with No. 7 the journal has

been printed semi-legally, in the face of immense difficulties. That we have been able to put out 88 issues is no mean feat.

Its subject-matter is varied. The following are the main themes it deals with:

Communist Party activity and its defense of Marxism-Leninism;

New and old features of imperialist domination in Colombia, neo-colonialism in the economic, political, military and cultural areas;

Role of the working class in revolutionary battles, strike experience, government anti-labor policy;

The agrarian problem, including such of its vital aspects as rapid growth of the rural proletariat, new forms of land development, the peasant self-defense and guerrilla movements.

In addition, the journal carries articles and shorter items on the Communist youth movement, Colombian culture, history and literature, and reports of public debates, notably between Communists and Catholics.

One of its central tasks is reporting and analyzing various facets of Party activity, especially its work in the propaganda and organizational fields. Their interconnection was formulated in the second issue: "Propaganda is but the path to organization, and the Party's main task is to organize popular resistance to the tyrannical regime. . . . If we succeed in extending our propaganda to every part of the country—and that, indeed, is our immediate aim—we shall facilitate the rise, extension and consolidation of mass organizations."

Describing the Party's increasing role in the life of our people, *Documentos Politicos* wrote in June 1960: "Only the Communists have been able to break through the double wall of the old established parties. We are now the country's third biggest party with deep roots among the workers and peas-

ants, and we are surmounting the barriers erected by our people's exploiters and tormentors in a vain effort to block our development."

Much space is devoted to the international Communist movement. Materials under this head included the documents of the three international Communist and Workers' parties conferences in which the Colombian Party participated, and articles against the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders. The journal has unambiguously denounced their neo-dogmatism and stated its own position on world Communist unity.

True to proletarian internationalism, it has reported the progress of the Cuban revolution, the changes in Chile and Peru, the position in Venezuela and Uruguay, etc.

The diverse forms of North-American penetration are systematically analyzed, particularly such aspects of the problem as foreign loans, the policy of the financial corporations, the sale of North American agricultural surpluses, the neo-colonialist designs of the International Monetary Fund and the Alliance for Progress, the implications of regional economic integration, the role of foreign investments and new forms of profit exports, and U.S. cultural infiltration.

Still another major feature is exposure of American imperialist participation in the war against our people—the so-called "military-civil action," "preventive" operations, and so on. The journal closely analyzes the character, aims, strategy, tactics and techniques of this war and also, of course, the spread of the guerrilla movement.

But central to all our articles is the working class. The first issue contained a study of its role in the Colombian revolution, and subsequent issues discussed the trade-union movement, strikes, the vanguard role of the working class and the problems posed by Party organization and propaganda work among workers. Early in 1967 this was the subject of a national Party conference; its main resolutions and other materials appeared in No. 65 of *Documentos Politicos*.

Articles dealing with the peasants' fight for land, government reform plans, peasant self-defense and guerrilla movements, trade-union organizations in farming areas and the worker-peasant alliance, are indicative of the importance we attribute to Party work among the rural population.

In the past three years there have been special issues on the 100th anniversary of Marx's *Capital*, the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, the struggle of the

Vietnamese people, militarism in Colombia and Latin America, the Lenin centenary, and the 40th anniversary of the Communist Party of Colombia.

From time to time we review the work of the journal. In our opinion, it has come to play an important political role because it firmly adheres to Marxism-Leninism, realistically approaches social, economic and political problems, and follows a correct line on ideological questions which often give rise to contradictory views in the revolutionary movement.

In short, we are no longer a "mirror of facts" as was the case in the early years. The journal is not confined to information on the way theoretical problems are being discussed and solved, or to the publication of important Party documents, though this is still a major feature. More attention is being paid to prognosticating political developments and, in this context, mapping out the central tasks of the working class and other sections of the people in economic and political struggle.

There are still many shortcomings. Our readership is drawn mainly from Party members. The present circulation leaves much to be desired. We have been slow in enlisting new authors. Many important developments at home and abroad are not adequately or timely reported and analyzed.

The task now is to keep in closer touch with Party activity and the masses, and promote constructive polemics on the problems of the popular movement, the struggle of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia. The point was made at an extended meeting of the Editorial Board that "we must reckon with the growing influence of theory and ideology in the revolutionary struggle. This calls for rapprochement with intellectuals. We should not fear their joining the Party because of the difficulties this might create, and we should respect them as creative workers and bring them into closer touch with our policy, methods and aims."

If the journal is to give the Party more effective assistance in its educational and cultural work, we will have to restructure it, with a view to improving its contents and increasing its circulation through special sales campaigns and recruitment of more regular subscribers.

The journal should deal, in a more concrete manner, with such pressing problems as the fight against Left deviations, the specifics of Colombian and Latin American

reality, and the study of Marxist-Leninist theory. That is the only way to extend its coverage and more effectively cater to the requirements of its readers.

If we accomplish these tasks, *Documentos Politicos* will come to its twentieth an-

niversary with the proud knowledge that it has made a considerable contribution to preparing the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and patriotic revolution so vitally needed by Colombia.

T. VARELA

DIARY

Visiting our editorial offices, Comrades Kurt Bachmann, Chairman of the German Communist Party, and Herbert Mies, the GCP Deputy Chairman, who were on an official visit to Czechoslovakia at the invitation of the Central Committee Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, outlined the activity of the GCP, the West German working people's party recently founded on the basis of the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and proletarian internationalism.

Founded in September 1968, the GCP has nearly doubled its membership in the intervening two years, acquiring experience in defending the people's vital interests and combatting monopoly power in the FRG. The Party's press organ, the weekly *Unsere Zeit* ("Our Time"), is complemented by the factory newspapers put out by Party branches in some 250 industrial enterprises, in addition to which the Party has branches in 18 of the country's higher educational establishments.

Referring to the Lenin Centenary year, the GCP Chairman said large-scale ideological functions were held on Lenin's hundredth birthday in many FRG cities.

Comrade Bachmann welcomed the USSR-FRG Treaty concluded in Moscow on August 12, 1970, as the first instrument signed by the Federal Government since the founding of the FRG that formalizes the renunciation of force and recognizes the existing European frontiers. He called for the treaty's earliest ratification and hoped attacks on it by reactionary finance capital, conservatives and Right extremists would be repulsed.

Comrade Mies gave a brief account of the current relation of political strength in the FRG.

* * *

Stopping over in Prague, Comrade Taufiq Toubi, Member of the Israeli Communist Party's Political Bureau and Central Committee Secretariat, paid a visit to our editorial offices, where he recounted what the Israeli Communists were doing to help end the aggression against the Arab countries,

to speed the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territories and to secure a just and enduring peace in the Middle East. The war against the Arab states, he said, reflects painfully on the situation of the working people, who suffer from spiralling taxes and prices. Discontent is mounting in the country over the chauvinist policy of the Zionist ruling element, which has made Israel an imperialist tool. Its drive to annex traditionally Arab land, coupled with its sabotage of the Jarring mission, obstructs a political solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Despite obstacles and persecution, Comrade Toubi said, the Communist Party of Israel is conducting a far-flung anti-war campaign for the speedy conclusion of a just Middle East peace, which is winning many people to its side.

That Communist influence is growing, Comrade Toubi added, is borne out by the fact that 50 per cent more votes were cast for Communist Party candidates in the latest parliamentary election.

* * *

An exposition of photographs, diagrams and other materials illustrating the collective work of the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties on this journal and showing the main trends in its activity, was put on display at the French Communist Party's celebrations of *l'Humanite* Day.

In a letter, the French Communists thanked us for taking part in the celebrations and pointed out that the exposition evoked considerable interest.

It is planned to send the exposition, which is available in several languages, to be displayed on press days of fraternal parties in other countries in 1971.

* * *

A conference of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* readers was held in our editorial offices last November under the joint auspices of this journal and the Ideological Department of the CC of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The conference was opened by K. I. Zarodov, our editor-in-chief, who noted that some 60 fraternal Communist and Workers' parties cooperated fruitfully in putting out the journal, and outlining its work and present-day tasks.

Villem Novy, the journal's Executive Secretary, presided, and Ladislav Novotny, head of the CC CPC Ideological Department, made the main address.

Representatives of the CC CPC, lecturers and propagandists, instructors in Marxism-Leninism at the Higher Political School of the CC CPC, and at the Military Academy, members of the Socialist Academy, top

functionaries of the South Moravian CPC Committee and Party branches of the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry and the cities of Kosice, Brno and Usti-nad-Labem, and staff members of the central Czechoslovak press, took part in a lively discussion. Speakers acclaimed the journal's role in disseminating Marxist-Leninist ideas, elaborating topical theoretical problems and promoting political education, and offered suggestions and criticisms designed to improve the journal, calling attention to the need for its more extensive advertising and dissemination in Czechoslovakia. Some speakers suggested holding readers' conferences in other Czechoslovak cities.

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

LENIN, V. I. *O nauchnoi organizatsii truda* (Scientific Organization of Labor). Collection, Moscow, Politizdat, 1970. 183 pp.

ALTER L. B., BRAGINSKY B. I. *Ekonomicheskiye zakony i sovershenstvovaniye planirovaniya narodnogo khozaistva* (Economic Laws and the Improvement of Economic Planning). Moscow, Ekonomika, 1970. 151 pp.

ATCHUTHAN, M. *Fact Book on Wages*. New Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1970. 52 pp.

BEBEL, A. *Ausgewahlte Reden und Schriften* (Selected Speeches and Works). Vol. I, 1863-1878. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1970. 766 pp.

Vneshnaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza i mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya (The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union and International Relations). Collection of documents, 1969. Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, 1970. 296 pp.

HANZLICEK, K. *Spomienky na zaciatky robotnickeho knutia v Bratislave* (Recollections of the Early Stage of the Working-Class Movement in Bratislava). Bratislava, Praca, 1970. 180 pp.

DUMONT, V. *Les communistes et la condition de la femme* (Communists and the Condition of Women). Study by the FCP Central Commission for Work Among Women. Paris, Editions sociales, 1970. 172 pp.

KEIDERLING, G., STULZ, P. *Berlin 1945-1968* (Berlin 1945-1968). The history of the GDR capital and the independent political unit of West Berlin. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1970. 684 pp.

KOSSAK, J. *Lenin i kultura* (Lenin and Culture). Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1970. 216 pp.

LIGHTFOOT, C. M. *Black America and the World Revolution*. New York, New Outlook Publishers, 1970. 94 pp.

Leninske ucenie o strane a sucasnost (Lenin's Teaching on the Party and Modernity). Bratislava, Epocha, 1970. 68 pp.

MAIOROV, S. M. *Posledniye pisma i statyi V. I. Lenina* (Lenin's Last Letters and Articles). Moscow, Politizdat, 1970, 95 pp.

MARIANETTI, B. *Las luchas sociales en Mendoza* (Social Battles in Mendoza). Mendoza, Republica Argentina, Ediciones Cuyo, 1970. 189 pp.

PONCE, A. *Educacion y lucha de clases* (Education and the Class Struggle). Buenos Aires, Ediciones el Viento en el Mundo, 1970. 197 pp.

POPOV, S. I. *Kritika sovremennoi burzhuanoi sotsiologii* (Criticism of Modern Bourgeois Sociology). Moscow, Mysl, 1970. 111 pp.

Privetstviya Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza v svyazi so 100-letiem so dnya rozhdeniya V. I. Lenina (Messages of Greetings to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin). Moscow, Politizdat, 1970. 375 pp.

The "Productivity" Hoax! — and Auto Workers' Real Needs! New York, New Outlook Publishers, 1970. 63 pp.

Resheniya partii i pravitelstva po khozai-stvennym voprosam (Party and Government Decisions on Economic Matters). Vol. VII, July 1968-1969. Moscow, Politizdat, 1970. 585 pp.

Sozialistischer Realismus (Socialist Realism). Positions, Problems, Prospects. Introduction. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1970. 344 pp.

SURET-CANALE, J. *La Republique de Guinée* (The Republic of Guinea). Paris, Editions sociales, 1970. 432 pp.

EDELMAN, J. *Women on the Job: a Marxist-Leninist View*. New York, New Outlook Publishers, 1970. 21 pp.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
Problems of Peace and Socialism
CONTENTS FOR 1970
(Nos. 1-12)

**LENINISM AND OUR TIME
TOWARDS THE LENIN CENTENARY**

	No.	Page
D. AHRENS. Ideological Struggle for the Youth	3	25
C. AMORT. Lenin in Prague	6	39
A. ANDREYEV. Lenin Will Never Be Forgotten	11	29
R. ARISMENDI. Lenin, Revolutionary Communist and Revolutionary Leader	5	92
K. BAGDASH. Lenin and Struggle Against Opportunism and Revisionism in National Liberation Movement	4	92
G. BATAL. Leninism and the National Question	3	16
L. BECERRA. Leninism and Topical Problems of Revolutionary Struggle in Latin America	3	44
K. BECKSTROM. Lenin and Labor Movement in Sweden	3	53
M. BORQUES. Lenin's Theory of Revolution	3	50
L. BOUHALI. Lenin-Type Party and Struggle for National and Social Liberation	5	4
A. BUCHMANN. Lenin's Theory of Imperialism Confirmed	2	34
T. BUCK. New Level of Struggle for Freedom, Peace and Socialism...	2	14
J. BURLES. Loyalty to Leninism—Earnest of Victory	2	48
N. CEAUSESCU. Lenin and Building Socialist Society	5	78
N. CHAOUI. Leninism and Problems of Revolutionary Movement in Arab Countries	5	60
G. COLMAN. Lenin's Immortal Ideas Are Our Guiding Star	3	28
A. CUNHAL. Proletarian Internationalism—A Policy and Outlook	5	70
G. DANELIUS. Leninism—Sharp Weapon of All Revolutionary Forces of Our Time	4	9
Y. DEMIR. Lenin and Some Problems of Revolutionary Movement in Turkey	4	97
J. DICKMAN. Lenin's Ideas Help the Working Class and People of Chile	3	7
J. DIZ. Leninism and Some Aspects of the Ideological Struggle	3	22
J. DUCLOS. Triumph of Lenin's Ideas	4	37
W. EHRLICH. Leninism and Struggle Against Chauvinism and for Proletarian Internationalism	3	56
J. FOJTIK. To Fight Opportunism—Lenin's Behest	3	46
General Secretary, Central Committee of the Communist Party of East Pakistan. Leninism Is Our Guide	5	67
W. GARNES. Sources of Opportunism Today	3	65
J. GOLLAN. Lenin's Analysis of Imperialism and Some Developments of Monopoly	3	71
W. GOMULKA. Lenin's Approach to National Question	4	77
L. GRUPPI. Leninism as Method of Revolutionary Action	2	41
G. HALL. Marxism-Leninism Indivisible, Indestructible	5	88
G. HUSAK. Lenin's Teaching on the Party and Czechoslovak Reality	1	6

	No.	Page
G. HUSAK. Leninism and the Communist Movement in Czechoslovakia	5	23
D. IBARRURI. Leninism: Inspiration and Guide in Our Struggle for Democracy and Socialism	4	85
C. JAGAN. Lenin and Our Time	4	54
K. JESPERSEN. The Age of Leninism	5	30
M. JIJON. Lenin's Teaching on Imperialism and Our Time	3	59
J. KADAR. Socialism—Main Trend in World Development	5	35
A. KARIM. Leninism and Some Problems of National Liberation Movement	3	62
W. KASHTAN. Lenin's Teaching—A Dependable Compass	5	11
K. KOLIYANNIS. Leninism and Experience of the Communist Party of Greece	4	48
A. KURELLA. Humane in All Things	6	43
J. LABORDE. Lenin and the Party of a New Type	2	31
W. LAMBERZ. Leninist Principles of Scientific Guidance of Socialist Construction and Their Application in the GDR	2	21
Lenin in Our Lives. Lenin Centenary Questionnaire	2	52
The Lenin Year	1	3
The Lenin Year	12	3
Lenin Centenary Preparations in Fraternal Parties	1	24
Lenin Centenary Preparations in Fraternal Parties	2	57
M. LUMER. Lenin on General Crisis of Capitalism	2	25
B. MATTHEWS. Lenin on Fight for Democracy in Capitalist Countries with Particular Reference to Britain	3	38
A. MILEIKOVSKY. Lenin's Theory of Imperialism and New Phenomena in the Capitalist Economy	6	28
MUHRI. Some Lessons for Struggle of Austrian Communists	4	4
T. NAMSARAI. Non-Capitalist Development of Backward Countries Towards Socialism	3	19
D. NEMES. Leninism and Development of the Socialist World System	1	15
D. NEMES. Some Results of Leninist Policy in Hungary	3	10
I. NORLUND. Leninism and Some Problems of Labor Movement in Smaller Countries	2	45
S. NOSAKA. What Has Assured Advancement of Communist Party of Japan	5	48
H. NUMATA. Leninism and Question of Parliament in Modern Revolution	3	3
M. O'RIORDAN. Lenin in Irish History	4	66
E. PAPAIOANNOU. Lenin and Some Problems of National Liberation Movement	4	26
B. PANKIN. Words Across the Years	11	32
B. PONOMARYOV. Great Leader of the Revolutionary Epoch	2	4
I. PRYMOV. Lenin's Cooperative Plan in Bulgaria	3	41
R. RADMANESH. Lenin's Teaching in Our Life and Struggle	4	59
I. RADULESCU. Leninism and Experience of Building Socialist Society in Rumania	3	13
E. RAUTEE. Interconnection of Struggle for Democracy and Struggle for Socialism	3	35

	No.	Page
A. SAARINEN. Lenin and Finland	4	33
C. SEHANAVIS. Lenin and the East	2	28
J. SZYDLAK. Undying Leninist Ideas of Proletarian Internationalism	2	37
E. TABARI. Lenin and Problems of the Social Revolution in Iran	3	32
Y. TSEDENBAL. Lenin's Ideas of Proletarian Internationalism are Communists' Battle Standard	4	73
W. ULBRICHT. Lenin and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany	4	42
D. URBANY. Luxembourg Working Class and Lenin	4	70
A. VASQUEZ. Leninism and Colombia's Revolutionary Path	2	18
G. VIEIRA. Lenin, Greatest Revolutionary Strategist of All Time	5	17
M. VILNER. Leninism and Our Place in the Revolutionary Struggle	5	42
S. A. WICKREMASINGHE. Rise and Growth of Leninism in Ceylon	4	23
K. ZARODOV. Leninism—Banner of Our Movement	3	68
T. ZHIVKOV. Lenin Principle of Unity of National and International Tasks	4	14

ON THE 150th ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FREDERICK ENGELS

G. COLMAN. Engels and Internationalism	9	25
A. DANSOKO. "Socialist" Trends in Tropical Africa in Light of Engels' Criticism of Utopian Socialism	9	82
A. DEAC. Engels and the Labor Movement in Rumania	9	37
D. ELAZAR. Engels on the Agrarian Question and the Experience of the Bulgarian Communist Party	9	30
H. FAGAN. Engels and the British Working Class	9	27
J. FOJTIK. Engels' Doctrine of Historical Determinism Still Meaningful	9	59
Frederick Engels—Thinker and Revolutionary	9	3
A. GEDO. Engels and Present-Day Theoretical Struggle	9	77
W. GERNS. Ideological Battle Over the Engels Legacy	9	45
G. GIRGINOV. Engels on Laws of Scientific Progress	9	71
K. HAGER. Frederick Engels—Great Theorist and Leader of International Working Class	9	11
P. HENTGES. History and Class Struggle	9	19
A. KARIM. "Anti-Duehring," Its Relevance to Ideological Struggle in Arab Countries	9	80
B. KEDROV. Engels on Connection Between Philosophy and Natural Science	9	22
S. KHAMIS. Engels' Contribution to Teaching on Party of the Working Class	9	39
J. LABORDE. Engels on Principal Forms of Proletarian Class Struggle	9	48
J. LADYKA. Engels' Criticism of Metaphysics	9	33
V. I. LENIN. Frederick Engels	9	4
A. MALYSH. Engels and Marxist Economic Doctrine	9	62
Marking the Jubilee. Forum Held by West German Communists	9	114
I. NORLUND. Engels on the Unifying and Guiding Role of Communists	9	68
Pages Out of a Great Man's Life Story	9	89
E. RAGIONIERI. The Later Engels and the Historicism of Marxism	9	36
C. UNNI RAJA. Engels on National Liberation Movement and Problems of India	9	65
B. VESZI. Engels on the State	9	42
M. YOVCHUK. Engels and Revolutionary Russia	9	74
K. ZARODOV. History Bears Out Teaching of Marx-Engels-Lenin	9	85
B. ZHODOV. Engels' Heritage and Experience of the Mongolian Revolution	9	51
E. ZUCKER-SCHILLING. Engels and Strategy of the Communist Movement	9	54

PROBLEMS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

	No.	Page
H. ALVARADO. The Guatemalan Revolution and Lenin's Ideas	12	26
H. BERG, P. HENTGES. Lenin Lives On	6	3
V. BILAK. Time-Tested Friendship	8	14
T. BUCK. Lenin and New Problems of Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism	7	7
J. DUCLOS. Fifty Years of the French Communist Party	11	24
R. ISCARO. Peaceful Coexistence and Revolutionary Struggle	10	10
V. KOTSEV. Fighting Anti-Communism Is Our Common Task	7	14
J. KOWALCZYK, J. LABORDE, M. HARMEL, P. HENTGES. Important Stage in the Development of the Communist Movement	7	3
Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties	3	78
L. C. PRESTES. Lenin's Heritage and Fight Against Opportunism in the Brazilian Communist Party	11	10
L. SVOBODA. Role of the Soviet Union in the Modern World	11	3
C. UNNI RAJA, G. SHAKHNAZAROV, L. JUNTILA. The Power of Collective Creativity. Tenth Anniversary of the 1960 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties	10	3
V. ZAGLADIN. The Triumphant Advance of Lenin's Ideas	6	5

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

G. BATAL. Great Victory of the Lebanese Communists	12	34
H. CAMPOS, G. KOLMAN. The Peoples' Struggle Against the Dictatorship and Party Tasks	6	60
A. CARRILLO GILES. Fourth Congress of the Guatemalan Party of Labor	10	34
A. CUNHAL. A Year of Headway	3	83
A. D. The Working Class Is the Leading Force of Social Renovation	6	57
J. DICKMAN. For an Anti-Imperialist Popular-Unity Government.....	2	88
E. FAJON. French Communist Party: Theses of the 19th Congress.....	6	20
A. FAVA. Victorio Codovilla and the Argentine Communist Movement	11	41
T. HALAY. HSWP Science Policy	11	39
In Brief	1	81
In Brief	3	97
In Brief	7	38
In Brief	8	26
In Brief	10	38
In Brief	11	46
In Brief	12	44
CH. JAGAN. A New Stage in the PPP	12	32
K. KNIESTEDT. Compound of Youth and Revolutionary Experience	8	23
F. LAGER. Working Program of Swedish Communists	1	76
J. MARAVILLA. Philippines: Results, Difficulties, Prospects	12	37
J. METZGER. Engineers and Technicians, and the Working Class.....	3	91
F. MUHRI. Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of Austria	8	18
G. NAPOLITANO. Developments in Italy After the 12th Party Congress	2	81
E. PAPAIOANNOU. Twelfth Congress of AKEL	7	26
V. PESSI. Finland: Towards Party Unity	6	55
M. O'RIORDAN. Irish National Liberation Struggle and the Communists	10	29
L. SH. Political Work and Raising Effectiveness of Production.....	1	79
J. TERFVE. Belgium: National Question and Its Class Content	7	21
R. URBANY. New Attainments Open Up New Prospects	7	31

	No.	Page
H. VASS. History of Hungarian Workers' Movement	8	30
A. VIEUGUET. Democratic Centralism and Inner-Party Democracy	10	32
B. Z. Rumanian Communist Party's Program of Agricultural Development	7	35

THE SOCIALIST WORLD TODAY

I. ABAJIYEV. Agrarian-Industrial Complexes—New Stage in the Development of Bulgarian Agriculture	12	76
Interviews with Trade Union Leaders of the Socialist Countries.....	6	64
L. LEONTYEV. New Contribution to the Political Economy of Socialism	7	40
M. MOC. Czechoslovakia: Out of the Crisis	10	22
Objective: Socialist Integration (interview with CMEA Secretary N. Faddeyev)	8	50
G. OSTROUMOV. Realities and Prospects of Lenin's Cooperative Plan	2	67
G. RADULESCU. Rumania in Economic and Technical Cooperation	11	56
B. SUKHAREVSKY. Problem of Economic Incentives in CMEA Countries	8	53
The USSR Today. Completing the Five-Year Plan. New Stage in Soviet Agriculture	11	48
D. YADAMSUREN. The Unions and the Workers of Mongolia	6	70

IN THE CITADELS OF CAPITALISM

Imperialist America Today	1	49
G. HALL. New Directions of Development, New Problems of Imperialism	12	13
H. LUMER. Problems of Inflation in the United States	1	57
V. PERLO. The Monopoly Offensive	1	50
J. WEST. The Scientific-Technological Revolution—No Boon to U.S. Working Class	1	64
Facts, Figures, Testimonials	1	73
F R G	7	61
K. ENGELHARDT. Strategy of the War Monopolies	7	68
W. GERNS. Crisis of the Educational System	7	72
H. JUNG, K. STEINHAUS. West Germany: Strike Struggles	7	76
L. MAIER. New Trends in Development of West German Imperialism	7	62
Facts and Figures	7	80

PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT*

L. BECERRA, J. DICKMAN. U.S. Imperialist Policy in Latin America	7	83
TRAN HOAI NAM. For National Liberation, Against Neo-Colonialism	2	78
C. UNNI RAJA. Struggle for Land and Land Reforms in India	11	89
H. M. WINSTON. Black Americans and the Middle East Conflict.....	11	18
A. YATA. For a Genuine National, Anti-Imperialist and Democratic Front	12	20

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT

Against U.S. Aggression in Indo-China. Conference of Communist Parties of European Capitalist Countries	7	46
J. ALDRIDGE. Cambodia: U.S. Myths, Inventions and Plots	7	47
I. CARJE. Important Document of Rumanian-Soviet Friendship and Cooperation	10	44

*More articles on this subject in the "Viewpoints" section.

	No.	Page
L. CORVALAN. Chile: The People Take Over	12	5
Curb the American Aggressors! U.S. Imperialism's New Crime—Invasion of Cambodia	6	12
H. GAUTIER. The Chances for a New Bonn Policy?	1	45
P. GENSOUS. An Act for Unity	1	38
J. GIBBONS. Reflections on British General Election (Letter from London)	10	48
L. JUNTILA. Benefits of Peaceful Coexistence	11	73
I. NORLUND. Problems of "Northern Unity"	6	49
L. PADILLA. Bolivia: New Prospects for Struggle	8	41
Jan PRAZSKY. 1960: A Political Survey	1	28
S. G. SARDESAI. Political Struggle in India	7	50
G. TOUBI. The Middle East: Dangers and Prospects	11	69
Yu. E. Important Landmark on Way to Democracy and Independence	11	75
Y. R. Solidarity with Fighting Laos	8	39
Y. ZHUKOV. The Destinies of Europe	10	16

POLITICAL COMMENTARY

Jan PRAZSKY. Imperialism's Fifth Column	6	46
Jan PRAZSKY. Violence and Its Origins	7	56
Jan PRAZSKY. Fate of U.S. Civilization	8	45
Jan PRAZSKY. Armies Against the People and Armies with the People	10	53
Jan PRAZSKY. The Non-Alignment Movement	11	78
Jan PRAZSKY. Blackpool, 1970	12	91

THEORETICAL CONFERENCES AND DISCUSSIONS

Ts. DAVAGSUREN, J. LABORDE, A. MASYAGIN. The Party and Building the New Society	8	3
Discussions (Austria, GDR, Norway)	6	34
Frederick Engels and Communist Movement (Materials of International Theoretical Conference) *	9	9
International Conference on Leninism	1	27
Leninism and Contemporaneity (International Theoretical Conference) **	2	3
Leninism and Fight Against Anti-Communism	3	79

VIEWPOINTS

O. BOGOMOLOV. Economic Integration of Socialist Countries	11	63
R. DOMENGER, A. LETNEV. Tropical Africa: Its Parties and the Problem of Democracy	10	58
Once More About the Non-Capitalist Way	6	85
T. OTEGBEYE. Leninism and the African Revolution	8	78
Y. PEVZNER, F. FUERNBERG. Some Aspects of Uneven Capitalist Development in Conditions of the Two-System Contest	6	79
Y. ROZALIEV. Asia and Africa: Capitalism and the Socialist Option	7	88

OUR ROUND TABLE

France: Communist Municipal Activity	2	94
Socialism's Place in History, Stages and Criteria of Its Development	12	46

*The list of contributors is given under the head "On the 150th Anniversary of the Birth of Frederick Engels."

**The list of contributors is given under the head "Leninism and Our Time."

VISITING MARXIST RESEARCHES

	No.	Page
Institute of Marxist Studies (Frankfurt-am-Main, FRG)	8	35
Visit to the Institute of World Economics and International Relations (Moscow)	10	40

THE BATTLE OF IDEOLOGIES

J. ANGENFORT. The Neo-Nazi Ideology—A Peril Only Too Real	10	72
A. B. Anti-Fascists Meet on the Main	10	76
M. BUHR. Hegel and the Marxist Philosophy	10	79
F. COHEN. Lenin and French Communists' Struggle on Two Fronts	8	84
A. GEDO. The Philosophical Relevance of Leninism	12	96
J. D. "El Mercurio" and "Punto Final": A Case of Ideological Convergence	8	91
P. STEIGERWALD, J. H. HEISELER. Marxist Spotlight on the "Frankfurt School"	8	88

ON THE FRONTLINE OF THE BATTLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM

A. B. Ten Embattled Years	12	82
A. FANTIS. NATO Against Cypriot Independence	12	88
HOANG QUOC VIET. The Aggressors Must Go!	2	76
V. KACHANOV. Harbingers of Freedom	10	64
NGUEN MINH. Shoulder to Shoulder With Our Brothers in the South The People of Vietnam Shall Win	2	75
M. WARNENSKA. The War Comes to Cambodia	2	74
	12	83

CLASS BATTLES

F. LAGER. No "Class Peace" in Sweden	8	76
G. MEYERS. Trade Union Struggles in the U.S. Today	6	74
Strike Struggles: Summer 1970	11	85
Towards United Trade Union Action	11	82

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION AND SOCIETY

B. CAREY. Changes in the Australian Working Class	8	69
S. LAURENT. Changes in Social Strata and Classes in Developed Capitalist Countries	8	64
S. NOVOSELOV. Sharpening Social Contradictions of Capitalism and New Problems of Working-Class Movement	8	58

PAGES FROM HISTORY

O. BORISOV. Historic Significance of Defeat of Japanese Militarists	10	84
S. A. DANGE. Gandhi and Indian Revolution	1	91
P. FEDOSEYEV. New Lenin Documents	6	8
R. GUYOT. The Youth International	1	84
E. HONECKER. May 8, 1945: The Turning-Point	6	13
A. KAMBAKHS. Iran Communist Traditions	12	107
G. McLENNAN. 50th Anniversary of the Communist Party of Great Britain	10	89
A. MASYAGIN. At the Sources of the Bolshevik Party	12	104
O. MUELLER. Truth About the Reichstag Fire	1	95
J. PALECKIS. The Re-awakened Land	7	94
Y. SOLODUKHIN. Ideas That Are Still Valid (On 50th Anniversary of Second Congress of the Communist International)	8	94
S. USTUNGEL. Breaking Through the Darkness	12	110

	No.	Page
T. YEROFEYEV, A. KISELYOV, O. RZHESHEVSKY. Collapse of Imperialism's Strike Force	3	99

AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF DEMOCRATS

G. BATAL, L. BOUHALI, M. HARMEL. End Persecution of Communists in Iraq	8	94
J. DORCILIER. Courage and Dedication of Haiti's Communists	11	95
He Must Be Freed!	10	71
Paraguayan Communists Demand Release of Patriots	11	97
P. RAMIRES. Brazil: Terror Escalation	10	70
A. U. Indonesia: Reactionary Propaganda Figments	6	91

BOOKS AND JOURNALS

Annotations	7	53
Books in Brief	8	101
Books in Brief	9	116
Books in Brief	10	106
Books in Brief	11	102
Books in Brief	12	113
A. DUBACKI. Polish Reminiscences of Lenin	8	99
V. F. The Party and Technical Progress	8	101
P. FEDOSEYEV. CPSU—True to Its Internationalist Duty	10	96
J. FREVILLE. Lenin Is With Us	7	98
V. GONZALEZ. The Relevance of Leninism for Latin America	11	101
F. HITZER, O. NEUMANN. Dealing in Anti-Communism	1	99
W. ISKRA. The Strategy of Intensive Economic Development	11	99
J. KNOP, V. WACKER. GDR Scientists on the Economic Laws of Socialism	3	105
A. M. Lenin's Doctrine of the Party	6	95
R. MASS. Adventurism Exposed	10	101
G. PIROGOV. Policy of Alliances of Socialist Unity Party of Germany	1	98
V. PLEVZA, M. VARTIKOVA. Gustav Husak on the Slovak National Rising	6	94
V. S. Autopsy As a Social Science	7	99
L. SORONI. "Economie et politique"	11	106
V. SUKHANOV. The Danaides Vessel	2	112
T. VARELA. Documentos Politicos	12	116
V. V. A Valuable Contribution	1	97
E. YORGEN. Fight for Leninism in Canada	8	99

OUR MAILBAG

Letter from Colombia	8	105
Letters from Puerto Rico, Moscow, Mauritius, Peru	7	102
Readers' Suggestions	3	107
G. SCHORSCH. "Addressee Unknown"	6	97
Statement of the Venezuelan League of Former Political Prisoners and of the National Inter-Prisons Committee	3	107
Letter from Turkey	6	96
A. USMANI. Letter from Pakistan	6	96

* * *

Diary	10	109
Dairy	12	119

* * *

	No.	Page
In Memory of K. Y. Voroshilov	1	102
In Memory of Victorio Codovilla	6	99
In Memory of Evremond Gene	1	102
In Memory of Gamal Abdel Nasser	11	108

SUPPLEMENTS

Economic Development in CMEA Countries	1	103
The Political System of the Socialist Countries (separate insert)	8	
Contents for 1970	12	121

Periodicals from the USSR

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ SOVIET FILM (English, French, Spanish, German) Illustrated monthly. Features about Soviet and foreign films, actors, producers, \$3.50 (12 issues). ☐ SPORTS IN THE USSR (English, French, Spanish, German) Photos, drawings, diagrams in monthly edition, highlighting sports world in Soviet Union, systems of training, records etc. \$1.00 a year (12 issues). ☐ IZVESTIA (Russian only) Daily, organ of deputies of Supreme Soviet of the USSR. \$4.80 a year, air-mail. ☐ CULTURE AND LIFE (English, French, Spanish, German). Illustrated monthly, with news of Soviet theatre, music, art, film, sports. \$2.50 a year (12 issues). ☐ FOREIGN TRADE (English, French, Spanish) Monthly. Deals with various aspects of the foreign trade of the Soviet Union. \$12.00 a year (12 issues) ☐ SOVIET UNION (English, French, Spanish or German). Pictorial monthly. Photo-series on Soviet life. \$2.50 a year. ☐ NEW TIMES (English, French, Spanish or German.) Weekly analysis of world affairs. Carries supplements with government documents. Airmailed direct. \$3.50 a year. ☐ SOVIET WOMAN (English, Spanish or German). Illustrated monthly about the life and work of Soviet women. \$2.50 a year. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ SOVIET LITERATURE (English, Spanish or German). Contemporary Soviet authors, literary criticism. \$2.50 a year. ☐ FEMME DE NOS JOURS (French only) Monthly featuring women, children. \$2.50 a year. ☐ MOSCOW NEWS (English, French, Spanish). Weekly tabloid on Soviet events. Free supplements. Airmailed. \$5.00 a year. ☐ PRAVDA (Russian only). Daily newspaper of Soviet Union's Communist Party. Airmailed. \$5.40/yr ☐ KROKODIL (Russian only Soviet humor magazine. Cartoons, short stories, satire, 36 issues a year. \$6.00 a year. ☐ INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (English or French) Monthly journal on world economic and political affairs. \$3.50 a year. ☐ SOVIET MILITARY REVIEW (English or French). Monthly illustrated military-political journal on theory and practice of modern military science. \$6.00 a year. ☐ OEUVRES ET OPINIONS (French only). Illustrated monthly, new works by Soviet writers. \$2.50/yr | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ RUSSIAN ABROAD (in Russian). Quarterly for teachers and students of Russian. Long - playing record included containing phonetic exercises, texts, etc. \$3.60 a year. ☐ SPUTNIK (English, French, Russian). New monthly pocket-size digest of the best articles, photo-stories, etc., from the Soviet press. \$5.00 per year. ☐ NEWS FROM THE UKRAINE (English). Articles and news items dealing with Soviet Ukraine's progress in fields of economy, culture, education, science, and sport. 24 issues, \$2.00 per year. ☐ SOVIET CHESS (Russian only). All the masters—a unique journal. 12 issues per year, \$3.60. ☐ SOVIET HOMELAND (Yiddish only). A literary journal of contemporary Soviet authors writing in the Yiddish language. 12 issues per year, \$3.00. ☐ SOVIET INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS. Three times a month the latest on Soviet production and engineering techniques. \$170 a year. |
|---|---|---|

*All English editions listed above available in Russian except for Moscow News.

PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 2B, Ont.

Enclosed is the sum of \$..... Please send magazine(s) indicated to:

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Please include 15c for bank charges.

Progress Subscription Service

487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 133, Ontario, Canada

NEW PAMPHLETS

"VIVA LA RAZA!"—A Communist View on Chicano Liberation

"VIVA LA RAZA!"—Una Proposición. Comunista Sobre la Liberación Chicana

A contribution to the on-going discussion of the road to Chicano liberation.

English—16 pages—25c; Spanish—16 pages—40c

GUS HALL—The Man and The Message

by Joseph North, James Jackson, George Meyers

A biographical appreciation of the General Secretary of the Communist Party on the occasion of his 60th birthday.

64 pages—50c

BLACK AMERICANS AND THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

by Henry Winston

An exposure of the Nixon Administration's attempts to win Black support for Israeli aggression.

16 pages—25c

WOMEN ON THE JOB: A Marxist-Leninist View

by Judy Edelman

A discussion and program for struggle around the special problems of working women.

24 pages—40c

THE "PRODUCTIVITY" HOAX!—AND AUTO WORKERS' REAL NEEDS!

An analysis of the auto industry and the Communist Party's action program for auto workers.

64 pages—65c

DIG WE MUST!—INTO THE COAL OPERATORS' PROFITS!

An analysis of the coal industry and the Communist Party's action program for coal miners.

16 pages—25c

TERRORISM—IS IT REVOLUTIONARY?

by Gil Green

A Marxist-Leninist discussion of terrorism and violence as they relate to conditions in the U.S. today.

40 pages—50c

HARD HATS AND HARD FACTS

by Gus Hall

A letter to American workers by a former "hard-hat" construction worker about the real meaning of the recent actions in New York "in defense of the flag" and what construction workers must do to truly protect their interests.

24 pages—25c

NEW PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Complete official program adopted by the 19th Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A., 1969.

128 pages—50c

OF THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE

Pictorial highlights of fifty years of the Communist Party, U.S.A., 1919-1969. Includes 143 photographs and illustrations, plus brief history. 9" x 12" booklet.

32 pages—\$1.00

BLACK AMERICA AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION

by Claude M. Lightfoot

Five recent speeches showing the growing revolutionary character of the Black liberation struggle and its relationship to the world-wide revolutionary process.

96 pages—90c

At bookstores or order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East

Room 801

New York, N.Y. 10003

Orders must be prepaid in U.S. dollars (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST

world marxist review

**problems of peace
and socialism**

Monthly, theoretical and information organ of the Communist and Workers' Parties, dealing with various aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of the revolutionary struggle at the present stage, including:

- ▶ socialist and communist construction; the working-class movement in the capitalist countries; the national-liberation movement;
- ▶ strategy and tactics of the Communist and Workers' Parties;
- ▶ the struggle against bourgeois ideology, anti-communism and nationalism;
- ▶ questions of war and peace;
- ▶ economics and politics of capitalism today.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW covers:

- ▶ the successes of the world socialist system;
- ▶ the activity of the Communist and Workers' Parties;
- ▶ class struggles in the capitalist countries;
- ▶ the peoples' movement for national liberation and its consolidation;
- ▶ the general democratic movement of the peoples.

Among the contributors to the journal are leaders of Communist and Workers' Parties, prominent scientists and publicists.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published in Arabic, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Rumanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish and Vietnamese.

progress books

487 ADELAIDE ST. WEST
TORONTO 2B, ONT., CANADA

\$5.00 for 12 issues.

Single copies are 50 cents.

New rates effective January 1971.

Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM" 1970

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH

(World Marxist Review):

Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1, England

Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)

Société d'Édition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des
Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Editions Progressives
C.P. 175, Sta. E
Montreal, Canada

Librarie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36, rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION

Stredisko pro rozširovani tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BULGARIAN EDITION

"Russki" 6,
Sofia

CYPRUS EDITION

(in Greek)

Laikon Praktorion,
Tricoupi Street, 53 r. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION

Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DANISH EDITION

Förlaget Tiden
Dr. Tvaergade 3,
1302 Kobenhavn K.

GERMAN EDITIONS

Deutscher Buch-Export und
Import GmbH,
Leipzig 701, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus"

Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft

Literaturvertrieb Zürich,
Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

GREEK EDITION

Akadimias 57 (Siné Opera)
1 etage Athènes 143

HUNGARIAN EDITION

Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Steindl u. 6

ITALIAN EDITION

Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 4, Roma

MONGOLIAN EDITION

Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

NORWEGIAN EDITION

Boks 3715
Oslo 1

POLISH EDITION

P. K. W. Z. "RUCH",
Warszawa, Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION

Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH

Agencia de Distribucion
de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589,
Montevideo, Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION

Förlagsaktiebolaget
Internationell Revy,
Kungsgatan 84,
112 #27 Stockholm

VIETNAMESE EDITION

So'o xuất nhập khẩu
sach bao 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-noi

