

AUGUST, 1969

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

WORLD CONFERENCE OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Gus Hall

Wladislaw Gomulka

Leonid I. Brezhnev

Waldeck Rochet

Walter Ulbricht

ROAD TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Wolf Ehrlich

TASKS FACING CZECHOSLOVAK COMMUNISTS

Gustav Husak

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

A Memorable Gathering 1

Gus Hall

Toward Unity Against World Imperialism 4

Leonid I. Brezhnev

For A New Upsurge of Anti-Imperialist Struggle 16

Walter Ulbricht

Socialism on German Soil 30

Wladislaw Gomulka

Peaceful Coexistence: A Vital Need 34

Waldeck Rochet

For A Democratic Alternative 38

Wolf Ehrlich

The Road to Peace in the Middle East 42

Gustav Husak

Tasks Facing Czechoslovak Communists:
Part II 51

COMMUNICATIONS

A Connecticut Reader and Herbert Aptheker
On "Anti-Semitism and Racism" 63

A Memorable Gathering

The World Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, held in Moscow from June 5 to June 17 of this year, was an historic event. Attended by representatives of 75 parties, it achieved a notable advance in the process of unification of the world Communist movement and of the anti-imperialist forces as a whole.

The Conference was the fruit of years of diligent effort and work, leading first to the 19-Party Conference held in Moscow in 1965 and later to the Budapest Conference of a year and a half ago. The latter was followed by long months of preparatory meetings, of the collective labors of representatives of many parties, which produced the main document adopted by the Conference: *Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces*.

That so many parties took part in the Conference is itself of great significance. So, too, is the fact that only one vote was cast in direct opposition to the main document—that of the representative of the Communist Party of the Dominican Republic.

In these and other respects the Conference is evidence of renewed desires and pressures for solidification of the world Communist movement and the stepping up of the offensive against world imperialism. It testifies to the development of a new phase in the world revolutionary process, a new phase in the anti-imperialist struggle. The emergence of such a new phase is apparent in all three sectors of the anti-imperialist forces—in the socialist countries, in the national liberation movement, in the working-class and progressive forces in the capitalist countries.

The new phase is marked by the fact that the attacks of counter-revolution and reaction have been blunted and the forces of revolution have entered into a new upsurge of struggle. This is shown, first of all, in the defeat inflicted on U. S. imperialism in Vietnam, a defeat which has had a profound impact on the relationship of world forces. It is expressed in the victory of the anti-imperialist forces in the Sudan; in the nationalization of oil and the institution of agrarian reforms in Peru; in the increased unity and the new level of struggle of the forces of progress in Chile. It is expressed in the great upsurges of working-class struggles in France and Italy. It is expressed in the new advances—economic, scientific, political—in the socialist countries.

The new phase of struggle made itself evident also in the highly successful World Peace Conference which recently took place in Berlin. This was the broadest and most united gathering of its kind ever held. And we may be sure that it will become even more evident in all coming international meetings and actions.

The Conference based itself on the fundamental theses of the *Statement of 81 Communist and Workers Parties* issued in 1960, and in particular on its estimate of the world balance of forces. It stressed that the main line of historical development continues to be determined by the forces of socialism, national liberation and peace. It repudiated those who saw in the occurrence of certain reverses a reversal of the entire balance of forces and a retrogression to a past historical epoch, and demonstrated that on the contrary the past decade has witnessed the continuing weakening of capitalism and the growing strength of the forces arrayed against it.

The Conference reflected these new developments and drew conclusions from them for future struggles; hence it is a gathering which will influence the course of world events for a long time to come. It was, so to speak, the right conference at the right time.

But the Conference studied and drew conclusions not only from the new phase of struggle, but from *all* the developments of the past decade, including the setbacks in Indonesia, Ghana and elsewhere. It took note of the greatly increased emphasis of imperialism on ideological and psychological warfare, and of its ideological penetration into the ranks of the socialist and national liberation movements.

Emphasis was placed, therefore, on the need for elevating ideological struggles to a new plane. The discussion brought forth the need of much greater struggle against opportunism, of the advancement of working-class concepts and Marxist-Leninist standards. It posed the necessity for unceasing defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, against the incursions of revisionism, dogmatism and nationalism.

In particular, the discussion raised the need for far more intense struggle against racism. On this point our Party, which formally introduced the question, made a signal contribution.

The new advance of unity in the anti-imperialist camp also reflects a decline in the influence of Maoism. Many speakers at the Conference sharply condemned the provocative, reckless and divisive policies of the Mao group. The effects of these policies, however, should not be underestimated. Although in the end almost no Communist parties ended up in the Maoist camp, the fact is that the influences of nationalist, go-it-alone concepts made themselves felt in a number of

parties to one degree or another.

Ideas gained currency that parties must individually solve their own theoretical and ideological problems in terms of the specific conditions in their own countries. And with this came opposition to the holding of a world conference altogether or demands for reducing it to a mere formality.

There were tendencies to equate unity with restoration of the discipline of the Comintern. This idea was seized upon by the capitalist organs of propaganda, which sought to portray unity as "subjugation to Moscow" and to place the independence of parties as opposed to their unity. They attempted to becloud and to reject any idea of ideological unity among autonomous, independent parties.

But such unity is indispensable, for it is not possible for parties to resolve their theoretical and ideological problems on their own, in isolation from others. Lenin took note of this in his day, and it is all the more true in this day and age of the multinational corporation, economic integration and the growing aggressiveness of imperialism in all corners of the world.

The rise of nationalist influences held back the realization of a world conference for a time, but the needs of proletarian internationalism prevailed, and it is to these that the Conference gave expression. It showed that a basis for ideological unity did in fact exist in the common adherence to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. It demonstrated this not only in the main document it adopted but also in two others: "An Appeal in Defense of Peace" and "Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam!" And the general appreciation of the common heritage of Leninism which bound all parties together was manifested in a resolution calling for universal celebration of the centenary of Lenin's birth.

The spirit of the Conference is also expressed in many of the speeches by leaders of delegations. These were no mere formalities, but made important contributions to the collective thinking of the parties which took part as well as others not represented. To this, we believe, the excerpts published in this issue give ample testimony.

The Conference has presented to the world Communist movement and the anti-imperialist forces generally a collectively established outlook and line of action, a basis for rallying all parties to close ranks in the common endeavor against the common enemy. More than 80 parties have now identified themselves with its assessments and conclusions. For us the task is to build on this magnificent foundation.

Toward Unity Against World Imperialism

When we are dealing with the phenomenon of imperialism, we are dealing with a constantly changing reality. The struggle against it must reflect these changes.

There is the continuing, irreversible shift in the balance of forces between imperialism and anti-imperialism. There is the changing picture of relationships between the countries of imperialism, reflecting the law of uneven development of capitalism. And there are the contradictions, shifts and changes within each of the imperialist countries. The forces of anti-imperialism are compelled to take note of these changes, because they are reflected in the changing and shifting battle plans of imperialism.

Imperialism develops new tactics, new ideological arguments to meet the changing reality. We cannot be satisfied either with the scope or the effectiveness of our anti-imperialist propaganda, on the level of mobilizing the millions.

The changes in objective reality are world-wide. The shifts in tactics and ideological positions of imperialism are world-wide. Any idea that each sector of anti-imperialism can effectively deal with this changing and shifting global challenge in a piecemeal fashion is a dangerous illusion. Such illusions can only result from an underestimation of the resourcefulness, the craftiness and the totally aggressive and brutal nature of imperialism.

As the draft document correctly states, U.S. imperialism remains the most aggressive, war-like force in the world. It continues its bloody aggression against the people of Vietnam. It continues its policies of aggression against the people of socialist Cuba. It is *the* main force of military, political and economic aggression in Latin America, Asia and Africa.

It remains the base of operation for the forces of imperialism everywhere in their futile attempts to halt the world revolutionary processes. It is the greatest danger to world peace. It poses a nuclear Damocles' sword, and is held in check only by the forces of this new epoch and especially by the powerful military and nuclear shield of the Soviet Union.

U.S. imperialism is in an ever deeper crisis, and it can be defeated,

but to underestimate the aggressiveness and the danger that it presents would be the height of folly. Creating the illusion that it presents no danger of war is imperialism's own trump-card in preparation for war. Only this week, Nixon announced the fake withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. troops in order to create the illusion of disengagement, while it resumed the bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

In fact, with the election of Nixon, the forces of reaction have become emboldened. Nixon continues the policies of the old Johnson Administration, but minus its small tactical concessions.

Aggressive continuation of the old policies without tactical concessions is the new U.S. format for both the policies at home and the imperialist policies beyond its borders. Nixon has already abolished the "Alliance for Progress" with its appearance of concessions to its Latin American empire and has replaced it by the grand tour of the number one robber of the continent—Nelson Rockefeller. He has wiped out even the appearance of concessions in the foreign aid programs.

In place of tactical concessions the Nixon Administration is placing a higher priority on the use of open terror—on the use of the paramilitary forces, of the CIA and FBI. Nixon will continue the tactic of the carrot and the club—but with less carrots.

This is the main direction, the new emphasis in the U.S. policy of aggression. Of course, one has to keep in mind that the new administration has not yet dealt with the real world, which includes the wrath of the people of the U.S.A. And it is a fact that a policy with less sugar-coating on it can be exposed faster.

For an effective struggle in any arena, one must know one's enemy. Because the U.S. is the center of world imperialism, permit us to dissect some of its bloated innards. It is a powerful, dangerous foe, but it is in serious difficulties. In cash values, the annual price tag on the U.S. policy of aggression is reaching the \$100-billion level. For the people, this becomes translated into runaway inflation, skyrocketing prices and rents. Forty percent of all workers' wages are now extracted in taxes. Because of this, real wages are now declining for the third year in a row.

No people or nation has ever been in such debt. The total debt by individuals, corporations and the government has now reached over one and one-half trillion dollars. We are the most mortgaged people in the world.

The Nixon policies of cutting back on tactical concessions is setting the stage for new explosions in the ghettos, for more bitter strike

struggles—for ever greater mass upheavals. . . .

The especially brutal nature of U.S. capitalism is shown in its oppression of national minorities. For three hundred and sixty years it has maintained a special system of oppression, applied today to twenty-five million Afro-American citizens. And after the long years of militant and heroic struggles, even though some important victories have been won, the special system of racist oppression remains largely intact. Thus the system continues in force the discrimination and inequality, the segregation and the ghettos, with its degradation, hunger and misery. It results in an income that is one-half of the national level, in an unemployment rate that is three times higher, in a death rate that is double, in slum housing and chronic hunger for the majority, in denial of education, in black Americans being forced to work at the lowest-paid and most dangerous jobs, in their being at the bottom of the seniority lists. Despite all the heroic struggles of the Negro people and allied forces among the majority white population, this system in its essentials remains intact.

After the passage of many new laws and after many fine speeches, racism still stalks the land. It is still capitalism's most widely used and most useful tool for extracting superprofits.

No ruling class has ever singled out for special oppression so many of its people, within its own national boundaries—a fact that constitutes an enduring indictment of anti-humanist U.S. capitalism.

To the special oppression of twenty-five million Afro-Americans, U.S. capitalism has added special forms of oppression against eight million Mexican-Americans, two million Puerto Ricans and the segregation of what numbers remain of the original Indian Americans into reservations which are barren graveyards of hunger, social deprivation and inhuman wretchedness. This same policy is applied to the Eskimo people of Alaska. The capitalist equation according to which racist oppression—divide and rule—equals superprofits remains a central feature of U.S. capitalism.

Imperialism's Foes

Capitalism has thus created a monster. But it has also created something more. It has given rise to a militant working class. It has created a mass revolt. It has generated a courageous, militant freedom movement of black Americans, of the mass of Negro people. It has given life to a youth and student revolt. It has set multi-millions into motion and struggle.

It has spurred a mass struggle for peace and against militarism,

which cuts across class lines and has penetrated deeply into the armed forces of U.S. imperialism.

It has stirred into action millions of women who in many areas of struggle are more active and militant than men—a point of which this Conference could well take note. It has given rise to a deep probing—to a national uneasiness, to widespread dissatisfaction, distrust and contempt for the bourgeois establishment. It has set into motion a process of radicalization. In a word, it has created a storm of protest and struggle.

We pay special tribute to the heroism of our soldiers and sailors who are challenging the autocratic military regime, who are raising the banner of peace and equality, who are exposing the aggressive character of U.S. imperialism's wars—in the barracks, in the military mobilization and induction centers, and at the military bases.

Never before in the history of our country have so many members of the armed forces taken direct action against militarism. Just look at these official government figures: more than fifty-three thousand desertions took place in the year ending June 30, 1968. This means that in the two-year military hitch of the average GI, approximately one out of thirty men risks a long prison term, loss of jobs and ostracism for life, because his conscience will not permit him to act as an instrument of the racist, colonialist, genocidal U.S. military establishment.

There are more than twenty-three thousand draft delinquents. There are thousands fleeing the U.S. for Canada, and added thousands seeking refuge in Sweden, France and many other countries. There are underground and open anti-war papers published by the GIs on the major military bases. No wonder the ruling class is exploring the possibility of abolishing the conscription system of the draft and raising military salaries, in order to build an army of paid professional servants of imperialism.

The most dynamic and potent expression of the new wave of struggle and the process of radicalization in the United States is the rapid growth of organized rank-and-file movements in the shops and trade unions. The power of these movements can be seen in the trade union elections, in which old, encrusted trade union bureaucracies are being overthrown.

The qualitative political shift on the American scene finds expression in these rank-and-file caucuses. The most dynamic of all the expressions of this upsurge are the caucuses of the Afro-American union members. The popularly-named "black caucuses" are now an active force in hundreds of shops and locals. A glimpse of the level

of this development can be obtained from the names they adopt. The designation of "revolutionary" workers' caucuses is an accepted form among increasing sections of black workers.

Motivating this rank-and-file upsurge are the new problems of the class struggle, the special problems of black workers, and the desire to reshape and to retool the trade union movement as an instrument of class struggle, so that it can meet the problems of today. The workers who make up the rank-and-file movements are the shop militants, the radicals and, of course, the Left and the Communists.

This development is the key link in the class struggle in our country today. More, it is the key link in the struggle for social progress.

This rank-and-file upsurge is reflected in the formation of a new national trade union center. The base of the new center is the three million members of the Teamsters and the Automobile Workers. It is a direct challenge to the infamous, reactionary Meany-Lovestone AFL-CIO leadership.

This new formation has taken up the task of organizing the unorganized, especially in the racist South. But most important, it has taken a stand against the further militarization of the country. This is an important step away from a position of open and aggressive support given by the AFL-CIO's leadership to policies of United States imperialism. It has a position of seeking new ties with all sections of the world's trade unions.

Needless to say these developments on the working-class front have had great significance in all areas of struggle, including the struggle against the policies of imperialism.

The shock-brigaders of the revolutionary transition, the youth, are continuing to set the pace of militancy. The ruling circles are praying for the return of the good old days—the days of the student pranksters—of the panty raids and goldfish swallowing. The liberals are now also worried because the students are not just "letting off steam" but have presented some non-negotiable demands.

These demands reach into some very basic issues of our capitalist society. The students are demanding that higher education be recognized as an inherent right and a realistic possibility for all youth. They are demanding an end of the system in which the wealthy benevolently dole out college entrance permits. They are demanding an end to the racist bars and the system of tokenism in all institutions of higher learning. They are demanding that educational institutions break their ties with the military-industrial complex. They want to close the doors of our colleges and universities to recruiting for the military and for the manufacture of lethal gases and other instru-

ments of mass death. They want to abolish the elitist Reserve Officer Training Corps.

These are fundamental demands that not only affect our schools but go to the heart of the basic problems of our capitalist society—they are demands for domestic reform in place of the war policies and expenditures of imperialism.

The young workers, who are new in industry, are also in great numbers becoming the shock brigades for the working class. They spark the rank-and-file movements. They are pushing for a revitalization of the trade-union movement. It is these young workers, many of whom were themselves recently students, who form the link between the students and the working class.

They are a strong force in the struggle against racism because they do not have some of the hangups afflicting many of the older workers. They are of the radicalized generation. They are more open to new socialist ideas. In our industrial concentration efforts these young workers are our central concern.

There is absolutely nothing on the U.S. class scene that in any way challenges the basic concepts of Marxism-Leninism. That non-working-class sections of the population move into action separately or differently than the working class is not new or unique for the United States. This "discovery" should not be used to uphold theories that reject the Marxist concepts of the role of the working class.

On the basis of the upsurge in non-working-class sections many petty-bourgeois theoreticians in the U.S. have developed theories of revolution without the working class, theories of revolution made by those who are not involved in the production process. These concepts were articulated especially by ideologists on the C.I.A. payroll, such as Marcuse.

What is new and most significant on the U.S. class scene is the historic rise of struggle—the process of radicalization in the ranks of the working class. Also of great significance is that movements representing millions are recognizing the fact that in industrially developed countries there is a built-in limitation to non-working-class upsurge—unless they become allied with the working class. These movements are rejecting the theories of petty-bourgeois radicalism.

Our Party has paid special attention to the youth in rebellion. But the question is not only one of attention it is also one of the content of that attention. This is not a generation that can be won over by paternalistic, classless bouquets. They want answers to their problems. They have to be won in sharp ideological struggle, especially against petty-bourgeois radicalism. They have to be won to a revolu-

tionary path, to learn about the hollowness of reformism and liberalism. They have to be won to Marxist and working-class ideas.

Our Party is a part of these mass currents of struggle and reflects them. We have emerged from years of extreme political oppression on the crest of the waves of mass struggles. Our Party has become united in giving leadership to the mass upsurge. We remain in many ways semi-legal and illegal. There are some new acts of terror and new legal moves against our Party. There are new dangers of reaction and fascism.

With great difficulty, we have now published a daily Marxist paper for almost a year. The next stage in the consolidation and building of the Party is taking place on the crest of the new wave of struggles now taking place. The struggles and the process of radicalization now developing in the ranks of the working class are the new propellants for social progress. The Party is now giving its maximum concentrated attention to this key area of struggle. . . .

Struggle Against Opportunism

Marxism-Leninism, the world and class outlook of the Communist movement, has been largely molded in the struggle against the influence of opportunism.

In an earlier period the acid of opportunism, unseen and unnoticed, weakened the ideological fibers within the revolutionary movement, and at a crucial moment in history it finally destroyed powerful working-class parties of socialism. The acid had done its harm. It is of great importance that the crisis brought on by opportunism came in the struggle against imperialism. When the test came the professed internationalism of the different working-class parties vanished. The unity between parties first was diluted to a formal unity. But very quickly even the formal ties became obstacles. World class ties between parties became an embarrassment.

Each party stated that its internationalism would be expressed through effective work, each within its own national entity.

The leaders of the socialist parties very quickly made new discoveries. Very quickly they decided Marx was wrong. There were no laws of capitalism that applied universally. There were no world-wide concepts of the class struggle. In each country they discovered fundamental national peculiarities that overshadowed international similarities.

The class struggle became purely a people's struggle. Class concepts became "national" concepts. No party condemned internationalism, it just put it on the shelf "for the duration."

Many of the parties became large mass parties. This was good. But what was *not* good was that they became broad popular parties by going along with popular concepts of nationalism and classlessness. They became mass parties by giving up their advanced working-class positions. They ceased to be revolutionary parties and became mass reformist parties.

Only Lenin saw the nature of the acid. Only Lenin took up the struggle before it reached the crisis stage. Only Lenin saw its creeping insidious nature.

Much has happened since then. Much has changed. The ideological fiber of Communist parties is stronger. But the need to be on guard against the acid of opportunism has not lessened. The acid is the same. It still eats at the fibers of internationalism. It still erodes class concepts. It feeds on and itself feeds nationalism. It still leads to an accommodation to the pressures of the enemy. It still leads toward reformism. In its "Left" cloak it still leads to petty-bourgeois radicalism, to dogmatism. . . .

There are two opposite approaches to the question of relationships between internationalism and national interests. Whenever there are momentary differences between one's class international responsibility and some specific national interests, opportunism will in all cases lead to the discounting of internationalism. Opportunism leads to an emphasis on difference and on seeming contradiction by its emphasis on nationalism. A working-class revolutionary concept will lead to a search for the points of unity. Opportunism will seek to widen the points of difference. A revolutionary concept leads to the elimination of the differences. The struggle for concepts of internationalism is a struggle against opportunism.

Theories of disunity are also not new in the history of the revolutionary movement. They appear in exact ratio to opposition to working-class internationalism.

In the parties of the Second International, internationalism was never actually condemned. It was simply dispensed with, as an obstacle to inner class unity. Their scuttling of internationalism was also covered by numerous theories of disunity.

We are for the rejection of all theories of disunity.

We rejected the theory that constant splitting is as natural for the revolutionary movement as it is in nature. It is an open theory of disunity. It is a disguise for nationalism. It is also a distortion of the dialectics of nature.

It is also one thing to take note of and examine differences and momentary contradictions within the world socialist sector. But it

is another matter to use this as the basis for a theory of disunity that in essence says "that's how things are and that is how it will be," that we must therefore accept this as a fact of reality, and that any attempt to find a path of unity is only an illusion.

Opportunism leads to theories based on nonexistent internal contradictions within the socialist world. Marxism-Leninism seeks the path of cohesion and of overcoming momentary differences.

We reject all theories that efforts to bring about working-class unity in fact only bring disunity.

We also reject the concept that silence can disperse ideological differences and thus create the basis for unity. U.S. imperialism has never for a moment given up its drive to chip away at the unity of the socialist world. For it, the focus of the class struggle on the world scale is the Soviet Union. For it, the Soviet Union is the political and military power base of the world's working class. It views the Soviet Union as the main roadblock to its plans of world conquest. This has been and remains the pivot of its imperialist policies.

Thus its main ideological attack is on the Soviet Union. U.S. capitalism is ready to make significant short range concessions to any group, party or state, if these concessions fit into the tactical or strategic plans of U.S. imperialism against the Soviet Union, into its plans of dividing the socialist sector and the other forces of anti-imperialism.

For example, for years there has been a well-organized, high-power political group, composed of some of the most reactionary imperialist forces and called the "China Lobby." It has been the organizational and ideological center for the U.S. policies of aggression in the Far East. This most reactionary force has now undertaken a drive, both in the open and behind the scenes, to bring about a working relationship between the U.S. and the People's Republic of China. This is a well-financed drive, supported by some of the most aggressive monopoly circles in the heartland of world imperialism. Needless to say, these forces are not interested in U.S.-Chinese friendship. Their main interests are not even trade with Communist China. Their aim is to use the split in the socialist world. Their aim is to try to use the People's Republic of China in their anti-Soviet plans. Their aim is to open the doors of China for political penetration. One cannot blame China for what U.S. imperialism does, but one cannot ignore policies that lead imperialism to conclude that it can use them.

The use of such negative policies is not necessarily a matter of

agreements or contracts with imperialism. The same end is accomplished by giving the massive imperialist networks the material with which to vilify and slander the Soviet Union, socialism and the Communist parties of the world. The imperialist network is much more anxious to spread slander coming from such a source than slander from its own barn of ideological fabricators. They are fully aware of the credibility gap of a Morgan, a Nixon or a Rockefeller.

U.S. imperialism has such a specific, worked-out plan of action for every socialist country—for every newly liberated country—for every political party throughout the world.

What the progressive forces of the world must understand is that no world power has ever had an active policy of penetration, of subversion, of corruption, of buying off, of terror and murder on such a massive scale as is the case with U.S. imperialism.

The policy is world-wide but the pivot around which these plans revolve is the plan against the Soviet Union.

Any accommodation to the ideological pressures that arise from this reality weakens the forces of anti-imperialism. No amount of ideological tiptoeing or sidestepping is going to change this hard rock of reality. Any attempt by one socialist country or one Communist party to gain favors by being silent or by any other form of accommodation can only lead to capitulation and defeat.

It is true that the Soviet Union does not ask for nor does it need the kind of defense it did as the first young socialist republic. But even then the significance of the world-wide campaign was far more than the defense of the Soviet Union *per se*. It was an important ideological campaign. In fact this was its central purpose.

For this same reason the statement by some people concerning Soviet self-sufficiency, while correct, cannot be a cover for not taking up the challenge of the anti-Soviet campaign. Such silence, for whatever reason, has political and ideological consequences—not in the Soviet Union, but for the masses in the rest of the world. Herein lies the importance of replying to the slander no matter where it comes from. Anti-Sovietism is a form of anti-Communism. It is a special ideological instrument in the imperialist drive to create dissension in the socialist world, to mislead the anti-imperialist movement. . . .

The Barbaric War Against Vietnam

The U.S. Air Force and Navy have destroyed most of the substantial structures and bridges in North Vietnam, including, by their own claim, tens of thousands of trucks, thousands of railroad engines

and cars, large numbers of vessels, the bulk of all industrial installations. They have destroyed the majority of above-ground schools and hospitals, and countless homes. They have damaged the invaluable dikes and irrigation systems.

The U.S. Armed Forces have destroyed most of Hue, large parts of Saigon, Cantho, and other cities in South Vietnam, and countless villages and hamlets, by aerial bombardment and artillery fire.

The U.S. Armed Forces have ruined a million acres of arable land through defoliation, bulldozing, conversion into military bases. They have destroyed vast rubber plantations, and rice fields, shops, and small industrial establishments in South Vietnam. They have destroyed or stolen hundreds of thousands of tons of rice, tens of thousands of head of livestock.

The U.S. Government strives openly to kill the maximum number of Vietnamese people, boasts daily of the number killed, and of the "kill ratio." It has in fact killed more than one million Vietnamese men, women and children.

The U.S. Government has surpassed all of its past efforts at destruction in this war. It has dropped more tons of bombs than in any previous war. The damage has been correspondingly colossal.

The U.S. is completely responsible for this war, and is guilty of unprovoked aggression against the people of Vietnam, North and South. Similar massive destruction has been carried out in Laos, and serious damage has been done in Cambodia.

World public opinion must force U.S. imperialism to pay full reparations for the damage it has wrought. Nobody needs or wants the charity of U.S. imperialism, and their so-called aid is only given to their clients and puppets. But what is involved here is reparations, which by international custom are paid by the aggressor to the country attacked. And it is our supreme duty to make sure that U.S. imperialism is in fact defeated in its criminal attempt to make a *de facto* colony of South Vietnam.

How much reparations? There is no sum big enough to pay for human lives lost. The damage done to property in Vietnam, measured by U.S. standards, by the prices the U.S. pays its munitions makers, by the actual costs of rebuilding at world prices, would mount into the tens of billions of dollars.

Undoubtedly, the Vietnamese people themselves will be able to add up the bill accurately. But I think that to make economic amends, to pay its just material debt to Vietnam, the U.S. must pay at least the amount it spent in a single year striving to conquer and to destroy Vietnam—\$30 billion. Let the American workers now

producing munitions be put to work on providing some of the goods represented by these \$30 billion owed to Vietnam.

This must be made an issue in the anti-imperialist movements and struggles.

The U.S. is not only the economic and military citadel of world imperialism. It is also its political and ideological center. It has in its service the most massive propaganda machine of any power in history. It has at its service tens of thousands of well trained ideological and political specialists. This is a most highly class-conscious cadre. This imperialist network is sharply keyed to this Conference. Its agents have been briefed and rebriefed. They have been supplied with political, ideological, health and psychological dossiers on most top Communist cadres. They are not afraid of any secret decisions from this Conference. They are worried about the effects the Conference will have on the millions.

This network is geared to minimize the effects. It can do this to the extent that it can create an impression of disunity. Every discordant note is being magnified a thousand fold. In this sense the statement of Comrade Rodriguez for the Communist Party of Cuba that they would not let their absence here be used by the forces of imperialism is of very great importance.

Let us not feed this imperialist network of propaganda.

Let us rather feed the spirit of struggle, the sense of new confidence that masses will gather from a new level of unity symbolized in this historic Conference of Communist and Workers' parties.

There are some in the Communist movement who feel that the draft document is too positive in tone. We do not think so. Communist analysis must of course be rounded out. But there is one special quality in Communist assessments. We are dealing with processes in motion. We are dealing with currents in the process of emerging. It is necessary for us to seek out that which is positive, that which is emerging. We must examine weaknesses, but we must build on that which is positive.

Communists deal with currents and forces that contain within themselves the future. Our assessments reflect our deep confidence in the future of these forces. We have a positive posture because we are the present—but because we are also the future.

For A New Upsurge of Anti-Imperialist Struggle

The principal item on the agenda of our meeting is the question of the tasks of the struggle against imperialism at the present stage and of the unity of action of Communist and Workers' parties and of all anti-imperialist forces. From our point of view, the essence of the problems covered by this agenda is clearly formulated in the draft of the Main Document. The Central Committee of the CPSU considers that the draft, and the other documents which we shall have to examine, conform to the present-day tasks of the Communist movement.

We are convinced, comrades, that our meeting, at which most of the world's Communist parties are represented, will play a major role in stimulating the actions of the fighters against imperialism. It will contribute toward uniting the entire world front of the forces championing peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

At the same time, we are confident that the work of this meeting and the joint struggle for the aims which it will chart will help to surmount the difficulties that have emerged in the Communist movement and strengthen its unity on the principled foundation of Marxism-Leninism. . . .

All this will still further enhance the prestige and influence enjoyed by Communists among the broad masses of working people and all progressive forces in the world. . . .

A Menace to All Peoples

All of us are unanimous that *as a social system imperialism has been and remains the chief obstacle to mankind's historically inevitable advance toward the triumph of freedom, peace and democracy. . . .*

What may be said of the features of imperialism over the past decade? Wherein lie its strengths and its weaknesses in our day and, most important of all, what makes it a menace to the peoples?

The growth of socialism's might, the abolition of colonial regimes and the pressures from the working-class movement increasingly influence the inner processes and policies of imperialism. Many important features of modern imperialism may be explained by the

fact that it is compelled to adapt itself to new conditions, to the conditions of struggle between the two systems.

First and foremost, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that the imperialism of our day still possesses a powerful and highly developed production mechanism. We cannot afford to ignore the fact that modern imperialism also makes use of the possibilities at its disposal by the increasing fusion of the monopolies with the state apparatus. The programming and forecasting of production, the state financing of technological progress and scientific research, and various steps aimed at achieving a certain restriction of market spontaneity in the interests of the biggest monopolies are becoming more and more widespread. In some countries this is leading to a certain enhancement of the efficiency of social production.

The economic, scientific and technological achievements of the socialist countries and the class struggle are compelling capitalism to make some concessions to the working people in the social sphere. It seeks to camouflage the rising level of exploitation of the workers. Monopoly capitalism thereby tries to avert social and economic upheavals fraught with the greatest danger to the bourgeois system.

To meet the challenge of socialism and strengthen their own positions, the imperialists are combining their efforts on an international scale and having recourse to various forms of economic integration. International monopoly associations are being set up with the support and participation of the bourgeois governments. Imperialist military and political alliances are becoming more active.

It goes without saying that today, despite all this, the ineradicable inter-imperialist contradictions remain a vital law governing capitalist society. These contradictions are made all the more acute by the circumstance that reciprocal penetration of the capital of these countries is intensifying and the interdependence of their national economies is increasing. The growth of contradictions between the imperialist powers finds its expression particularly in the weakening of aggressive military blocs, chiefly NATO.

As a whole, however, under conditions of the deepening general crisis of capitalism, a certain shift of the center of gravity of imperialism's strategy is taking place in the world arena. The policies of imperialism are being increasingly determined by the class objectives of its general struggle against world socialism, the national liberation revolution and the working-class movement. . . .

However, in speaking of these aspects of modern imperialism without underrating the strength and potentialities of our adversaries, we consider that neither must they be overrated. The deep-rooted, truly

ineradicable inner contradictions that undermine capitalism, chiefly the contradictions between labor and capital, are becoming more and more acute in our day. Under the onslaught of the forces of socialism and democracy, its positions in the world continue to grow weaker. Today, more fully than ever before, it is exposing itself as a system of social and national inequality, oppression and violence.

Massively socializing production and centralizing its management, state monopoly capitalism is deepening to the bursting point the basic contradiction of the bourgeois system, the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private mode of appropriation. The unnatural character of the situation in which production complexes, some of which serve more than one country, remain the private property of a handful of millionaires and billionaires is becoming increasingly evident to the peoples. The need for replacing capitalist by socialist relations of production is becoming ever more pressing.

The further imperialism goes in its attempts to adapt itself to the situation, the deeper become its inner social and economic antagonisms. The development of capitalist economy is marked by periodic recessions. The unevenness and one-sidedness of the development of individual countries is becoming more pronounced. All this cannot fail to engender serious difficulties within these countries and boost the growth of contradictions between them. This is shown by the constant balance-of-payments deficit, the extremely acute outbursts of currency and financial crises, and the rising cost of living and inflation which in the nineteen-sixties have become a chronic disease in many capitalist countries. This disease is now frequently called a "creeping crisis."

Imperialism's inability to deliver mankind from poverty and need, to abolish unemployment and ensure the working people and small proprietors a life free of fear of the morrow, is particularly striking against the background of the unparalleled possibilities being opened by the present-day development of science and technology. To a steadily growing number of people it is becoming clear that capitalism neither can nor will ever admit the working people to real participation in the running of production and social affairs. It is growing more and more obvious that imperialism is leading toward an unprecedented decline of society's cultural and moral values.

The monopolies use the increased potentialities of production, science and technology for their own selfish ends—to intensify the exploitation of the people, strengthen the apparatus of violence over them, and reinforce the machinery of military aggression and adventures. The social gulf between the handful of top monopolies and

the huge masses of the working class and all other working people continues to widen. In other words, the imperialist system is a permanent and ineradicable threat to the conditions of life and the very existence of the broadest masses in the capitalist countries, where acute class conflicts break out with increasing frequency.

Breeds Fascism and War

The trend, intrinsic to imperialism, to abolish democratic freedoms and move toward the fascization of social and political life likewise harbors a tremendous threat to the peoples. Lenin emphasized that reaction in all spheres is inherent in imperialism. In the nineteen-sixties, a great deal of new, incontrovertible evidence of this has come to the fore.

The influence of the so-called military and industrial complex, i.e., the alliance of the largest monopolies with the military in the state apparatus, is growing rapidly in the most developed capitalist states. This sinister alliance is bringing increasing pressure to bear on the policy of many imperialist countries, making them still more reactionary and aggressive.

Where the exploiters find themselves unable to ensure the "order" required by them within the framework of bourgeois democracy, power is placed in the hands of openly terrorist regimes of the fascist type. There are many examples of this in our day. These regimes enjoy the financial and political support of the ruling circles of imperialist powers and of the largest monopolies.

Imperialism is still the greatest threat to the freedom and independence of the peoples of the former colonies. Even today, after the collapse of the foundations of imperialism's colonial system, one of its inalienable features continues to be the pillaging of the national wealth and the exploitation of the labor of the population of the weaker and less developed countries, although the imperialists are now compelled to act more craftily and pillage in more disguised form. The resistance of the peoples of the newly independent countries to the policy of neocolonialism creates a new and important front of the anti-imperialist struggle.

One of imperialism's gravest threats to the peoples of the whole world is that of another world war.

Militarism has always been part and parcel of imperialism. But today it has acquired truly unparalleled proportions. It is the fault of imperialism that the labor of many millions of people, the brilliant achievements of the human intellect, and the talent of scientists, re-

searchers and engineers are used not for the benefit of mankind, for promoting progress and the remaking of life on earth, but for barbarous, reactionary purposes, for the needs of war, the greatest of calamities for the peoples. These, comrades, are not empty words but facts. Suffice it to say that during the past five years U.S. military expenditures amounted to nearly \$350 billion, or 20 per cent more than the total during the Second World War. Yet today the imperialist governments are drawing up new plans for building up armaments over whole decades in advance. Implementation of these plans will be a further heavy burden on the shoulders of the working people and will increase the threat of another world war.

In the nineteen-sixties alone, the U.S.A. and other imperialist states launched armed attacks on Vietnam, Cuba, Panama, the Dominican Republic, the Arab countries—this list can be continued.

Combined with the stockpiling by the principal imperialist powers of weapons of mass annihilation, the policy of military gambles makes the imperialism of our day a constant menace to world peace, a threat to the lives of many millions of people, to the existence of whole nations. For this reason the struggle against imperialism is at the same time a struggle to deliver mankind from the threat of a world thermonuclear war. One of the cardinal tasks of the international Communist movement is to head the struggle of the people for a lasting peace, and today, far from diminishing, the importance of this task is constantly growing.

We hold that it would be a gross error to underrate the threat of war created by imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism, the main force of world reaction. Millions of people must be made to understand what is in store for mankind as a result of the imperialist policy of unleashing wars, the existence of aggressive blocs, the policy aimed at revising existing state frontiers, and the subversive activities conducted against the socialist countries and the progressive regimes in the young national states. Our task is to see to it that the peoples not only appreciate the entire danger of this policy of the imperialists but also multiply their efforts in the struggle to frustrate the aggressive designs of imperialism.

An extremely important form of the struggle against the threat of imperialism starting another world war is to organize a collective rebuff to the actions of the aggressors whenever they launch military adventures in any part of the world. The most striking example of this is the rebuff which U.S. aggression has received in Vietnam. The heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against the interventionists has merged with the determined and effective military and

economic assistance of the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries, and with the broad popular movement of solidarity with the victims of aggression which has started in almost all countries throughout the world, including the U.S.A. The result of all this is that the aggressors are failing to achieve their aims and the war started by them is turning into a demonstration of their bankruptcy. . . .

Cooperation of Socialist Countries

In many ways the situation on the front of the anti-imperialist struggle is now determined by the course of the economic competition between socialism and capitalism. It may be said with gratification that in this sphere the socialist countries have scored many achievements. If we take, for instance, the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, we shall find that during the past ten years their national income has increased 93 per cent, while in the developed capitalist states the national income rose 63 per cent in the same period. Occupying 18 per cent of the world's territory and having only 10 per cent of the world's population, the CMEA countries now account for approximately one-third of the world's industrial product. On this foundation, the people's standard of living is rising and increasing possibilities are opening up for further successful economic, scientific and cultural development.

Parallel with this, economic cooperation between socialist countries is deepening and improving. In this sphere, as in the economic development of separate countries, the main accent today is on the qualitative aspect, on promoting the efficiency of social production and economic relations. Precisely this task is served by the economic reforms carried out in the European socialist countries. The same aim is pursued by the comprehensive long-term program of further socialist integration, whose main directions were defined at a special CMEA session held recently in Moscow. . . .

Cooperation among socialist countries in foreign policy is an important factor of the anti-imperialist struggle. As practice has shown, this cooperation increases the influence exerted by socialism on the course of world development and enhances socialism's role in the struggle against imperialism. . . .

The struggle of socialist countries against imperialism is not only economic, ideological and political. Imperialism, which has been and remains aggressive by nature, constantly enlarges its military machine and, as the events in Vietnam have shown, is prepared to put it to use. Strength, and more than a little strength at this, is needed to

defend the socialist gains. That is why, like other fraternal parties, the CPSU ceaselessly concerns itself with ensuring the steady growth of the socialist states' defense might and with promoting close cooperation among them in the sphere of defense. This year, important decisions have been taken to improve the control of the Warsaw Treaty armed forces. Coordination between the armed forces of the allied countries is being systematically perfected, and their combat skill is growing. The armies of the Warsaw Treaty member states and other socialist countries are being equipped with the most up-to-date armaments.

In this way, comrades, and by collective effort, the mighty weapon of the defense of the socialist states is being forged in persevering struggle against the world of imperialism. It is at the same time a weapon of freedom for those who are waging an armed struggle against imperialism. Our strength is the bulwark of peace for those who fight the threat of another world war. By defending socialism and peace we defend the future of mankind. . . .

The whole experience of the political struggle proves again and again that the victory of the trend toward consolidating fraternal relations between socialist states and the progress of the socialist system itself are indissolubly linked with the strengthening of the leading role of the Communist parties in the building of socialism and communism. Our Party highly values the determined struggle which the Communists of fraternal countries are waging against any attempts to weaken the leading role of the Communist parties, replace socialist democracy with political liberalism of the bourgeois type, and erode the positions of socialism. To be as firm as Lenin in defending and upholding the principles of socialism is the lesson which life teaches us.

We fully subscribe to the provision formulated in the draft of the Main Document that the main direction in cementing the socialist system is steadfastly to implement the principles of socialist internationalism, correctly combine the national and international tasks of socialist countries, and promote fraternal mutual assistance and support between them on the basis of consistent observance of the equality of all socialist countries, of their sovereignty and independence, and of non-interference in their internal affairs. . . .

Nobody can deny what the ruling Communist parties have already accomplished, or that they are engaged in extensive work of historic significance. Naturally, it cannot be said that ways have been found to resolve all problems, and that we know all there is to know and are able to do everything. Life does not stand still. In place of prob-

lems already resolved new ones arise, linked with the need for the further improvement of socialist relations. Like other Communist parties of socialist countries, the CPSU seeks to resolve these problems creatively, in good time, and consistently in line with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, taking into account the concrete conditions of its own country and the international situation.

By working for a further strengthening of fraternal relations between sovereign and equal socialist states and mobilizing the working people for fresh achievements in the building of socialism and communism, the Communist parties directing the building of the new society fulfill their duty to their own peoples and their internationalist duty to the working class of the whole world. . . .

Cannot Ignore Differences

The successes which the Communist parties have achieved are incontestable. But our meeting is right to concentrate its attention on unresolved tasks, on the new possibilities in the anti-imperialist struggle, on the difficulties that arise in its path. Such difficulties do exist, and some of them spring from the state of affairs in our movement itself, which is going through a difficult period of development. Unity has been seriously disrupted in some of its links. Some fraternal parties have suffered setbacks and even defeats.

There are various reasons for these difficulties.

One of them is connected with the fact that in present-day conditions, when a tremendous social breakup of the foundations of the old world is taking place under the onslaught of socialism and all the revolutionary forces, there is growing resistance from the bourgeoisie. To safeguard its positions, it strives to use all the economic and political possibilities of state monopoly capitalism. In the capitalist countries, anti-Communism has been elevated to the status of state policy. To erode the Communist and the whole revolutionary movement from within is now one of the most important directions of the class strategy of imperialism.

Another reason for the difficulties that have arisen is that fresh millions of people belonging to various social strata are being drawn into vigorous political action. Many of them enter politics with a great store of revolutionary energy, but with rather hazy ideas about how to solve the problems agitating them. Hence the vacillations—the swings from stormy political explosions to political passivity, from reformist illusions to anarchic impatience. All this tends to complicate the activity of the Communist parties, multiplies the number

of their tasks and increases the demands on their practical work. In this situation, Communists must display Marxist-Leninist firmness and loyalty to principle and a creative approach to problems of social development if they are to keep control of developments, and tackle their problems in the light not only of short-term requirements but also of the long-term interests of the revolutionary movement. Otherwise, grave errors in policy are inevitable.

We cannot afford to ignore the divergences existing in the Communist movement today and pretend they do not exist. These differences have been largely caused by the penetration into the Communist movement of revisionist influences both of a Right and of a "Left" nature. And these influences are making themselves felt not only in the sphere of "pure" theory. Revisionism in theory paves the way to opportunist practices, which inflict direct harm on the anti-imperialist struggle. Revisionism is, after all, a departure from proletarian class positions, a substitution for Marxism-Leninism of all sorts of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois concepts, old and newfangled. . . .

Right-wing opportunism means a sliding down to liquidationist positions and to conciliation with Social-Democracy in policy and ideology. In socialist countries, Right-wing opportunism goes to the extent of denying that the Marxist-Leninist Party should play the leading role, and this can lead to surrender of the positions won by socialism and to capitulation to the anti-socialist forces.

"Left"-wing opportunists, behind a barrage of ultra-revolutionary verbiage, push the masses into adventurist action, and the party onto a sectarian path, which paralyzes its ability to rally the fighters against imperialism.

For all their distinctions, deviations from Marxism-Leninism to the "Left" ultimately result in similarly harmful consequences: they weaken the militancy of the Communist parties and undermine the revolutionary positions of the working class and the unity of the anti-imperialist forces.

A frequent feature of "Left"- and Right-wing opportunism is concessions to nationalism, and sometimes even an outright switch to nationalistic positions. Lenin showed up this connection a long time ago. He wrote, "The ideological and political affinity, connection, and even identity between opportunism and social-nationalism are beyond doubt" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 154). . . .

Splitting Activities of Chinese Leadership

The stand taken by the leadership of the Communist Party of China

offers a striking example of the harm that can be done to the common cause of the Communists by a departure from Marxism-Leninism and a break with internationalism.

Frankly speaking, until just recently we had no intention at all of touching on this question at the meeting. However, the events of the recent period, particularly the nature of the decisions taken by the Ninth Congress of the CPC, have forced us to deal with it. There has arisen a new situation which is having a grave negative influence on the whole world situation and the conditions of the struggle of the anti-imperialist forces.

Peking's present political platform, as you are well aware, was not shaped either today or yesterday. Almost ten years ago Mao Tse-tung and his supporters mounted an attack on the principles of scientific communism. In its numerous statements on questions of theory, the CPC leadership has step by step revised the principled line of the Communist movement. In opposition to this, it has laid down a special line of its own on all the fundamental questions of our day. . . .

The Ninth Congress of the CPC marked a new stage in the evolution of the ideological and political propositions of Maoism. In the new Rules of the CPC, Mao Tse-tung's thought has been proclaimed the Marxism-Leninism of the modern epoch. Chinese propaganda openly proclaims the task of "hoisting the banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought over the globe."

It is a difficult and serious task to make an all-around Marxist-Leninist analysis of the class content of the events in China over the last few years, and of the roots of the present line of the CPC leaders who have jeopardized the socialist gains of the Chinese people. The CPSU, like the other fraternal parties, is giving it due attention. But in the light of the tasks facing this meeting, there is a need to dwell here primarily on the international aspects of the Chinese leadership's policy. It is doubly important to speak about it because a section of progressive world opinion still believes that the present Chinese leadership has revolutionary aspirations, believes its assertions that it is fighting imperialism. . . .

You will recall that the Chinese leadership accused the Communist parties of France, India, the United States, Italy, Latin America, and other countries of refusal "to engage in revolution," of being renegades, and of other deadly sins. "Traitors," "social strike-breakers," "social-imperialists"—those are the labels attached to many of the parties represented here. Everybody here knows what insults were showered on all the participants in the present meeting by the

CPC leadership in its reply to our invitation.

The Peking leaders impute "revisionism" to all parties that do not share their views and aims. They resort to all possible means against these parties—from slanderous charges of "connivance with imperialism" to organizing subversive splinter groups. Such groups now exist in almost thirty countries. The Peking leadership is trying to give them the semblance of an organized movement.

The damage done by Peking's splitting activities should not be underestimated. Recent class battles clearly showed what great harm Peking's activity, which prods people on to an adventurist path, is doing to the organized struggle of the working class, of all working people.

The present Peking leadership's fight against the Marxist-Leninist parties for hegemony in the Communist movement is linked closely with its great-power aspirations, its claims to the territory of other countries. The idea that China has a messianic role to play is drummed into the heads of the Chinese workers and peasants. A wholesale conditioning of minds in the spirit of chauvinism and malicious anti-Sovietism is under way. Children are taught geography from textbooks and maps that show territory of other countries as belonging to the Chinese state. The Chinese people are being oriented to "starve and prepare for war." Nor is there any doubt left about what sort of war is meant. Only two days ago the Peking *Kuangming jihpao* issued a call "to prepare both for a conventional and a big nuclear war against Soviet revisionism." Of course, noisy statements are a far cry from actual possibilities. The Soviet Union has sufficient strength to stand up for itself, and the Soviet people have strong nerves—they will not be frightened by shouting. But the direction of official Chinese propaganda speaks for itself.

In the light of all this, the policy to militarize China takes on a specific meaning. We cannot help comparing the feverish military preparations, and the fanning of chauvinistic feelings hostile toward the socialist countries, with the general approach by the Chinese leaders to the problems of war and peace in the modern epoch.

Possibly many of the comrades here remember Mao Tse-tung's speech in this hall during the 1957 meeting. With appalling airiness and cynicism he spoke of the possible destruction of half of mankind in the event of an atomic war. The facts show that Maoism calls not for struggle against war, but, on the contrary, for war which it regards as a positive historical phenomenon. . . .

The facts show that the Chinese leadership talks about struggle against imperialism, while in fact helping the latter, directly or

indirectly, by everything it does. It helps the imperialists by seeking to split the united front of the socialist states. It helps them by its incitements and its obstruction of relaxation of international tension in times of acute international crises. It helps them by striving to hamper the emergence of a broad anti-imperialist front, by seeking to split the international mass organizations of youth, women and scientists, the peace movement, the trade union movement, and so on.

Naturally, the imperialists are making the most of Peking's present orientation in the field of foreign policy and see it as a trump in their political struggle against world socialism and the liberation movement.

The Border Clashes

To sum up: the attack on the Soviet Union all down the line, the specious propaganda, the mud-slinging at the Soviet people, at our socialist state, our Communist Party, the fanning of hatred against the USSR among the people of China and, last but not least, the resorting to arms; intimidation and blackmail in relation to other socialist states and the developing countries; flirting with the big capitalist powers, including the Federal Republic of Germany—those are the guidelines of China's present foreign policy.

As you know, comrades, in March, the Soviet Government, striving to end the clashes organized by the Chinese side on the Soviet-Chinese border, called on the Government of China to refrain from border actions that might create complications, and to resolve differences, wherever these occur, by negotiation in a calm atmosphere. We proposed that the Soviet-Chinese consultations on border issues, which began in 1964, should be resumed in the immediate future. At the same time, we warned that any attempt to deal with the Soviet Union in terms of armed power would be firmly repulsed.

Recently, the Chinese Government made public its reply. If one may judge from words, the Chinese side does not reject the idea of negotiations. There are also expressions of consent to avoid conflicts on the border and refrain from opening fire. At present, we are preparing a pertinent reply to this Chinese statement. This reply, like the Soviet Government's statement of March 29, will naturally be in complete accord with our principled stand: to settle differences through negotiation and to favor equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation. . . .

The future will show whether the Chinese leaders are really eager to negotiate, whether they desire agreement, and what course events

will take. However, we cannot afford to overlook the fact that provocations by Chinese military personnel on the Soviet border have not stopped. At the same time, an unprecedentedly broad and intensive anti-Soviet campaign is being conducted all over China on the basis of the decisions of the Ninth Congress of the CPC. The idea is being drummed into the heads of the Chinese people that the Soviet Union allegedly wants to attack China.

It is needless to refute these fabrications. Not only Communists, but all decent people know perfectly well that our people are preoccupied with the peaceful creative labor of building Communist society, and that they have never attacked nor intend to attack anyone.

Our policy with regard to China is consistent and based on principle. The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government chart their policy on long-term perspectives. We are conscious of the fact that the basic interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples coincide. We have always persevered and will continue to persevere in our efforts to keep alive the friendly feelings of the Soviet people for the fraternal Chinese nation, and are certain that the Chinese people, too, have the same feelings toward the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

At the same time we do not consider it possible to remain silent about the anti-Leninist, anti-popular essence of the political and ideological principles of the present leaders of China. We shall carry on a resolute struggle against Peking's splitting policy and against its great-power foreign-policy line. It stands to reason that we shall do everything to safeguard the interests of the Soviet people, who are building communism, from all encroachments.

We do not identify the declarations and actions of the present Chinese leadership with the aspirations, wishes and true interests of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people. We are deeply convinced that China's genuine national renaissance, and its socialist development, shall best be served not by struggle against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, against the whole communist movement, but by alliance and fraternal cooperation.

Power of International Solidarity

Comrades, the situation created by the policy of the Chinese leadership introduces a new element into the problem of anti-imperialist unity. We Communists must take a responsible and clear stand. The policy of subverting the Communist ranks, of dividing the anti-imperialist forces, can and must be opposed by our firm will for unity,

by our deeds and joint actions promoting unity.

In their fight for unity the Communists have a tested weapon. It has brought victory in glorious battles for the cause of the working class, for socialism. That weapon is proletarian internationalism.

The imperialists are conscious of the power of international proletarian solidarity. That is why they bank on nationalism in fighting the socialist forces, the revolutionary movement. They expect thereby to divide and atomize the Communist movement, to set the revolutionary contingents one against the other.

Bourgeois propaganda goes out of its way to malign the principle of proletarian internationalism and to counterpose it artificially to the principles of the independence, sovereignty and equality of the national contingents of the working class and Communist movement. This is the purpose for which imperialist propagandists have fabricated and put into circulation the notorious theory of "limited sovereignty."

As for us, Soviet Communists, we hold that the present world situation again forcefully bears out the validity and viability of Lenin's concept of proletarian internationalism. . . .

Genuine internationalism also implies support of the existing socialist society by all fraternal parties. We think highly of the stand of our friends who are irreconcilable toward any and all slander of socialism. For Communists that is not only a natural expression of their internationalist sentiments, but also an approach to internationalism as the true policy serving the common cause of revolution. For example, all of us agree that new opportunities have arisen in the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism by virtue of the radical change in the international arena in favor of socialism, and to the detriment of imperialism. But this also means that any weakening of socialist positions in the world is bound to reflect negatively on the positions of all Communist parties. . . .

While still preparing for this meeting, all of us agreed that in order to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement we must search for ways to overcome existing divergences. These are of different kinds. And, naturally, different courses must be employed to overcome them. In some cases doubts and questions may be removed through bilateral meetings and comradely discussion. In other cases they may be ironed out through the practical experience of the joint struggle for common aims in the international arena. But there are also differences that concern fundamental problems and the very essence of the Communist movement. And it will probably take a long time and uncompromising struggle to overcome them.

Socialism on German Soil

After the defeat of Hitlerite fascism in the Second World War, historic lessons were drawn in the eastern part of Germany. The first peace-loving state—the German Democratic Republic—was established. Imperialism and fascism were uprooted in an industrially developed country and the rule of the people was set up under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary party, in alliance with the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the artisans and tradesmen. It was demonstrated that it was fully possible to establish the rule of the working people on German soil, in the heart of Western Europe. The slogan: “Everything through the people, and for the people” was translated into reality.

This was not an easy task. Since U.S. imperialism staked on the division of Germany in order to preserve German imperialism as a spearhead directed against socialism, socialism had to be built in the German Democratic Republic under the conditions of a divided country and an open frontier, under conditions of bitter class struggle. But the tasks of transition from capitalism to socialism were successfully accomplished because the Socialist Unity Party always tried to apply creatively the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws to the concrete conditions of our country. It has been, and remains, fraternally linked with the Party of Lenin—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The socialist system, for the first time, was established in a developed country where the working class comprised a majority of the population. This working class had to direct onto the socialist road the peasants and all other working sections of the population, even the rich peasants and capitalists with small and medium-sized enterprises. Our Party stressed tirelessly the necessity, and the right, of the working class to lead the nation and saw to its implementation. It conclusively demonstrated that the bourgeoisie, which by its policy had repeatedly plunged the German people into wars and calamities, had finally forfeited this role.

Without doubt the most complicated task was that socialism had to be built by people, millions of whom had been captives of fascist ideology. The monstrous spiritual and moral prostration and ideological confusion in the minds of the people was far greater than the material damage inflicted by the Second World War. It was necessary to eliminate the fascist way of thinking and the influence

exerted by reactionary bourgeois ideas over the years.

In the twenty years that have passed since the defeat of Hitlerite fascism by the Soviet Army, an anti-fascist, democratic and socialist revolution were effected democratically in the German Democratic Republic. Socialist relations of production have triumphed. That is why our Party, at its Seventh Congress, was able to set the next goal: the creation of a developed social system of socialism. . . .

The economic system of socialism has now been comprehensively developed and tested. It will be fully achieved in the next few years. This will enable us to utilize all the advantages of socialism to solve the problems of the scientific and technological revolution, to elaborate the most efficient pattern of our national economy and to score outstanding achievements in the economy, in science and technology. In the course of the third reform of higher education, which is being carried out jointly by students and professors, the universities are being reorganized in conformity with the demands of a developed socialist society. The integrated socialist system of education has been fully introduced and is proving its worth. A national culture is growing out of the humanist and anti-fascist democratic legacy.

In the course of shaping the developed system of socialism, various social strata of the working people draw increasingly closer to the working class. On the basis of the new socialist relations, women and young people participate in social development more actively than ever before. People are arranging their lives more and more in conformity with the rules of socialist morality and ethics. The socialist community, the comradely cooperation of people are growing stronger. The GDR's new Constitution not only reflects these profound social changes but also helps the people to improve socialist democracy in the process of shaping an advanced socialist society. The fact that the Constitution has been worked out and is being implemented by the people, demonstrates the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system in the sphere of democracy.

We are sometimes offered various recipes from the capitalist countries on how a socialist society in the GDR could be built in a different and, allegedly, better way. Up to now we have held to our own “recipes.” We have been trying to creatively apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism to our concrete national and historical conditions. Up to now this has enabled us to achieve good results.

We have eradicated the power of the monopolies, the militarists and the Junkers on German soil. In alliance with all sections of the working people we have established the power of the workers and peasants and are successfully building a developed socialist society. . . .

Thanks to the existence of the GDR and its socialist policy of peace, which is being carried out in alliance with the U.S.S.R., the German people and all the peoples of Europe have been living through the longest peace period of this century, despite the aggressive policy of West German imperialism. The GDR, together with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, are fully resolved to prevent a situation from arising under which the vital interests of socialism would be infringed and encroachments made on the inviolable frontiers of the socialist community.

Compared with other West European countries, West Germany has the highest degree of integration of all spheres of social life into a state-monopoly system of rule, with such characteristic developments as the full-fledged domination by the most reactionary forces of military and finance capital, the extension of the monopoly dictatorship through emergency laws, the militarization of social life and the manipulation of the intellectual life of the people. In this way the imperialist rulers of the Bonn state seek to create the conditions for using, at the expense of the working people, the scientific and technological revolution to consolidate their economic and political power. . . .

All this serves to step up the economic and political expansion of West German imperialism, above all in the countries of Western Europe. For the same reason as Hitler, even if somewhat different methods are employed, West German imperialism seeks to secure domination of Western Europe for its aggressive policies against the socialist countries. . . . West German imperialism is able to conduct this policy of intensifying the dictatorship at home and unbridled expansion and aggressiveness in external relations, by using Social-Democratic ministers as accomplices of the ruling state monopoly system and as executives of its will.

Although West German imperialism has concentrated all its strength to maintain the obsolete capitalist order, it is incapable of easing its main internal contradiction. An ever greater section of the working class and other strata of the population realize the irreconcilable contradiction between their interests and the government's policy. . . .

As the scientific and technological revolution in West Germany advances, there is increasing social uncertainty. Although monopoly capitalism does manage to neutralize, by means of higher wages, a section of the skilled working people . . . there is a growing uncertainty about the future among the majority of the working class and the toiling peasantry, a certain section of the intelligentsia and a section of the economic executives.

The movement of the working class, the youth and the intelligentsia of West Germany against the expansionist policy of the Bonn regime, for the international legal recognition of the GDR, shows that the success of our workers and peasants' state also benefits the working people of West Germany. The more they see for themselves the achievements of the German socialist state, the stronger their drive against the rule of the monopolies, against revanchism and militarism. Thus the successful establishment of a socialist society in the G.D.R. helps to narrow down the social basis of West German imperialism and its possibilities for manipulation. . . .

Up to the mid-fifties, the Social-Democratic leadership tried to create the impression that it was seeking a third way for Germany. This propaganda, because it was designed to divert the mass of workers from the democratic alternative to state monopoly capitalism, only benefitted the big bourgeoisie. At the same time, it was aimed at creating the illusion among petty-bourgeois elements in the G.D.R. that it is possible to set up a democratic state system without working class domination. . . .

It is becoming increasingly clear that a sizable section of the Social Democrats of West Germany hold views which generally coincide with our own. Most members of the Social-Democratic Party stand for the achievement of mutual understanding with European states on the question of European security, for the right to have a decisive say in the struggle against the dominant positions of the employers and for the abolition of all privileges for the rich monopolists, against the ruin of the toiling peasants by the big banks and the government, against the conservative policy in public education, for equal opportunities to education for all, and in defense of the rights of youth and women.

All these are demands which we also support. Of great importance in this connection is the fact that the socialist German state has already proven that these demands can be implemented. But this requires that the power of the conservative forces of decaying West German capitalism be destroyed.

The G.D.R.'s way is the only possible way to our people's peaceful democratic and socialist future. In accordance with the laws governing developments in our day, our republic embodies the national alternative to the decaying capitalist system of West Germany. The fundamental understanding that the German people can win the respect and friendship of nations, peace and security only by its achievements through peaceful, creative labor, is being implemented in our country.

Peaceful Coexistence: A Vital Need

The problem of war and peace remains the most important issue of our epoch. All the basic conflicts of our times are concentrated around the struggle to resolve this question. No one can predict the final result of this struggle, for no one can anticipate the future. History and the struggle of the popular masses will decide whether the forces of socialism and peace will be able to block the road to a world war or whether the striving for aggression, which springs from the very nature of imperialism, will lead to a final test of strength between socialism and the capitalist system in the flames of war.

In their policies the socialist states have to consider both possibilities. In face of the arms race imposed by imperialism, they are taking all measures to strengthen the defense capability of the socialist world. At the same time, they pursue a consistent policy of upholding peace and peaceful relations with all countries irrespective of their social system.

The thesis that another world war is inevitable is theoretically false and politically sterile. Acceptance of this thesis would mean abandoning the struggle for the most advantageous conditions, from the standpoint of the working masses of all nations, for settling the basic conflict of this epoch—the conflict between socialism and capitalism. Reconciliation with the prospect of a world war under contemporary conditions would, in fact, be an expression of disbelief in the forces of the socialist system, the international working class and the national liberation movement. It would be tantamount to an underestimation of our forces and an overestimation of the potentialities of imperialism.

A policy based on the thesis that a world war is inevitable would fundamentally depart from the most cherished aspirations and strivings of the broadest masses in all countries. Such a policy is, therefore, unacceptable to the Communist movement.

The alternative to passive reconciliation with the prospect of a world war is the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

The Polish United Workers' Party consistently adheres to the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Those principles were formulated in the documents

of the 1957 and 1960 international meetings and accepted at the time by all Communist and Workers' parties without exception. These principles have to this day preserved their importance to the struggle of the Communist movement and have been fully confirmed in the draft Main Document of this meeting.

Peaceful coexistence is vital in our day. For half a century the contemporary world has been divided into two systems and no one is able to foresee how much time is required for socialism to win the final victory or what will be the stages of the struggle for overthrowing capitalism in individual regions of the world in subsequent periods of history.

The social and political experience of the past decade has fully confirmed the general line of the international Communist movement which considers that its historical mission is to safeguard the world from the devastation and suffering of a nuclear catastrophe before the final triumph of socialism removes the possibility of war from the life of mankind.

By implementing this line, charted in the Statement of 81 Communist and Workers' parties adopted at the previous international meeting, the international Communist and working class movement has scored tremendous successes. The bogey of so-called Communist aggression is no longer effective. In the eyes of the peoples the socialist system and the world Communist movement constitute today the force that consistently uphold peace and act as the main obstacle to the imperialist policy of war, conquest and pillage. In the minds of hundreds of millions of people the very concept of socialism has become a synonym for peace today.

To oppose the prospect of peaceful coexistence with the thesis that there are only two possibilities in connection with a world war—"either war will lead to revolution or revolution will prevent war"—means to shy away from the actual problems of our times. It is an obvious truth for Communists that the victory of the socialist revolution will avert war. The problem is that the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution on a world scale will most probably take a long time; it may even take decades. Throughout this time mankind will face the cardinal problem of war and peace. Throughout this period the revolutionary movement of the working class, which represents the most vital interests of the people, will be confronted with the necessity of finding a concrete answer to this problem. An evasion of this question turns the call for a socialist revolution into an empty cliché because the thesis that a world war will lead to the socialist revolution is no answer. From the viewpoint of the interests of the

working masses and the whole of mankind, this would be most costly, a catastrophic way of putting an end to capitalism.

War is not a fatal inevitability, in the same way that peace is not a gift from the heavens. As long as imperialism exists the danger of war can only be eliminated through resolute resistance by the peoples to the aggressive policy of imperialism, through a consistent joint policy of the socialist forces.

Only a lack of understanding of the problems of modern times, and of the essence of peaceful coexistence, can lead to the conclusion that peaceful coexistence implies upholding the status quo in the world and abandoning the struggle for the victory of socialism and national liberation.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is aimed first and foremost at securing the renunciation of war as a method of settling conflicts between states. Implementation of these principles would signify a relaxation of international tensions, the creation of a system of collective security, respect for the sovereignty of states and nations, a halt to the arms race and defining the principles for settling interstate conflicts peacefully. The triumph of the principles of peaceful coexistence would, therefore, create a solid barrier to imperialist wars of intervention aimed at establishing neo-colonialist regimes and exporting counter-revolution.

The policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems cannot change the nature of either socialism or capitalism. These diametrically opposite socio-political systems, while coexisting and even promoting certain economic, scientific and cultural cooperation, cannot become similar in their social aspects; they cannot mutually penetrate or grow into one another. The revisionist interpretation of peaceful coexistence, according to which it allegedly leads to a cessation of the ideological struggle and to a gradual "convergence" of these systems is, therefore, profoundly erroneous and dangerous.

Under peaceful coexistence, the class struggle is and will continue to be waged both on an international scale and within individual capitalist and socialist countries. The struggle of the working class for power and the struggle of the peoples of the former colonies for full independence will develop within the framework of peaceful coexistence. This struggle may assume various forms: it may be relatively peaceful and take the shape of massive movements and actions within democratic institutions, or it may be an armed struggle against foreign intervention or home reaction and counter-revolution.

Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is

in no way contradictory to the revolutionary or national liberation struggle of the people, regardless of the forms through which these will be waged. The socialist countries never have been nor ever will be neutral in relations to this struggle. They will support them with political and moral solidarity and with material assistance.

We must not delude ourselves that imperialism will renounce its struggle against socialism under any condition. In the present period, when the world balance of forces has upset imperialism's hopes of overthrowing socialism in individual countries through the classic armed counter-revolution, supported by intervention from without, imperialist strategists will, in their efforts to undermine socialism, put their main emphasis on ideological and political subversion adapted to the actual situation in individual socialist countries.

The aim of the struggle for peaceful coexistence is to create the best possible conditions in the world for resolving the basic class conflicts of modern times and securing mankind's further development without another world war.

In Europe, the Communist movement is confronted with particularly important tasks. They were defined two years ago in the joint statement adopted at the conference of European Communist and Workers' parties in Karlovy Vary. . . .

The European continent remains one of the most important theaters of social, ideological and political struggle between socialism and capitalism and of the economic competition between the two systems. Everything indicates that any war in Europe would become the fuse for another world war. This objective situation makes the struggle for the realization of the principles of peaceful coexistence in Europe of exceptional importance and, at the same time, offers the most realistic chances for its realization.

There is a growing consciousness among West European peoples that only a new policy can provide a way out of the vicious struggle of cold-war contradictions. Europe needs a program that would be based on peaceful coexistence and peaceful cooperation of all its states and peoples. Precisely such a program is advanced by our Marxist-Leninist Communist and Worker's parties, both those in power in the socialist countries and those that lead the struggle of the working masses in capitalist countries. Our movement has enough strength and influence to give such a program political weight and authority and to rally broad sections of the people in support of it.

For Europe the main point of such a program should be the creation of an all-European system of collective security.

For A Democratic Alternative

The development of the struggle by the working class and other sections of the working people in the capitalist countries is an important factor making for the relative weakening of the imperialist system. The powerful working class and democratic movement which spread in France in May and June, 1968, revealed the new scope and significance of this struggle.

It was the first big clash in our country between the mass of working people and state monopoly capitalism. Its root cause was the deepening of the antagonism between the monopolies and their power on the one hand, and the working class and the overwhelming majority of the people on the other.

Events since 1960 have confirmed the correctness of our Party's assessment of state monopoly capitalism. In recent years the policy pursued by the monopolies and their state has been growing ever more reactionary and anti-social.

In the last ten years, production and labor productivity in France have increased very substantially, yet by May, 1968, the purchasing power of wages remained on the whole the same. Four million workers are literally unable to make both ends meet. The average working week has been, and remains, the longest in Europe. The workers' gains, such as social security, have been curtailed or threatened.

Politically, the monopolies increasingly seek to abolish democracy, to exclude any form of mass participation in and control of state affairs, to restrict trade union rights, to substitute for the traditional representative institutions structures and agencies to ensure the prevalence of the private interests of big capital over those of the working masses and the nation as a whole. The regime of personal power is a concentrated expression of this policy.

What was characteristic of the movement in May and June, 1968, with its nine million strikers, was that in addition to advancing the immediate economic demands of the workers it directed a blow against the domination of national life by the monopolies and their state power. This movement had for its aim deep-going changes in the social, economic and political spheres. It was proof that the ideas of socialism have been accepted by broad sections of the working people.

The May-June, 1968 movement also showed that it is possible to draw into the struggle against the monopolies and their power, on the side of the working class, new social strata, specifically workers by brain, whose numbers are growing steadily.

The scientific and technological revolution has led to an increase in the number of workers by brain, specifically teachers, research workers, engineers and technicians. Their number has doubled in 10 years. At the same time, there has been a rapid growth of the student body. Since science is increasingly becoming a direct productive force, ever greater numbers of workers by brain are drawn into industry. Their creative aspirations run up against the avaricious policy of the monopolies. . . .

Young workers and a section of the students have displayed great militancy. Young workers who are hardest hit by unemployment, low wages and inadequate vocational training, are in the front line of the battles for economic demands, for social progress, against capitalism and imperialism, and for socialism.

For their part, the students have ceased to belong to the "*jeunesse dorée*" (gilded youth). Most of them come from the petty and middle bourgeoisie and suffer from the economic difficulties of these strata caused by monopoly oppression. They also suffer from the obsolete system of education and methods of instruction. They are compelled to join the revolutionary struggle of the working people. . . .

Since the protest against the retrograde nature of the structure and system of university education was chronologically the initial point of the May-June movement, some have drawn hasty conclusions about a weakening of the revolutionary role of the working class.

Actually, the powerful May-June movement in France had been prepared by the ceaseless 10-year struggle of the working class—an incessant battle which our Party has waged since the first day against the Gaullist power and its policy of serving the monopolies. Moreover, it was only when the working people joined the struggle, in a massive and organized way, that the movement against the regime of personal power and for a new democracy grew in strength. . . .

The unity and strength of the working class movement in which our Party and the General Confederation of Labor played the decisive part, compelled the big employers and the government to satisfy the essential demands of millions of working people, ranging from wage raises to recognition of trade union rights at the enterprises. But it was not possible to put an end to monopoly rule and substitute for it an advanced democratic system representing

the interests of the working people and other non-monopoly strata.

Contrary to the assertions of the proponents of Leftist tendencies, the balance of class forces had made it impossible to put on the order of the day the instant establishment of socialist power. What would have been possible was the ousting of Gaullist power and replacing it with a regime of advanced democracy opening the path to socialism. What was missing for realizing this very real possibility was the unity of the workers and the democratic forces.

Our Communist Party spared no effort to achieve a firm agreement among the Left parties and major trade unions on the basis of a common program of democratic change, which would make possible a genuine alliance of the working class and other anti-monopoly social groups in town and country, in the struggle for a democratic alternative opening the path to socialism.

The socialist leaders obstinately rejected this. They even agreed, in secret, to adventurist combinations inspired by anti-Communism. This situation was exploited by the Gaullist power. Cashing in on the irresponsible violence by Leftist groupings, it worked out a plan designed to involve the labor movement, notably the Communist Party, in a sanguinary clash with the police and the army. . . .

Because of the absence of a strong alliance between the workers and the democratic forces, the reactionary bourgeoisie would have put down the struggle of the working class for a long time and established a military dictatorship. Fully aware of its responsibility to the working class, our Party upset the calculations of its adversary. It succeeded in securing for the working people a series of significant economic and social benefits, retaining and consolidating the conditions for continuing the political battle for democracy and socialism.

Our Party's authority has increased. Many working people, both workers by hand and brain, most of them young people, have joined our ranks. Hundreds of new grass-roots Party branches have been set up. The General Confederation of Labor has increased its membership by 400,000.

The policy the Party pursued in 1968 has proved to be correct. Less than a year later, the working class and democratic forces inflicted a heavy defeat on the Gaullist power: the 'No' vote won in the referendum-plebiscite on April 27 of this year in which de Gaulle had demanded that the people ratify his policy and support his regime. This victory followed by de Gaulle's resignation, revealed the magnitude of the urge for change among the working people. . . .

That is why our Party, loyal to the policy established by its

Congresses and the Central Committee Manifesto, began to unify all workers and democratic groups on the basis of a new political program to be worked out jointly, which would provide for profound political, economic and social transformations and aim at replacing the reactionary rule of the monopolies by a coalition government with Communist participation.

The opportunist policy of the Socialist Party leaders made impossible an alliance of Left-wing forces in the current presidential campaign. That is why our Party put forward its own candidate, Jacques Duclos, and regarded the campaign as a stage in the struggle for an alliance of the workers and the democratic forces. Our Party scored an important success by winning almost five million votes, i.e., over 21 per cent. It showed that it was a major force in the democratic renovation of our country, as a spokesman articulating the urge of the working class and democrats for unity, as a great party of socialism. This achievement will have a highly positive effect on the continuation of the struggle. . . .

In the recent period, the stand of the Social-Democratic leaders in France has fully borne out the justice of the assessment given in the draft of the Main Document. Scorning the unity of the workers and democratic forces, they prevented the massive movement in France in May and June, 1968, from replacing the Gaullist regime by a democratic regime paving the way to socialism. During the presidential election on June 1, the reactionary candidates could have been defeated by a common Left-wing candidate nominated on the basis of a program for a democratic government worked out together with our Party, but the Socialist Party leaders rejected our proposals to unite our efforts. . . . Their call to vote for the reactionary candidate Poher, who enjoys Kiesinger's support, shows up the logic of this fatal policy.

These leaders, who systematically refuse to work together with the Communists for the interests of the working class and its allies, stubbornly strive for an alliance with that section of the reactionaries designated as "centrists" and to edge their way into the administration of social affairs to safeguard the interests of big capital. They bear the full burden of responsibility for the split of the democratic and workers' forces. . . .

Despite the new difficulties that have arisen on the way to unity, our Party, which has grown stronger as a result of its June 1 success, will intensify its efforts to win Socialist working people for unity, because the militant unity of the working class is essential for the victory of socialism.

The Road to Peace in the Middle East

The Israeli-Arab conflict goes on. The Palestine problem has not been solved. The acute crisis, brought about by the June, 1967 war, is still with us. The Middle East remains one of the main trouble spots of the world, a prospective hotbed of war. The cause of peace, the cause of the rights of the peoples, demand a solution.

In the minds of many, the problem appears entangled and complicated. In contradistinction to the Vietnam problem, the Middle East problem finds progressives and anti-imperialists still divided over the solution.

Understanding is made more difficult by the false thesis that there are irreconcilable contradictions between the people of Israel and the Palestinian Arab people, between the state of Israel and the Arab states. The anti-Marxist thesis is advanced that it is a question of right against right, and sometimes Israeli nationalism tries to get its position accepted by conceding the right of nationalism to the Arab side.

Many progressives are taken in by official Israeli propaganda because it uses the slogan of peace, although they should be immune to it by virtue of their experience that in our times there is no aggressor that does not do this. A big part of public opinion in Western countries, led astray two years ago by the appealing David-Goliath story, have sobered up, have freed themselves of hollow emotions, have started to think.

At the end of the solution, there must be lasting peace. Lasting peace can only be just peace. Surrender to *diktat*—even if feasible—would carry the germs of a new round of war. A just peace must answer the just strivings of the peoples of the region. It must give recognition to the right of the people of Israel to independent existence and unhindered security to build up their country. It must give the Palestinian Arab people the fulfillment of their legitimate national rights. It must give the peoples of the Arab countries the security which will free them of the danger of renewed aggression,

* Wolf Ehrlich is a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Israel.

the possibility freely to develop their national liberation movement.

All this is not to be achieved overnight. With problems entangled and hatred accumulated, it will be a long drawn-out process. No details can now be given for all the stages; no blueprint can now be drawn of how the Middle East will look after ten or twenty years.

Growth of Opposition to Occupation

But a start has to be made now. The question facing us is how to get into the correct direction, what way to choose.

The occupation is now in its third year. Two years after the June, 1967 aggression, the Israeli rulers relied on, and were backed by, the United States. The Israeli rulers tried to serve the imperialist aims of liquidating the anti-imperialist regimes in neighboring countries. In this they failed. They also tried to advance their own Zionist aims of territorial expansion. In this, they were temporarily and partly successful. Now, they want to gather the fruits of aggression. They can do so only with the backing of the United States. To retain this backing remains the main object of their political tactics.

In their other political objectives, they have already failed. They have failed to break the unity of the Arab world against the occupation of Arab territories. They have failed to come to separate terms with Jordan at the expense of the U.A.R. or with the U.A.R. at the expense of Jordan.

They have failed to come to terms with the Arab population of the occupied territories. The Arab population has rejected cooperation with the occupying power. No representative collaborator could be found. They had to replace a policy described as "liberal" by the policy of the iron fist. Opposition to occupation is mounting all the time. It has risen from passive non-cooperation to mighty strikes and demonstrations where women and school-girls take their proud place. Israeli soldiers describe how they feel, surrounded by enemies. By every means the Arab population manifests its urgent desire to see occupation ended, to greet the wished-for day of withdrawal of the occupation forces.

Terror against the population mounts. Hundreds of houses have been blown up under various pretenses. Mass arrests are on the agenda. Searches are a daily occurrence. Torture is practiced in dungeons. Economic pressure is applied, particularly in the Gaza strip, aiming at a mass exodus of the population. While the second wave of refugees were, in the main, not allowed to come back,

additional people are being deported to the East Bank of the Jordan river. Deportation orders are especially directed against leaders of the people, against prominent members of the Communist Party of Jordan.

Attempts at uprooting the Arab population go hand in hand with Jewish settlement, urban and rural. Military and civil-paramilitary settlements have been set up in Arab Jerusalem and in the West Bank, in the Syrian heights and in the Sinai peninsula. Jewish presence in the areas should become a *fait accompli*.

This has greatly increased hatred and enmity. Occupation engenders opposition to occupation. The population of the occupied territories expresses its opposition to the continuation of occupation in various ways, mainly through mass struggle such as strikes and demonstrations.

The population of the occupied territories has the right to struggle against occupation, and only it has the right to choose the means for such resistance that it considers the most useful. At the same time, irresponsible actions occur. Bomb outrages in Israeli towns, terror acts against the Israeli population, do not serve the struggle against occupation; they only play into the hands of the Israeli rulers, oiling their propaganda machine.

Aggressive Acts Continue

Bloodshed is mounting at the cease-fire lines. Except for the days of attack in October-November, 1956 and June, 1967, there has never been since 1949 such a daily toll of human lives on both sides of the dividing lines as there is now. The Israeli press has revealed that figures given by the Ministry of Defense on killed, wounded and missing among Israeli soldiers are incomplete and that reports are selective.

The Israeli war machine makes a practice of carrying out commando, marine and air raids over the cease-fire lines into U.A.R., Jordanian and Syrian territory, and over the international boundaries into Lebanon. According to the theory propagated in Israel, the Israeli government is fully entitled to decide when, where and how to strike. Men, women and children are killed, maimed, burnt by napalm. Electric high-tension lines are attacked in Egypt; bridges, dams and irrigation canals are destroyed on the East Bank of Jordan. Israeli official propaganda boasts of driving the civil population away from the cease-fire lines, of creating a third wave of Arab refugees.

The Israeli rulers have still not abandoned the hopes of achieving with these means what they failed to achieve two years ago: to

topple the anti-imperialist regimes in Arab states, and particularly that of President Nasser in the U.A.R. Successful Israeli attacks feed imperialism and reactionary anti-Nasserist agitation asking: Why doesn't he act? Why doesn't he go to war?

Aggressive acts are accompanied by threats of renewed large-scale aggression. Ministers vie with each other in shaking fists, fulminating and calling for further escalation.

The Israeli rulers do everything to increase their military might. The Phantom deal is a major case. Whether the report in *Der Spiegel* on Israel having atom-bombs is true, I do not know. But it is a fact that, like West Germany, Israel refuses to adhere to the non-proliferation treaty, and obviously the Israeli rulers would not be adverse to adding nuclear blackmail to their arsenal.

There can be no doubt that this situation is fraught with the greatest dangers—dangers for the Arab peoples but not less for the people of Israel. The present situation imperils peace in the region, and not only in the region.

The political Zionist line to which the Israeli ruling circles adhere, stands exposed. Its consequences are already today being borne by the people of the country. Economically, the working people bear the main brunt of the extraordinary military budget. Politically, democratic freedoms, especially the freedom of the trade union struggle, are more and more restricted. Restrictive orders and virtual house arrests are imposed on activists of the Communist Party of Israel and other opponents of official policy. And morally, occupation has a very bad influence on the values of the young people.

It is no accident that political life, government and parties, are steering to the right. The Golda Meir government is even more under the influence of the extremists than was the Eshkol government. The Labor Party is successfully blackmailed into supporting the most blatant expansionist aims. The Mapam leadership has renounced political independence by joining the alignment with the Labor Party, not to speak of the Mikunis-Sneh group of renegades that supports the official Foreign Office line.

There must be a change. An alternative must be found—a road that leads not to war but to peace.

False and Correct Solutions

Parties and currents participating in the broad Israeli government coalitions are divided among themselves on questions of tactics—on whether the time has come to announce major expansionist aims.

All are united in the basic strategic conception: to keep what they have, or, at least, as much of it as possible. Prime Minister Golda Meir has reiterated the official position laid down in the Basic Principles of the Government: "Israel will persist in her readiness to conduct negotiations—without prior conditions by any party—without every one of her neighbors, for the purpose of concluding a peace treaty. In the absence of peace treaties, Israel will continue to maintain fully the state of affairs determined by the cease-fire, and will fortify her position with due consideration for the vital needs of her security and development."

Stripped of its demagogic trappings, the meaning of this principle is clear: not to budge one inch from the territories occupied in the June, 1967 war, until a peace treaty is signed.

The Israeli government disqualifies itself as partner for negotiations by its refusal to accept and implement the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. Negotiations under conditions of occupation means surrender of the Arab states. Signing a peace treaty under conditions of occupation means acceptance of the Israeli *diktat*. At best, the Israeli government would be prepared to discuss what territorial changes might be conceded from the present cease-fire lines. It knows very well that no Arab government is prepared to surrender and to start discussions under the shadow of the bayonet. The meaning of the principle is therefore: no withdrawal, no political solution, no peace.

Government propaganda inside Israel is not far from acknowledging the essential roots of official policy. It tries to mobilize public opinion not in the name of peace but in the name of territorial expansion. The fact that the Israeli government has declared its opposition in advance to any findings of the four Great Powers on the Middle East proves that the Israeli rulers are afraid of peace, as the devil is of holy water. Their road is not the road to peace.

On the other hand, the programs advanced by extremists within the Arab resistance movement do not show political maturity. They aim not only at the liberation of the occupied territories, not only at fulfilling the just national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, but also at the liquidation of the State of Israel. This contradicts the just national rights of the people of Israel. It cannot form the basis of a political solution of the Palestine problem. It does not lead to peace.

This holds true also for the proposal to establish a Palestinian state, giving equal rights to Moslems, Christians and Jews. Such solutions proved to be unrealizable even in 1947-48; they are not

realistic today. Advancement of such slogans only tends to unite the people of Israel behind the present leaders. It makes liquidation of the present conflict more difficult. It perpetuates occupation. This is not the road to peace.

Need to Implement UN Resolution

The correct solution can only be a political solution. The possibility of such a solution is given in the resolution of November 22, 1967. This resolution contains all the elements needed to solve the pressing problems of today in the region. It provides for withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories occupied in June, 1967. It provides for an end to the state of belligerency. It guarantees the right to independent existence to all states, including Israel. It assures the right to security, free from the danger of attack, and the right to secure and recognized borders, to all the states in the region. It provides for the solution of the Arab refugee problem in accordance with UN decisions. It provides for freedom of navigation in international waterways in the region.

Implementation of this resolution is in the highest national interest of the people of Israel and the Arab peoples alike; it serves the cause of peace.

Implementation of this resolution would solve the most urgent questions tormenting the peoples of the region. It would constitute a major stepping stone towards the solution of the still outstanding questions, guaranteeing that these also would be solved in a peaceful way.

Discussion has been going on for many months about the concrete forms and stages of the implementation, about the drawing up of a time table meeting the requirements of all sides. The quadrilateral meetings of the Great Powers and the bilateral meetings between the Soviet Union and the United States serve the purpose of drawing up a complete program of implementation. The press of various countries has reported on the idea of a package deal, covering all points of the resolution and guaranteeing that no side could pick out some paragraphs and leaving others unfulfilled. It is to be hoped that discussions will be trustfully concluded at an early date, for time is running short.

Implementation of the resolution has become possible, since the U.A.R., Jordan and Lebanon have authoritatively announced their acceptance and their readiness to implement it in full. It is to be regretted that Syria has not done so, but there are clear signs that

when the question becomes acute, Syria will not exclude herself from the will of the other Arab states.

The main stumbling block is the refusal of the Israeli government to accept and implement the resolution. The Communist group in the Knesset has on various occasions proposed a motion that the Knesset calls on the government to accept the resolution and declares its readiness to implement it. These motions have been defeated by the Knesset majority. The policy of the Israeli rulers, their attempts at making the Jarring mission fail, their attempts at making the Big Four discussions fail—all testify to the refusal of the Israeli rulers to accede to the Security Council resolution.

They are consistent in this. For implementation of the resolution would mean an end to expansion and expansionism. It would prove that Israel's future is not on the side of imperialism, but on the side of the Arab peoples.

Full implementation of the Security Council resolution will lead to the establishment of a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab countries.

The Forces Fighting for Peace in the Middle East

There remain the questions often asked: how to overcome the opposition of the Israeli rulers and what are the forces which could do so.

As in other questions of world peace, the major and uniting force for peace is the international Communist movement. The Meeting of the 75 Communist and Workers' parties, held in June, 1969 in Moscow, rallied around the demand to implement the UN resolution.

On a broader basis, even if not accepted by all, this demand was voiced by the majority of those speaking on the Middle East crisis at the World Assembly for Peace, held in the same month in Berlin, capital of the GDR, and this was confirmed in the decision accepted by the jubilee meeting of the World Peace Council. A similar decision was taken at the World Congress of Women, held also in June, 1969 in Helsinki.

These decisions testify to the world-wide powerful front supporting a political solution of the Middle Eastern crisis.

Within this front, the mightiest force is the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is in the forefront of the fight for peace in the world. The Soviet Union has never been against the interests of any people, and the attempts of Israeli reaction at depicting Soviet policy as anti-Israeli are nothing but calumny. The Soviet Union is against aggression, against the aggressive policy and acts of the rulers of

Israel. The Soviet Union is at the side of the victims of aggression. By its peace policy, the Soviet Union acts in the best interests of the people of Israel.

The Soviet Union is a great material force, influential in the Middle East. Today it throws all its weight into the balance to enforce a political solution of the crisis, to implement the Security Council resolution, to establish lasting peace.

These powerful international forces join with the national liberation struggles of the Arab peoples, the struggles of the population of the occupied territories against occupation and for liquidation of the crisis.

In many capitalist countries this struggle, led by the Communist parties, gains momentum. Mobilization of public opinion has not reached the level attained in solidarity with the Vietnam people. But in relation to the Middle East, public opinion is also coming round to seeing who is obstructing peace. The demand for the implementation of the Security Council resolution is definitely gaining ground.

All this increases the pressure on the U.S. administration to yield to public opinion and to demand of the Israeli rulers that they do their part in implementing the resolution. It may be added that not only peace forces work in this direction, but also sections of big capital who see in a change of tactics the only way to retain strategic and economic positions in the Arab countries.

On the Israeli scene, more and more people feel that the war has not solved problems. Increased insecurity makes itself felt. There is a growing anxiety of parents over the fate of their sons stationed at the Suez Canal or the Jordan River. Many youngsters are not happy about being part of the occupation army. This leads to questions, even if the correct answer is not yet accepted.

An increasing number of intellectuals give realistic answers. University professors appear in the press and even on the public platform against the continuation of occupation. They question the wisdom of annexationist policy. They affirm the rights of the Palestinian Arab people. They complain about the impact of occupation on human values among the people.

Likewise, class battles are reappearing on the Israeli scene. In the months following the June aggression, ruling circles succeeded in persuading the working people that it was unpatriotic to press for their demands at a time of national emergency. Now this argumentation has become thin. Workers of the Ashdot port led a magnificent struggle for their rights. They were not deterred by the

admonitions of government representatives and the trade union bosses that they were helping the enemy. Solidarity actions of the Haifa port workers forced government and Histadrut (Trade Union Federation) leaders to accede to the workers' demands.

The Tel Aviv postmen struck in solidarity with one of their colleagues who had been discriminated against. On the first day of the strike they added demands for better pay and better working conditions. They were joined by postmen in many other towns of the country. The government failed to convince them that it was their patriotic duty to return to work. It had to issue work orders, on the basis of British Mandatory Emergency Regulations, threatening the strikers with two years in prison if they did not return to work. This was the first time that such orders were issued against striking workers; so far they had been used only against Communists and other opponents of government policy.

On September 2, elections will take place for the Histadrut Congress, and on October 28 for the Knesset and municipal councils. The ruling parties try to exclude questions of foreign policy and security from the election campaign on grounds of "national unity" against the enemy. But they will not succeed in doing so. It will be especially the Communist Party of Israel that will put these essential questions before the people. The Communist Party of Israel, at its 16th Congress held at the beginning of this year, called for the implementation of the Security Council resolution as its main plank for the immediate future. At the same time, it explained to the people of Israel that it is the bridge and link to the socialist world and to the Arab peoples. The Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties in Moscow has proved the correctness of this statement. In fighting for a peaceful solution of the present crisis in the Middle East, the Communist Party of Israel is fulfilling its responsibility toward the people of Israel, just as it is fulfilling its responsibility towards the international working class and Communist movement.

* * *

There is a crying need to choose the road to peace in the Middle East. The road is there. It lies in the full implementation of the Security Council resolution. Mighty forces are pressing for implementation. Their strength has to be increased. It can be increased.

The U.S. administration and the Israeli government can be compelled to accede to the wish of the peoples of the world. This can bring about a just and lasting peace in the region, for the benefit of all the peoples in the region and in the world.

Tasks Facing Czechoslovak Communists: Part II

We start from the premise that the class and political struggle in our society was decided in February, 1948, when the bourgeoisie and political reaction suffered a defeat, when the working class and its allies were victorious, when the power of the working class and the working people was established. We cannot and will not retreat from this position, and all the components of the National Front must start from this. It must be said — and this is embodied in the law on the National Front — that this is a closed political system, that no organization which wishes to participate in political life can do so legally outside the framework of the National Front. The main objective is the need to strengthen the socialist character, the socialist profile, of the National Front and its components.

In the past year and a half, some individual components of the National Front have been influenced by the extremist forces, deforming their political effectiveness. We watched with some anxiety the activity of various sections of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party, the Czechoslovak People's Party and of some elements in the Slovak Revival Party and the Freedom Party. Many leaders of these parties returned to the ideas, programs and concepts of the defeated bourgeois political parties of the period preceding February, 1948, the successors of which they considered themselves. They admitted to their ranks compromised leaders of the former bourgeois political parties who exerted considerable negative influence on the radicalization of a section of the membership and organizations of these parties. They accepted into their ranks compromised leaders from K 231, KAN and various other representatives from reactionary, anti-socialist and anti-Soviet elements who tried, contrary to the concept of the National Front, to deform the policy of these parties. The press of these parties repeatedly displayed anti-socialist, opportunist and bourgeois tendencies in the attempt to use the stormy waters of our political life to launch an offensive to strengthen the positions of these parties in the struggle for political power before the elections. In some places, these parties had become centers of anti-socialist, anti-Soviet moods, hopes and campaigns.

We are of the opinion that the leadership of these parties will be

strong enough to cleanse their ranks of these elements, to evaluate critically their own activities during the last year and a half, to ensure the socialist character of their movement in inner-party life and in public, steadfastly adhering to the program of the National Front.

The leadership of our Party will discuss these questions with the leadership of the other political parties. We expect that just as our Party is cleaning itself of all tendencies harmful for our socialist development, so the Czechoslovak Socialist Party, the Czechoslovak People's Party and other political parties will dissociate themselves from those phenomena, cleanse their ranks and become strong links of the National Front, its policy and socialist program. . . .

Formation of Opposition Groups

The National Front is not a coalition of political parties and mass organizations; it cannot imply a so-called "partnership" in the sense of political rivalry. From these petty-bourgeois, anarchist tendencies there arose practical and theoretical attempts to become a so-called "independent force," i.e., a force independent of the influence of the Communist Party, of our policy and of the concept of the National Front.

There were attempts to form diverse opposition blocs outside of, or against, the National Front, as for instance, the "worker and student" bloc or the bloc of "intellectuals, workers and students." Various agreements were concluded between individual components of the National Front, without its knowledge and against its political concept. We reject such concepts and such actions. We regard them as illegal political actions, the agreements invalid and not binding from the angle of National Front policy.

Groups of people, from various creative associations of the intellectuals, organized so-called "coordination committees" on a country-wide, national and regional scale. These are not registered organizations in accord with the provisions of our laws. They were not formed with the agreement of the National Front but in opposition to its policy. . . .

Some people — part of the university students — attempted to work politically outside the framework of the National Front. They even demonstratively announced that they were independent politically and not dependent on anyone. A part of the student body and youth fell under the influence of the demagoguery and anarchistic slogans of groups of irresponsible and immature young people. I want to make it quite clear that we shall not tolerate such activities outside the

framework of the National Front. We shall not tolerate such use of politically inexperienced young people by irresponsible adventurist groups. We will provide the young people and students every opportunity to organize on the basis of National Front policy, to mature politically and to take part and play a role in public life. However, we shall cut short all destructive tendencies by the aforementioned groups by employing political means and, if necessary, by applying the measures contained in our laws.

Over the past 18 months, certain cultural workers gave considerable attention to political activity in order to put forward opposition points of view. For such political opposition, and often direct subversive work, they made use of freedom of speech and especially the mass media and the publications of the associations of creative workers. When we censure their political attitudes or take the necessary measures in the communication media, they represent these steps as encroachments on culture, science and art. That is a wilful distortion of concepts. We have not, and will not, take administrative measures in the sphere of science, art and culture. On the contrary, the November resolution made quite explicit the Party's positive attitude to, and support for, scientific, artistic and cultural activity.

However, when someone begins to work actively and destructively in the political arena, if he conflicts with the political line of our Party and the National Front, he must run the risk of political struggle and not hide behind slogans on the defense of culture, science and art. We shall draw a line of demarcation between meritorious work in the field of science, art and culture and their political abuse for anti-Party and anti-socialist purposes. . . .

We regard non-Communists, or honest members of other political parties, as citizens of this state with full legal rights. We do not regard membership in our party as entitling us to special privileges. On the other hand, it demands more exacting obligations to society. We seek to avoid everything in our political life that leads to passivity, to indifference, to a lack of interest and non-participation.

We regard the development of socialist democracy, as we understand it in the Marxist sense, and as it expressed itself positively in the post-January policy, as an indispensable requirement in the development of our society and a prerequisite for further growth and development. . . .

The National Front is not a coalition of diverse antagonistic political forces in the bourgeois sense. It is a political expression of the class alliance of workers, farmers, intellectuals and other working strata—an alliance of a socialist society.

Negative and opportunist tendencies also infiltrated in some sectors of the revolutionary trade union movement. Various Right-wing, opportunist forces—even openly anti-socialist elements—used the stormy political situation we have experienced to seize positions of power in the revolutionary trade union movement, from factory committees to the highest trade union bodies. Working under the slogan of “trade unions without Communists,” or by agreement with Party members who had succumbed to opportunist and nationalist tendencies, they won some positions in the factories in the top trade union bodies. They concluded political agreements with students and cultural workers espousing analogous political views and, without the knowledge of the Party and the National Front, began to organize joint actions. To this day these forces continue to operate in some sectors of the revolutionary trade union movement in the attempt to gain influence of the working class and in the enterprises.

It is essential that we speak clearly in relation to this development. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia came into being as a revolutionary party of the working class and throughout its entire history it has been regarded as the political representative of the working class. Today, and in the future, our Party represents primarily the interests of the working class and all working people. We Communists cannot remain indifferent when confronted with the fact that opportunist and at times anti-socialist forces attempt to push the working class off the right road. It is imperative, that our Party, from top to bottom, wage a sharp political struggle against all opportunist elements in the factories and particularly in the trade unions. Our Party has always drawn its main strength from the enterprises and the working-class movement. It is, therefore, urgent that our Party consolidate its ideological influence in the factories, isolating the opportunist forces. We must enhance the leading role of the Party in all factories and plants, work with the Party groups in the trade union organizations at all levels, and lead the Party members in this sector to intensify responsible political work. . . .

Opportunist and often also anti-socialist tendencies have become manifest in various parts of our youth movement including its leading bodies. Our entire Party must devote much greater attention to the problems of the younger generation and to political work among them. We expect the Communists in the youth organizations to correct the wrong political line in those sections where it has become evident and to implement the policy of our Party in the work with young people in a disciplined and creative manner. . . .

The situation in the national economy is difficult and extremely

complicated. Crisis phenomena have persisted for almost ten years. The solutions that have been projected, either before or after January, 1968, were not always well thought out and applied half-heartedly, and were sometimes executed hastily or not at all. . . .

Major Attention to Economic Problems

Because of the weakening of Party and state leadership in the economy, elements of anarchy and disintegration, as well as spontaneous pressures for capital investment and wage demands, grew with all the ensuing negative consequences. The importance of the plan and regulation of economic processes diminished. . . . it can be said that the overall worsening of the situation in our economy was furthered by political factors: the slackening of discipline, the slowdown of production, the decline in exports, the overall intensification of tension and imbalance which reached large proportions. . . .

All too often the question of economic reform was exploited propagandistically. We paid too little attention to a detailed study of the experiences of other socialist countries, while our theoretically incomplete “own model” was popularized uncritically, the concrete goals not thought through and verified in practice. . . . We went from the extreme of bureaucratic administration to the other extreme of practically halting all administration.

Negative tendencies also increased dangerously during the first quarter of this year. Industrial production in the first quarter grew only by 3.8 per cent and labor productivity by 2.6 per cent. At the same time the production of consumer goods is stagnating. The manufacture of building materials is below the level of last year. This applies also to a whole series of other branches—such as textile, ready-made clothing, footwear, foodstuffs, etc. Exports to the countries of the socialist camp dropped by 10 per cent and to capitalist countries by 5 per cent. At the same time, the income of the population continued to grow at a very high rate. All in all it increased during the first quarter by almost 15 per cent; wages by 12.5 per cent; and the average wages of workers in industry by about 7.8 per cent. The volume of retail trade increased by more than 16 per cent.

No great economic study is necessary to see that these few figures show the dangerous trend our economy is experiencing. . . .

In May, the Presidium of the Central Committee examined thoroughly the general situation in our national economy. We ar-

rived at the following conclusions:

First: It is necessary fully to restore the leading role of the Party in the national economy, starting with the center and ending with the production units.

Second: It is necessary to strengthen the state and economic leadership in all spheres of the economy and to restore the authority of the economic leadership.

Third: It is necessary to strengthen the role of the state plan in the economy.

Fourth: It is necessary to improve the regulation of wages, prices and capital investments, as well as to strengthen the role of the state in foreign trade.

Fifth: It is necessary to take energetic measures to stop the negative development and to stabilize the economy.

Sixth: It is necessary to critically revise the course of the economic reform, its individual phases and measures, in order to determine the way out.

The Communist Party, as the main political force in our state, must devote major attention to economic problems on the widest possible scale and in every Party body, in the first place, to the sphere of material production. . . . We want to stress the responsibility of Communists—no matter in what section they are employed—for the fulfillment of the tasks in the economic sphere. It is necessary to restore planned, proportional guidance of the economy by a national economic plan which can ensure the requirements of the population and coordinate social, group and individual interests. . . .

In a relatively short time, it will be necessary to examine all measures taken in recent years, to check our progress and to complete the drawing up of a complex set of measures in the economy that will lead to its development. We have no intentions of returning to the old bureaucratic, administrative methods of managing our economy. But we want every step we take to be checked carefully, to be prepared responsibly and implemented with the minimum risk. The aim must be to accelerate structural changes based on present-day processes and trends of the scientific technical revolution. We should avail ourselves of all these modern processes in order to make greater use of reserves in production and, along with this, to render effective economic pressure on enterprises so that they find the ways and means to increase production, and primarily the productivity of labor. In this connection, it is necessary to considerably strengthen effective control over prices and the regulation

of wages, to strengthen the leading and coordinating role of federal bodies and the federal government.

In drafting our economic plans, we should take into account the extension of socialist integration, particularly within the framework of the socialist countries associated together in the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, in accordance with the decisions by the recent session of CMEA countries.

We believe that before the 14th Congress of our Party, we shall be able to work out the principles of a long-term economic strategy and elaborate the directives for the 1971-75 Five-Year Plan which we would like to discuss at the Congress. . . .

Strengthening Role of Socialist State

The strengthening of the socialist state and the whole system of state organs of power, national committees, the security forces and the army is an important component of the policy of our Party. In the past period these important links were also subjected to disintegration pressures which weakened their position, role and function, caused political differences among their workers, weakened the overall guidance of the state by government bodies and, in many places, led to irresponsibility and lawlessness. . . .

It is necessary to repeat that our state organs—organs of political power—represent the power of the working class and working people and are a most important instrument for the retaining of socialist power and for maintaining the very structure of socialist society. We shall strengthen the role of our socialist state in all spheres: in economic and social development, strengthening state discipline, the observance of our laws, strengthen, particularly politically, our army to which we shall pay special attention, strengthen our security forces and, it goes without saying, we shall see to it that our laws are consistently upheld. The army and security forces must be more intensively guided by the Central Committee of our Party.

At the same time, we want to turn our attention to effective and progressive forms for the carrying out of the functions of the socialist state. We are not going to return—as has already been said—to administrative, bureaucratic methods. In doing this, however, we want to act with responsibility and in a business-like manner, proceeding from Marxism-Leninism and in accord with the conclusions drawn by modern science. . . .

The main guarantee that the socialist state will discharge its function, that it will express the interests of all working people,

and that it will unitedly and rationally accomplish its tasks for the benefit of the entire society, is the consistent implementation of the leading role of the Party in all levels of the state organism. . . .

Another important political condition for the restoration of the authority and full effectiveness of the socialist state is the precise and consistent observance of existing legal codes, both in the sense of consolidating the legal confidence of citizens and in the sense of consistent implementation, in all respects, of the laws. That is why the Presidium of the Central Committee has just discussed measures for the improvement of the work of the prosecutor's office as a politically important sphere of the State to observe socialist legality. The present period makes equally important and pressing demands on the work of our courts and security organs.

Another prerequisite for the strengthening of the socialist state and its organs is the completion of its reorganization on federal principles. A federal system in our state was correct, but the practical experience in the past five months reveals some problems in the sphere of division of labor, the responsibility of federal and national organs and the coordination of decisive tasks in all spheres.

We knew, of course, that there would arise certain vagueness and difficulties in introducing a federal system and, therefore, in the shortest possible time we must think these questions over and organize the entire state mechanism and the system of state organs so that they work in a coordinated manner, without any vagueness in authorities. First of all our Party, as an integral force of the whole society, must contribute to the solution of all open problems. The federal system must not weaken the unity of our state. . . . But sometimes it happens that federal and national organs are not always capable of coordinating their activity sufficiently. These questions will also be dealt with by the Central Committee. The Party is not federalized. On the contrary, it is united and we are responsible for the work of Communists in all spheres—both federal and national.

The Presidium of the Central Committee recently dealt with the question of the preparation for the elections and adopted a plan of procedure to carry out a serious preparation of the election system concept in line with the Marxist-Leninist concept of the state, with changes in our political and state life, and with the democratic principles of suffrage embodied in the constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

We assume that the Party bodies will discuss the political principles of the new electoral system so as to ensure a united stand by Communists in the National Front and in the state organs and thus to

create the conditions for appropriate preparation of election laws.

We want, and we shall exert all efforts, to ensure that the general elections to the representative organs after the Party Congress in 1970 shall be worthy, democratic and successful, and in accord with the goals of our Communist Party to make them the culmination of the consolidation process in our country.

Concern for protecting our state and its citizens against danger from without is one of the prerequisites for guaranteeing a tranquil life for our citizens and for the successful solution of the internal problems of our state.

Alliance With Other Socialist Nations

The historic experience of the Czech and Slovak nations and the fifty-year existence of the Czechoslovak state led our Party and our people, during and after World War II, to the conclusion that the freedom of our nations and the sovereignty of our states will be best ensured in alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist states. These are vital problems for the existence of our nations—small nations which must seek allies. Our nations were convinced of that in 1938-39, when the Czechoslovak state was liquidated by fascist Germany and when the freedom of our peoples was suppressed. This year we shall commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Slovak National uprising when the first of Czechoslovak territory was liberated after six years, and when the national and democratic revolution began. We shall also commemorate the 25th anniversary of the battle on the Dukla pass when Czechoslovak military units, together with the Soviet Army, began to liberate the subjugated Czechoslovak people. In less than a year's time, we shall commemorate the 25th anniversary of the liberation of Czechoslovak territory by the Soviet Army and the restoration of the Czechoslovak state. It is necessary to recall these facts, especially in turbulent times like these, to recall this alliance as a permanent factor in safeguarding our national freedom, statehood, independence and socialist development. These are the foundations of our foreign policy and the security of our state after World War II, and it is our duty to preserve and strengthen this guarantee of the security of socialist Czechoslovakia.

Some people pretend not to see that the world is divided; that there exists the camp of imperialist states and the camp of socialist countries, and that our place is within the socialist community. Imperialism has not given up its intentions and plans. Since the power

of the socialist camp prevents imperialism from pursuing adventurist military actions in our area, it uses other, more subtle political and ideological means. In the past year and a half, Czechoslovakia has been a testing ground of imperialist and bourgeois forces acting in all directions—from the political and ideological attacks to the activities of agents. The plans of the imperialist world, pinning its hopes on the actions of the antisocialist and opportunist forces in our country, have fallen through. This explains the malice with which the emigrant agents of these forces slander us through Radio Free Europe and other intelligence propaganda centers in the West.

The world is divided into classes and we must know where our friends are, whom we can rely upon in possible crises and international conflicts. We have found a guarantee of international security in the alliance with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries—members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. This meets the vital interests of the nations of Czechoslovakia which border on the imperialist world.

Strengthen Bonds With Soviet Union

The great idea of international solidarity of Communist parties and the working class movement is a constituent part of our Marxist-Leninist teaching and program. It forms an inseparable part of our teaching, our program, our Party policy. That is why our Party considered it necessary and correct to express in all its fundamental documents that the maintenance of comradely and friendly relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal parties, as well as the relations between Czechoslovakia and the other socialist states, is a basic principle of its practical policy. This is also a firm and inseparable part of our post-January policy embodied in all basic documents adopted by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia after January, 1968.

One of the documents which our Party helped to formulate, and which it signed, is the Bratislava Statement of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries of August 3, 1968. This is an important document on which it is necessary to draw for the ideological and practical activities of our Party in the sphere of domestic and foreign policy. The principle that our parties "will never allow anyone to drive a wedge between the socialist states, undermine the foundations of the socialist social order," has not lost its value even today.

Recent experience has revealed the danger of such attempts. There-

fore, it is necessary to say: Whoever deviates in this respect from the policy of our Party, from the international obligations of our socialist state, departs from one of the basic principles professed by our Party, since this concerns the strengthening of the domestic and international position of the Republic, the security and sovereignty of our state.

In the past six weeks, we have taken steps to restore comradely and friendly relations between our Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal parties and states. In the talks with leading representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other parties attending the meeting of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, as well as in the talks with the leaders of the fraternal parties during my visit to Hungary, Poland and the German Democratic Republic, we became convinced that these fraternal parties, their leadership and the peoples, cherish friendly and comradely feelings towards our Party and towards the people of Czechoslovakia and sincerely wish an all-around, mutually advantageous cooperation with us in all spheres of Party, state and public life.

The Party policy will therefore be aimed at full restoration of mutual trust and the development of all-around relations between the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, between the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the other fraternal parties and states, in the political, economic, cultural spheres and all other areas. In the economic sphere, in keeping with the latest decisions of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, we shall strive to intensify the integration between our economies.

* * *

In the international Communist movement, we attach great importance to the coming International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, for the strengthening of the ideological cohesion and unity of action of the international Communist movement. We want to contribute, actively and constructively, to the successful work and conclusions of this conference. In this connection we would like to point out that the problems which arose last year between us and our allies are being, and will be, solved by mutual agreement, confidence and in conformity with our national and international interests. The atmosphere of confidence, friendship and comradely relations which is being established is the best guarantee for the solution of all these problems. That is why we

cannot agree with the tendencies to turn the so-called Czechoslovak question into an "international" question. Such an attitude to the question will not help, and will not promote, either the vital requirements and objectives of our Party or the interests of the international Communist movement. . . .

If the development of our Party and our society follows the road which we have outlined here, we are certain that the problems will be solved successfully, that conditions will be created for our further development. This will enable us, during this year and the next, to end the crisis situation in our society. Next year we intend to hold the regular 14th Congress of our Party, thereafter the national congresses followed by elections to the representative bodies. This should enable us to end the various temporary measures caused by developments during the past 18 months and to enter a normal period, when democratically elected Party, state and national bodies will be functioning.

A single year is not a very long period for fulfilling such complicated tasks and objectives. We are firmly convinced that during this time we can achieve our main goal—the consolidation of the situation in our country. Our political objective is to ensure a free and democratic life, social and civic confidence in the socialist state for all people. It is towards this goal that the road outlined here leads, a road out of uncertainty and crises toward peaceful and brighter days to a better future.

In this direction the Party leadership intends to lead the great army of Communists and all our people, purposefully, firmly and with responsibility.

WORLD CONFERENCE

When this issue went to press we had not as yet received the speeches of the delegates from Asia, Africa and Latin America. We will carry excerpts from these speeches in future issues.

COMMUNICATIONS

A CONNECTICUT READER

On "Anti-Semitism and Racism"

I would like to make a few comments on Herbert Aptheker's article, "Anti-Semitism and Racism," that appeared in your April issue. I generally find Aptheker an enlightening author, but I must state that I was very disappointed in this article.

The article is well written, as is most of Aptheker's material. But if one probes into the concepts he raises, one finds little to convince anyone of the point he is trying to put across. I mention several specifics:

1. In his attempt to differentiate anti-Semitism from racism, Aptheker states that anti-Semitism, unlike racism, is not based on the inferiority of a particular group. True, few anti-Semites attempt to show the Jew as mentally inferior—in fact, just the opposite ("clever," etc.). However, most anti-Semitism is based on the supposed "moral inferiority" of the Jew, not to mention his "physical inferiority." This is not to say there are not differences between the nature of oppression of the Jewish people and that of the Negro people, but I think that Aptheker stretches his point. But beyond this lies the question of why at this stage does he attempt to make this difference. It seems

to me that it tends to make people lax on anti-Semitism, at least when it comes from a progressive source.

2. Aptheker defines racism (p. 37) as applying only to "darker peoples." I don't seem to understand this. Even if one accepts his differentiation of anti-Semitism and racism, how does one classify anti-Italian or anti-Polish feelings, all based on supposed "inferiority"?

3. His claim that the charge of anti-Semitism among black people bears the earmark of "direct police and state inspiration" (p. 39) is one I hardly hoped to hear from Aptheker. Whatever one thinks about this issue, its base lies in developments and tensions in society. This is not to say that reactionary forces would not like to use it for what they can get out of it, but I don't think we should go looking for the police under every bed, as many look for Communists in every social problem.

4. Aptheker picks out some choice quotes on community control but, as all our publications have done, he does not present the other side of the picture.

In short, to me Aptheker seems to avoid the critical issues in-

volved. I am not saying that confronting these issues (that is, the increasing spread of anti-Semitism in the black community, in particular among certain "intellectual leaders") should lead one

into an anti-black direction. But to ignore them, as Aptheker has done, can only lead to a loss of credibility in him by people concerned with these issues.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Reply to "A Connecticut Reader"

The distinctions between racism and anti-Semitism are spelled out in my April essay and there is no point, in the limits of a letter, in trying to do this again. My April essay was defective insofar as it did not point out that especially with Hitler a new dimension was added to traditional anti-Semitism and this was a secularization of the originally religious assault. This secularization is in line with fascism as imperialism's extreme expression; hence anti-Semitism does in such circumstances take on features of a racist character and the result was not only pogroms but genocide.

The basic distinctions remain valid, however, and this is particularly true in the United States. Living here and facing U.S. imperialism with its organic racism represent the reasons why I chose in the April article "to make this difference." I would say that from the content and tone of the letter from "A Connecticut Reader" he in particular should concentrate upon "this difference."

"A Connecticut Reader" con-

fuses nationalistic feelings and hatreds with racism; there are similarities in these but they are not identical. In fact, black people in the U.S. suffer from both nationalistic and racist forms of oppression and exploitation—as well as class exploitation affecting the 90% of black people here who are workers. There are similarities in characterizations offered of slaves throughout history, and all peoples have been enslaved, but in the past the racist quality to the characterization of slaves was absent—as in ancient Greece and Rome and Africa and northern Europe; there appears to exist a partial exception to this in the case of ancient India and, particularly, China—but the exception proves the rule and helps underline the consequence of the distinction for U.S. history.

I did not say that the charge of anti-Semitism among black people was the result of "direct police and state inspiration"; in the article I stated—with examples—that anti-Semitism existed in the literature produced by a

few black authors — notably Harold Cruse. I stated that the exaggeration of this phenomenon and the spreading of the exaggerated charge and the near-hysteria that was provoked carried with it all the earmarks of provocation, probably police and state-connected. This remains my opinion. I also stated that the studies which have been made in the past showed the existence of anti-Semitism among black people but showed this to be *less* significant and less virulent among them than among white Americans. I do not look for "police under every bed" but I do know

something of the history of state-inspired provocation among reactionary classes and it is a history that perhaps "A Connecticut Reader" might do well to examine.

I did not "pick out some choice quotes on community control"; I examined the question of community control and drew the conclusion that the demand for it is progressive and democratic and its implementation is long overdue. There is "another side of the picture" and the commercial press has not been sparing in presenting that side. I reject it as being erroneous and malicious for the reasons offered in my article.

To Our Readers:

We have been sending a small bundle of six copies of *Political Affairs* to the Guyana People's Progressive Party, headed by Dr. Cheddi Jagan. We have received words of appreciation. The hope was expressed that, if possible, we increase the size of the bundle since the magazine is read with great interest by those who receive it.

We are anxious to do so. However, our fund for gift subscriptions has been exhausted for some time. Will you help to replenish it. Send us what you can spare. A one, five or ten dollar bill will be most welcome.

* * *

The next issue of *Political Affairs* will be devoted entirely to the 50th Anniversary of the Communist Party in the United States. Order additional copies for your friends, shopmates or neighbors.

—THE EDITORS

Important New Paperbacks from INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

- WITH EISENSTEIN IN HOLLYWOOD** by Ivor Montagu
Intimate account of Eisenstein's work outside the
Soviet Union \$1.95
- AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF W. E. B. DU BOIS**
Now in paperback \$3.25
- THE NEW BLACK POETRY**, Clarence Major, Ed.
The mood and spirit of the new black consciousness \$1.95
- COMMUNIST COUNCILMAN FROM HARLEM**
by Benjamin Davis \$2.85
- INSURGENT MEXICO** by John Reed
The author of *Ten Days* on Pancho Villa and the Mexican
Revolution of 1910-1920 \$2.65
- ZAPATA: The Ideology of a Peasant Revolutionary**
by Robert P. Millon. A detailed analysis. \$2.25
- PHILOSOPHY OF WORLD REVOLUTION** by Franz Marek
An examination of the mechanics of revolution \$1.95
- INTRODUCTION TO NEO-COLONIALISM** by Jack Woddis
New edition \$1.25
- HANDBOOK OF REVOLUTIONARY WARFARE** by Dr.
Kwame Nkrumah. Meant to be an actual manual for
guerrillas \$1.50
- NEO-COLONIALISM** by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah
Classic in depth analysis of the actual workings of neo-
colonialism in Africa today. \$2.85

From your bookshop or

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 PARK AVENUE SOUTH
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10016