



Problems of the World

Gyula Kallai

Communist

Movement

and the International

Political Scene

Price 6 d.

1967

474

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



Gyula Kallai

**Problems of the World
Communist Movement
and the International
Political Scene**

PEACE AND SOCIALISM PUBLISHERS ■ PRAGUE 1967

CONTENTS

I. Development of the Socialist World System . . .	10
II. The Communist Parties in the Developed Capitalist Countries	22
III. Disintegration of the Colonial System and Some Problems of the Development of the Former Colonies	35
IV. The World Balance and the Struggle Between the Two World Systems	46

Publishers' Note

This pamphlet is based on a lecture delivered in the summer of 1966 at the Political Academy of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party by Gyula Kallai, member of the Political Bureau of the HSWP and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic.

In little more than 100 years the international Communist movement has advanced from the modest beginning made by the handful of revolutionaries who rallied around Marx and Engels to a world-wide movement exerting a decisive influence on the development of humanity as a whole. Today there are 88 Communist and Workers' parties with a total membership of 50 million.

A movement of such dimensions can hardly have one organizational centre. The parties constituting it function in different conditions, their *immediate* tasks vary, and, consequently, their revolutionary struggle *differs from country to country, requiring the use of a variety of forms and methods*. Each Communist Party is completely independent; it works out its own policy, elects its leaders, and bears full responsibility before its people. But at the same time every Party is responsible for its activities also to the international working class.

The fact that the Communist parties have *no* common international organization which would ensure the unity of the movement through decisions obligatory to all, makes it imperative for them to get together from time to time to examine the general conditions in which they all function as well as the experience of each, and to work out a common political line on the basic issues. Such was the object of the meetings held in Moscow in 1957 and 1960 which, after a profound, comradely discussion and exchange of views, adopted joint declarations defining the common political line of the world Communist movement. This line remains valid to this day. It

was endorsed by the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU and the fraternal delegates from the parties of other countries who addressed the Congress.

Recent years have fully proved the correctness of this Marxist-Leninist course. Nearly all Communist parties have adhered to it and registered major gains. The political, economic and military strength of the socialist world system has grown, and the international Communist movement has forged ahead. The classical colonial system of imperialism has in effect disintegrated. A number of newly-free countries have taken the path of non-capitalist development with socialism as their objective.

However, these gains could have been greater still had not disruptive forces obstructed the implementation of the common line and sought to impose on the international Communist movement their own particular line deviating from that which they themselves endorsed at the 1957 and 1960 meetings. The Communist Party of China, even though it constantly invokes the Moscow Statement of 1960, has actually departed from the line set forth in this statement and opposed to it its own political line summed up in the 25 points published in June 1963. This line is marked by sectarianism, by petty-bourgeois ultra-revolutionism, which has a harmful impact on the cause of peace, socialism and national independence.

The past period has fully borne out the assessment contained in the Moscow statements of the position and role of modern imperialism. The nature of imperialism has not changed; it remains the worst enemy of the peoples, seeking to prevent the advance of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism by every means at its disposal, including local wars when no other opportunity offers itself. But the world balance has radically changed and the imperialists have to reckon with this fact.

The general crisis of imperialism has become deeper. As a result of the uneven development of capitalism, contradictions between the more developed capitalist countries have grown more acute. The ruling classes in the developed capitalist countries are faced with a growing democratic mass movement both in the international arena and in their own countries.

Imperialism hopes to find a way out of its impasse by stepping up aggression and intensifying international tension. In

particular, the aggressiveness of the USA has grown. The crimes committed by U.S. imperialism in the recent period once again confirm the fact that it has taken upon itself the ignominious role of "world policeman".

Clearly, aggression stems from the very nature of imperialism. But the imperialists are given added encouragement by the temporary disunity in the ranks of the international Communist movement. Hence they are now probing to see how far they can go in stepping up aggression. They believe that so long as the international Communist movement is occupied with internal controversies and there are cracks in the anti-imperialist united front they have a good chance of regaining lost positions by intimidating and blackmailing the peoples who recently won independence and employing crude force and naked aggression against peoples fighting to win their freedom. This was evident in the encroachments on People's Cuba, in the forcible suppression of the revolutionary movement of the Dominican people, in the Indonesian events, in the Right-wing military coup in Ghana, and it is particularly manifest now in the war in Vietnam.

The temporary disruption of the unity of the world Communist movement is a grievous phenomenon of present-day international life. When the overwhelming majority of the Communist and Workers' parties, working to cement unity, criticize the harmful policy of the leaders of the Communist Party of China and challenge their views, they do so above all because the pseudo-revolutionary policy of the latter obstructs the struggle against the main enemy of the peoples, against imperialism, in particular U.S. imperialism.

Seeing the temporary disunity of the international Communist movement, the activation of the forces of international imperialism, the temporary setbacks suffered by the champions of democracy, peace and progress in some countries and, as a result of all this, the heightening of international tension, many tend to ask: is our policy correct, are the theses set forth in the Moscow statements of 1957 and 1960 still valid?

It should be plainly said once again that our policy is the correct policy, that the general line of the Moscow statements is the only policy which is in the interests of all humanity in the struggles against imperialism and world war, for the triumph of socialism and peace.

The Moscow statements correctly point to the basic long-term factors which in our epoch determine the international situation. The thesis that the main content of our time is the transition from capitalism to socialism, that its main distinguishing feature is the transformation of the socialist world system into the decisive factor of development, has proved incontrovertible. The chief contradiction of our time is manifest in the relations between the two diametrically opposed social systems—socialism and capitalism. The struggle of the new against the old—the basic driving force of progress—finds direct expression in this contradiction and indirectly influences all the processes under way in the world today.

The countries of the socialist world system play the decisive role in the world-wide class struggle against imperialism. This follows primarily from the fact that the new social system being built in these countries will in the final analysis take the place of capitalism throughout the world, and, secondly, the fact that the socialist world system is the decisive military, political and economic force which, combating imperialism, acts as a curb on the aggressive forces, ties the hands of international imperialism and creates favourable opportunities for the popular struggle everywhere.

In this international class struggle the socialist world system operates in close alliance with all other anti-imperialist forces. Its militant allies are the world Communist and working-class movement, the international liberation movement, the countries which have rid themselves of colonial slavery, and the world-wide peace movement. *The main trend of social-development is increasingly determined by the socialist world system and its allies.* The past five years have also confirmed that the balance of forces in the world arena is generally changing in favour of socialism.

It would be a mistake, however, to take a mechanical view of this main trend. Imperialism is exerting every effort to prolong its existence. This is evident in the steady growth of state-monopoly capitalism in the imperialist countries, and in the stepping up of imperialist aggression in the international sphere.

The Communist parties must reckon not only with the basic, constant factors, but also with the concrete balance of forces at each stage, with the transient factors, facts and contradictions of the given historical moment, i.e., they should constantly examine the strategy and tactics of the movement, *enrich-*

ing them with new elements dictated by development and elaborating programmes of action according with the concrete conditions of the struggle. This is a collective task constantly facing the entire world Communist movement. Needless to say, in the present pamphlet it is impossible to make an exhaustive examination of the question. Its object is more modest: to examine once again, from the standpoint of the struggle for the unity of the international Communist movement, some of the basic issues at stake as well as some of the new developments since the adoption of the Moscow declarations, and to draw the corresponding conclusions.

I

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIALIST WORLD SYSTEM

The Moscow statements correctly point out that the main achievement of the international working class in our time is the socialist world system. This system is the principal revolutionary force of our epoch, and its strengthening and development exert the greatest influence on world-wide revolutionary processes and, hence, on man's progress in general.

"The course of social development," the 1960 Statement declares, "confirms Lenin's prediction that the countries of victorious socialism would influence the development of world revolution chiefly by their economic construction."

In keeping with this, the socialist countries have done much through joint effort to develop their economy in the past years. The rate of development of the socialist economy in this period has exceeded that of the developed capitalist countries. Between 1961 and 1965 industrial production in the socialist countries increased by 43 per cent as against 34 per cent in the capitalist countries. If we take a longer span of time, it will be seen more clearly still that the share of the socialist countries in world industrial production has increased substantially. In 1950 they accounted for less than 20 per cent of the world total, and in 1964, for 38 per cent.

A cardinal issue of international class struggle is the economic competition between the two world systems.

The fact that socialism first triumphed not in the developed but in the more backward capitalist countries laid its imprint on this competition for a long time. The start was made under inauspicious conditions. The countries launching out on the socialist road had to overcome the backwardness left behind

by the old regimes, to develop their industry and to abolish poverty while building the new, socialist system.

The advantages of the socialist system, however, made themselves felt from the very beginning. Harmony between production relations and the character of the productive forces stimulated production, and from the outset socialism left capitalism behind for rates of industrial growth. The pace set by the socialist system exceeded the best showing made by capitalism in its heyday.

The emergence of the socialist world system gave rise to *economic cooperation of a new type between the socialist countries*. The steadily deepening international socialist division of labour is one of the main reasons why the socialist countries are developing more rapidly than the capitalist.

The objective laws of the world market, of international trade, tend to promote trade between the two world systems. This trend can be accelerated by the pursuance of a conscious policy based on complete equality and mutual benefit.

Thanks to these factors the socialist world system is in a *far more favourable position* than before to forge ahead towards the aim set by Lenin—to *overtake and surpass economically the most developed capitalist countries*.

The view is widespread in the West that the socialist countries can keep up their rapid rates of economic development only until they have become predominantly industrial, that the higher the level of the economy the more the growth rate will fall off. To bear out this thesis the fact is cited that the industry of some socialist countries developed at a slower rate in the sixties than during the previous decade. But this is no grounds for the West to assume that there is a general slowdown of rates of socialist development. Firstly, the fact remains that the industrial growth rate in the socialist countries in this period exceeded the rate in the most highly developed capitalist countries. Secondly, the retardation of the rate of development in the socialist countries is only a transient phenomenon which will disappear with fuller utilization of the internal reserves of the socialist system.

This, in fact, is the object of the present reforms of socialist economic management and the deepening of the international socialist division of labour. New reserves are being revealed and harnessed more and more effectively. This will accelerate progress and steadily bring the economy of the socialist countries closer to the level of the economically more

advanced capitalist countries, and eventually enable them to outstrip the latter. But inevitable though this is, it would be a mistake to cherish illusions and arbitrarily set exact time limits for the achievement of this aim. It can be achieved only through persistent hard work, the conscious utilization of all the advantages of the socialist social system and mode of production in order steadily and rapidly to multiply the sum total of material and spiritual values.

Needless to say, the socialist countries influence world development not only through their economic achievements. These are not the only source of the growing force of attraction of socialism. Equally important is the political, moral and cultural superiority of the socialist system, as are the wide opportunities it provides for the political activity and spiritual development of the people.

The decisive factor which places the socialist countries above the capitalist countries politically and exerts a vast revolutionizing influence is that in the former there is no exploitation of man by man and the power is wielded by the working class allied with the rest of the people—the peasantry, the intellectuals, and the petty bourgeoisie. Socialism has abolished all obstacles to the advance of the masses and the full development of human personality: it has done away with privileges based on property or social origin and given millions a sense of security. The socialist system is the initial form of a society in which with the abolition of exploitation the political, social and material conditions are created for the all-round development of man, for genuine fraternity, equality and freedom.

But these advantages of the socialist system are not realized automatically. People judge socialism not by its abstract potentialities, but by the extent these potentialities are realized. Hence the cardinal tasks in consolidating and building the socialist social system are all-round development of socialist democracy, the achievement and consolidation of socialist national unity, multiplying the achievements of the cultural revolution, consistently implementing the principles of socialist humanism, and systematically raising the standard of living.

From the standpoint of influence on world development, the activities of the CPSU and the achievements of the Soviet Union are particularly important. This is so not only because of the great material strength of the Soviet Union, the fact

that the USSR turns out nearly 60 per cent of the total industrial output of the socialist world system, but primarily because the peoples of the Soviet Union were the first to take the path of socialist revolution and today are already working to build communism. The peoples everywhere legitimately regard what they see in the Soviet Union today as a prototype of their own future.

In 1965 the Soviet Union completed its seven-year plan. During this period, as was pointed out at the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU, industrial production increased by 84 per cent. In other words, Soviet industry made as much headway in these seven years as it had made in the previous 32 years. In the economic competition with the leading capitalist countries the Soviet Union registered new gains, further reducing the gap between its economic development and that of the USA. And in education, public health, social security, and such important areas of science and technology as nuclear physics, mathematics, electronics, radio engineering, rocket engineering and aircraft building it is already in the lead.

As regards the correlation of military strength, the superiority is on the side of the Soviet Army, which is a decisive factor in the maintenance of world peace.

In conformity with the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the CPSU considers the building of the material and technological base of communism to be its most important task. This, of course, cannot be done at once, in a year or two. It requires persistent political, economic, scientific, organizational and educational work over decades.

The new five-year plan of the Soviet Union calls for further substantial progress. A notable feature of this plan is that, while according priority to the production of means of production as before, it provides for bringing the rate of growth in this sector and in the production of consumer goods closer together. In this way it will be possible considerably to improve the living standard of the Soviet people. The wage increases, improvement of social security and the introduction of the five-day working week envisaged by the plan and other measures outlined by the Twenty-Third Congress mark a new step forward on the way to communism.

It is thanks to the socialist system that the Soviet people have been able within an historically brief space of time to overcome the backwardness inherited from tsarism and, in spite of the devastation caused by the Civil War and Second

World War, to advance to a level when they are in a position to compete with the leading capitalist countries. The achievements of the Soviet Union in building the material and technological base of communism exert a powerful influence on the economic development of the entire socialist world system.

This system, which unites fourteen countries, accounts for 26 per cent of the total land area and 35 per cent of the population of the world, extending to three continents.

The socialist countries have traversed a momentous historical path in a brief space of time. They have put an end to the socio-economic backwardness inherited from the past. The foundations of the socialist social system have been laid, and in nearly all of the countries socialist production relations have triumphed in all branches of the economy.

Today these countries have entered a new stage of development, a stage essentially marked by more intensive utilization of the advantages of the socialist system to accelerate progress and to complete the building of socialist society. A feature of this stage are the reforms aimed at improving economic management and planning which are now being carried out in nearly all European socialist countries.

Aware that these reforms signify still more rapid advance of the socialist countries, the capitalists are resorting to deception. Commentaries published in the Western press suggest that the reforms we are effecting are a concession to capitalism and amount to copying capitalist methods (incidentally, similar views are occasionally expressed by some people even in our countries). This interpretation, the authors of which are clearly engaged in anti-socialist ideological and political sleight of hand, is sheer slander. The ideologues of the bourgeoisie seek to discredit socialism by passing the word around that it is allegedly approximating to the "more developed" capitalism. The object is to counteract the gravitation of the people of the capitalist countries to socialism, and in the socialist countries to sow distrust of the reforms in order to weaken the activity of the masses.

In the socialist countries private ownership of the means of production has been replaced by public ownership. There is no more exploitation of man by man, and it has become possible to guide production and distribution in accordance with the interests of society, according to plan. And if today we attach more importance to the market and the profitability of enterprises, if we use the law of value consciously, we do so

not because we wish to give up public ownership of the means of production, to reject planning and leave production and distribution at the mercy of the market, or give free rein to all kinds of anarchic tendencies. On the contrary, we want the new socialist production relations to operate more effectively, to ensure, on the basis of public ownership of the means of production, that our economy brings in higher returns and that production measures up more fully to the needs of society.

The reform of economic management, which our country, the Hungarian People's Republic, too has undertaken is organically connected with our overall work to consolidate the socialist production relations, to complete the building of socialism. Without nationalization, collectivization, planned economy and the establishment of socialist production relations the present reform would be entirely out of the question.

In the period of full-scale building of socialism it is only natural that raising the effectiveness of the economic system should come to the fore, for this is the basis and precondition for consolidating the victory of socialism in every sphere. Only in this way, by posing bigger aims before the people, can we forge ahead along the socialist road and improve the living standard. No wonder, then, that a number of European socialist countries embarked practically simultaneously on reforming their economic mechanism.

The successes we have registered in the last several years in economic cooperation between the socialist countries have helped to strengthen the socialist world system as a whole. This cooperation rests on a solid foundation—the identity of the socialist production relations, mutual benefit, and basically identical political and economic interests. The deepening of international socialist division of labour is one of the main manifestations of internationalism in the relations of the socialist countries at the present time. We have now entered a period of broader, more far-reaching and effective cooperation. Besides trade, new forms of joint effort are asserting themselves, such as multilateral coordination of plans, specialization and coordination of production, joint investments, common institutions and enterprises set up on the basis of bilateral and multilateral agreements. Only socialist countries can engage in such cooperation. Although integration processes are under way also in the more developed capitalist countries, only the monopoly capitalists gain by them. Moreover,

competition between monopoly groups prevents genuine unity and cooperation; on the contrary, acute contradictions are rife between the Common Market countries, for instance.

As necessary and inevitable as friendly cooperation among socialist countries is, it nevertheless can hardly be completely free of problems and ensure progress automatically. In laying down the guideposts for deepening cooperation, it is necessary to take into account the level of the productive forces of each country, its production structure, and other factors. National interests correctly understood should be coordinated with the interests of the socialist community as a whole, which generally speaking are basically in harmony. The fundamental difference between capitalist integration and socialist integration is that between the socialist countries there are *no irreconcilable contradictions* in the sphere of economic or other cooperation, and hence any problems that may arise can be resolved by pursuing a correct policy, on the basis of mutual interests, for the good of the separate countries and the entire community.

In the past seven years trade between countries affiliated to the Council for Mutual Economic Aid increased from 5,600 million rubles to 8,500 million rubles. Other forms of cooperation apart from trade have also developed extensively.

Many socialist countries have coordinated their plans for 1966-70 as regards mutual deliveries of goods. This gives each country an added guarantee that their economic plans will be carried out. Preparatory work for closer coordination of plans after 1970 was already done at the twenty-first session of the Council's Executive Committee held early in 1966.

Bilateral and multilateral links are being developed further between the various socialist countries. On this basis we are in a better position to solve the difficult problems presented by our power, fuel, and raw material requirements. A substantial economy has been affected through setting up a single railway car pool for the Council countries. Integration of their power grids will enable them to make more rational use of electric power and at a lower cost. Important too are such joint undertakings as the Hungarian-Bulgarian Intransmash, the Intermetal, uniting a number of countries, and the Hungarian-Polish Haldex, to mention only a few.

The experience gained to date in economic cooperation shows that the socialist world system as a whole and each socialist country taken separately are vitally interested in

the development of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. For *cooperation accelerates the building of socialism while lack of cooperation retards progress.*

The fact that the chief adversaries in the international class struggle are the imperialist powers and the countries of the socialist system makes the unity of the latter extremely important. In the light of the developments in Vietnam this fact is so obvious that one hardly need dwell on it. *The extent to which the socialist countries are able to coordinate their actions in the struggle against imperialism largely determines the effectiveness of these actions while influencing also their internal development.*

But when differences arise, it is especially important that the parties holding correct, principled positions should patiently but persistently work, using flexible methods, to strengthen cohesion and achieve unity of action.

The object is, naturally, to achieve complete unity of the Communist movement and the socialist world system on the basis of the tried and tested principles of Marxism-Leninism, of ideological and political unanimity and the correct general strategic and tactical line of the international Communist movement. But since the ideological and political differences can hardly be overcome soon, we should lay aside the controversial issues and debates for the time being, and work for the unity of action which is so vitally needed and which is demanded of us by our own sense of responsibility. This is *the least* we can do in the face of the mounting aggressiveness of imperialism. People the world over, spontaneously voicing indignation and protest against imperialist aggression, demand concrete action to stop this aggression. It is up to us to translate into action the desire of the hundreds of millions of working people throughout the world for unity. To do so we should create an organizational framework; this, we are confident, would exert an influence also on those elements in the Communist movement who for one or another reason still do not agree to the restoration of unity.

The difference existing in the international Communist movement have not yet been overcome. But the efforts made by the CPSU and the other parties adhering to the correct position to restore unity have not been fruitless. Evidence that the international Communist movement has rallied to this position was afforded by the delegates of 86 Communist and workers' parties as well as of a number of revolutionary-

democratic parties of the developing countries who from the rostrum of the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU called for unity of action on the part of all anti-imperialist forces. Decisive for the strengthening of unity (which is proceeding simultaneously with the stepping up of imperialist aggression) is the fact that the most experienced contingent of the world Communist movement—the CPSU—following the correct principles and employing the correct tactics, is selflessly and resolutely working for unity, laying the emphasis, contrary to the stand of the leaders of the Communist Party of China, on that which unites us and overlooking for the time being that which divides us.

We welcome the repeated call to discuss the disputed issues and to strengthen unity contained in the report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the Twenty-Third Congress. This stand fully coincides with the decision taken by the Central Committee of our Party in February 1966 concerning the problems of the international Communist movement. We are confident that further strengthening of anti-imperialist unity of action, joint actions against imperialism, will have an influence on those who now reject unity, will make it impossible for them to remain in the sidelines, and will pave the way also to principled political unity.

The fact that in all our countries socialism is being built, that the structure of society, the nature and the organization of state power are socialist, that the Communist parties at the helm of the state and society adhere to the Marxist-Leninist ideology, provides an objective basis for the restoration of unity among our countries.

The Moscow conference of 1957 thoroughly examined the general laws of socialism which govern and should govern the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in all countries. These remain our guiding principles, providing the correct definition of the concept "unity".

The unity of the socialist countries does not imply identity in every detail. The general laws of the socialist revolution valid for all countries gradually materialize in the process of the revolution and the building of socialism in forms and at rates according with the specific conditions of these countries. The national and international elements are not of course divorced from one another in the process of socialist construction. As they give material shape to the general laws of development, the socialist countries also solve the most

pressing national problems. The entire socialist community is strengthened if the specific national elements are taken correctly into account, respected, and, when necessary, even underscored in order to ensure success within the country.

Our interpretation of unity is different from that prevalent before 1957 according to which even specific local and national problems had to be solved after one stereotyped pattern. But we have not yet succeeded in finally ridding ourselves of survivals of the old definition of unity. At times we see some isolated, *perhaps even exceptional* fact in some socialist country—for instance, an article or statement made by a writer, a painting by an artist, or the discussion evoked by them—giving cause for misunderstanding and prompting some people to make a major political and ideological issue of an untypical occurrence. It is not in such things that unity should be manifested. However, it will take time and patience before such attitudes will change.

The Communist parties are equal and independent and responsible primarily to their own working class, but also to the international working class. But independence and responsibility should not signify isolation, withdrawal into one's own shell. They should not signify refusal to study the experience of other parties. Quite the reverse.

Precisely because our interpretation of unity rejects the dogmatic view to which we adhered prior to 1957, exchange of experience and opinions between socialist countries and their parties is of decisive importance. Today there is no danger that we will borrow methods inapplicable to our conditions. Acquaintance with the experience of other socialist countries facilitates our work, enables us to compare our methods with international experience and in this way improve them. The study of experience of others and exchange of experience is of vast significance even when this experience cannot be utilized either directly or indirectly owing to differences in conditions and local peculiarities. Refusal to study and draw on the experience of others to the extent this is necessary and possible not only narrows down the range of means and methods used in the building of socialism on the international plane, but has an adverse effect also on the national plane.

Socialism is being built within the framework of independent national states and independent national economies. This independence is of course proper and useful so long as specific national interests are not counterposed to the common

interests of the socialist world system, the interests of the international working class and general progress.

It should always be borne in mind that the building of socialism proceeds in the conditions of a class, political struggle and that it is affected by the ebb and flow of the international class struggle. For imperialism is doing its utmost to drive a breach in the bloc of socialist countries by economic, political, ideological and any other available means.

One of the cardinal tasks of the Communist parties at the present stage is to remain true to socialist internationalism irrespective of the difficulties encountered in economic and political cooperation, and at the same time to work for their national interests correctly understood and not emasculated of their socialist content. It is imperative to allow no departure from principle.

The strongest link between the countries of the socialist world system is the identity of the interests of the working class of all countries—proletarian internationalism. The content of this concept has been greatly enriched in our time. Proletarian internationalism implies the militant political unity of the Marxist-Leninist workers' parties and, moreover, of the entire international working class. Today, when the socialist system has triumphed in fourteen countries and the socialist world system has come into being, proletarian internationalism should be particularly forcefully manifested and embodied in the unity and growing multilateral cooperation of these countries. Moreover, proletarian internationalism implies solidarity and cooperation with the masses in the capitalist countries who are fighting against exploitation and war policies; solidarity with the peoples who have freed themselves from colonial slavery and embarked on the road of independent national development, and support of the liberation struggle of the still enslaved peoples. But the touchstone of proletarian internationalism today too is the attitude to the first socialist state, to the pathfinder of communism—the Soviet Union—solidarity and fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union which is now building communism. "There is no such thing as anti-Soviet communism, there never was, and never will be," Janos Kadar declared at the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU as he outlined the position of our Party and people.

In view of the threat presented by imperialism it is now more imperative than ever for the socialist countries to strengthen their military cooperation as well. To this end there is

the Warsaw Treaty, that safeguard of the peaceful constructive labours of the socialist countries and of world peace. In recent years cooperation among these countries within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty and the United Armed Forces has been deepened. As before, we believe that so long as imperialism pursues a bellicose, aggressive policy and so long as aggressive military blocs, especially NATO, exist, it is necessary to perfect the Warsaw Treaty Organization, including the unified supreme command of the combined armies, with a view to ensuring more consistent and permanent leadership of these forces. What is needed is a united political and military organization operating more effectively and promptly than at present, an organization which would always be ready to take action, to defend the interests of the socialist community, to stamp out any threat emanating from the imperialists, to prevent or repel any possible attack.

The progress of the countries of the socialist world system will be the fastest along the road of unity—this is the important lesson taught by the period since the publication of the Moscow Statement.

II

**THE COMMUNIST PARTIES
IN THE DEVELOPED CAPITALIST
COUNTRIES**

The economic and socio-political scene in the developed capitalist countries during the last four or five years has presented a complex and contradictory picture. The thesis that capitalism is in the throes of its general crisis and that its contradictions have grown sharper than ever remains valid, of course. Nevertheless in some capitalist countries, especially in the USA, business activity has been on the upgrade. In Western Europe, on the contrary, the rate of economic growth has declined; in some countries, France for instance, there has been a recession or a standstill has set in, while in Italy signs of a crisis of over-production are very much in evidence.

Although the overall picture shows that the capitalist economy as a whole is unstable, there are countries of which it cannot be said that the boom has come to an end.

What accounts for this comparatively prolonged period of high economic activity in the capitalist world, on the one hand, and the signs of the aggravation of contradictions, on the other?

Western Big Business, seeking to avert a crisis of over-production, to increase monopoly profits and to counter the "challenge" of the socialist world, is increasingly intervening in state administration, in particular through militarization of the economy, stepping up the arms drive, and diverse devices in the sphere of credit, investment, budget and tax policy.

Despite the conscious use of all these measures, it cannot be said that the development of the leading capitalist countries is proceeding smoothly; nor is it free from contradic-

tions. While governmental authority and monopoly capital are increasingly combining in a single mechanism controlled by the latter, there are on the other hand contrary trends and aspirations, such as the trend to return nationalized property, industrial enterprises and transport facilities to private ownership, and the efforts made by those monopoly capitalists who are less interested in military orders to safeguard and increase their profits.

One of the most symptomatic and important new developments in modern capitalism is monopoly integration. Economic integration and the growth of the productive forces beyond national bounds are the product of state-monopoly capitalism and as such inevitable features of contemporary capitalist development. Hence the establishment of the European Common Market, which is making headway and exerting a strong influence on the economic development of European capitalism and its home and foreign policies. In 1958—64 the most rapid growth rates of all the capitalist countries were registered by the members of the Common Market. But it should be added that simultaneously the sharpest economic and political contradictions manifested themselves between the Common Market countries, and between the Common Market and the USA.

Federal Germany, owing to a number of external and internal economic and political factors, in particular foreign loans and growing self-financing, has become the second economically most powerful capitalist country after the USA. Although the industrial production and national income of France and Italy also nearly doubled in the past 10—12 years, West Germany's industrial potential (as regards steel, chemicals, machine-building, the auto industry, etc.,) is far greater and in some branches double (in terms of volume of output) the French and Italian level.

Underlying the growing contradiction between the Common Market countries and the USA, which financed the Common Market at the outset and invested huge sums in Western Europe, is the fact that the West-European developed capitalist countries are now seeking to rid themselves of the domination of U.S. capital. The contradictions between the USA and France are particularly sharp. Contrary to what many Western organs of the press claim, these contradictions can hardly be traced to personalities but stem partly from historical roots, partly from the basic economic problems of the day.

The French bourgeoisie has been fighting for years against the pressures exerted by German and British monopoly capital, on the one hand, and by U.S. capital, on the other. The striving of the French monopolies to assert their independence clashes with the interests of U.S. monopoly capitalism, and this finds expression in French foreign policy, which is aimed at ridding Europe of American tutelage and creating a situation favourable for establishing the hegemony of French capital. At present France under the leadership of de Gaulle is out to uphold her independent interests in NATO, which happens to be a highly sensitive spot for the USA and West Germany. It is not excluded that the withdrawal of the French armed forces from the NATO system will be followed up by a widening of the rift between France and her NATO partners, primarily the USA.

The foreign policy of the de Gaulle government is extremely complex and contradictory, but some of its aspects have a positive significance.

In working to establish its economic and political leadership in Europe, the French big bourgeoisie is pursuing an anti-American policy not only by coming out against NATO in its present form but also in many other areas, and has made foreign-policy moves which objectively coincide with the foreign-policy aims of the socialist countries. The French proposals for ending the American war in Vietnam and neutralizing the territory of Indochina are, in effect, in line with our demand for stopping the U.S. aggression. Recognition of the Chinese People's Republic by the French government was a blow at the notorious "two-China" policy of the USA. France regards the German frontiers established as a result of the Second World War as final and inviolable, and this makes her stand on one of the cardinal issues of European politics identical with that of the socialist countries. Moreover, France has recently made many moves towards expanding political, economic and cultural contacts with the East-European socialist countries and the Soviet Union. *The socialist countries can thus work in many areas together with France for reducing international tension.*

The striving of West Germany to establish its hegemony is inseparable from the present policy of the USA, and, conversely, U.S. hegemony in Europe is unthinkable without an economic and political alliance with West Germany. These powerful monopoly forces cannot break with each other—a fact which

is fraught with danger for Europe inasmuch as the West-German rulers are exerting every effort to gain access to nuclear weapons.

The relations between the developed capitalist countries are complicated by the fact that besides the U.S.-Canadian economic bloc and the Common Market there is a third market grouping—the European Free Trade Association. This association, established in the late 50's, is headed by Britain, which, though still very much interested in the continent, is being increasingly squeezed out economically and politically and no longer plays, either in Europe or elsewhere in the world, the role it played between the two world wars.

Owing to economic, political and strategic considerations, Britain, or to be more exact, the British Commonwealth, is a more reliable member of NATO than France, and, regardless of the fact that it has a Labour government, the contradictions between Britain and the USA are less acute than before the war. On all the main world issues Britain follows in the wake of the USA.

Thus we can see alongside common economic interests contradictions between these interests, and simultaneously a trend towards unity among the leading capitalist countries and a contrary trend. Accordingly, it is legitimate to speak both of the stability of military-political alliances and of rifts and weaknesses in them, or, as it was put at the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU, of the "Shakiness of imperialist blocs". But the fact remains that NATO, rent though it is by contradictions, still represents a formidable political and military force. From the standpoint of peace and the socialist world system, it is the most dangerous imperialist military bloc in which the USA, the centrifugal trends notwithstanding, has not yet lost its leading role.

Such new developments as the general growth of state-monopoly capitalism, capitalist integration, stable economic activity and the unprecedentedly high degree of exploitation have a strong impact on the political situation in the capitalist countries, including the Communist and Working-class movement.

The strength of this movement is unevenly distributed in the Western capitalist world. The Communist and revolutionary Left trade union movement is rather weak in the USA, Britain and Federal Germany if we take into account the size of these countries, the level of their industrial development, and the

numbers and the traditions of the working class. (The Communist Party USA has some 10,000—12,000 members, the British Communist Party 33,000—35,000, and in Federal Germany the Party is illegal.) Most of the trade unions in these countries are led by Right-wing Social Democrats, and during elections the workers give their votes mostly to the Social Democratic parties, and in the USA to the Democratic Party which represents monopoly interests. Examination of this peculiar state of affairs is one of the most important tasks facing Marxist researchers.

We do not propose to dwell in detail on parties in the intermediate bracket as regards size and influence. What is highly important and gratifying is that there are such Communist and Working-class movements in Europe as the French, Italian, Spanish (illegal), and Greek. The Italian Communist Party has 1,700,000 members, the French 430,000—450,000, the Spanish tens of thousands and the Greek hundreds of thousands. Communist parties functioning legally enjoy electoral support exceeding their own membership several times over. In France the Communist vote runs to 4—4.5 million, in Italy to 8 million, and in Greece the EDA, which includes the Communists, polled nearly 40 per cent of the total vote. The Communist Party of Finland has registered a major gain: following the last general election a government was formed which includes representatives of the People's Democratic Union. This is the first time since 1948 that the Communists are in the government, working together with their Left allies on the basis of an agreed programme.

The experience of these powerful mass Communist movements which are in the forefront of the movements in the capitalist world is an example to other Communist parties. It is natural, therefore, that they should consider it one of their most important tasks scientifically to elaborate their future policies and to reveal new phenomena and trends. They have tackled this task by joint effort.

The technological revolution, high productivity of labour, stability of business activity in the developed capitalist countries, a certain improvement of the material and social conditions of life of the working class and some sections of the white collar workers, and the indisputable fact that the existence of, and the force of attraction exerted by, the socialist world system are compelling the capitalist countries to make substantial socio-economic concessions—all this is used by im-

perialist propagandists to disseminate diverse bourgeois and Social-Democratic theories. For years they propounded the so-called theory of "people's capitalism" and latterly they have been putting the emphasis on "social partnership" and theorizing on its practical applications.

However, the fallacy of these bourgeois and Social-Democratic theories has been shown by the signs of regression in a number of countries (Italy, France and, increasingly, in Federal Germany). The stability of the economic situation in the most highly developed capitalist countries and the improvements in material and social conditions won by the working class through struggle, by no means signify that the contradiction between labour and capital is disappearing or diminishing, or that any social harmony is being achieved.

Despite the prolonged period of boom the number of strikes has not decreased, nor have they become less militant. On the contrary, there have been more strike actions of a more militant character than ever before in the USA, France, Italy, Japan and other countries. During the boom the working class fought for a bigger share in the national income and it registered definite gains. Now that the boom is coming to an end and the growth rates are declining in many countries, the working-class economic struggle is aimed at safeguarding these gains.

A considerable part of the strike struggles, especially in France and Italy, are of a political nature.

An increasingly important role in the West-European strike movement is played by world issues, primarily protest against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Mass actions in defence of peace and against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam are mounting throughout the world, and this opens new opportunities for promoting political cooperation and militant alliance between the working class and other class forces.

A notable feature of the political struggle against imperialist aggression is its growing scale in the USA, the citadel of imperialism. The prestige of the Johnson Administration has sharply declined because of its Vietnam policy, and a powerful movement for peace embracing, for the first time, the progressive trade unions, liberal intellectuals, university youth and the Negro movement, is gaining pace in the country.

As a result of the concentration and centralization of capital, the monopoly concerns in the developed capitalist countries are being taken over by fewer and fewer tycoons, while the

small and medium capitalists and individual peasant proprietors are being ruined and the middle strata and the intelligentsia proletarianized. This is the historical tendency of monopoly capitalism. And although the continued boom in many countries prolongs and consolidates the economic independence of the middle sections, this does not alter the basic tendency. In these circumstances the working class not only rises to the defence of its own interests against encroachment by capital, but is able, by virtue of its position, to unite all those anti-monopoly forces which suffer in one or another way from monopoly pressure. The Communist parties study the opportunities open to the working class and consider the building and constant strengthening and expansion of the anti-monopoly class alliance a cardinal element of their policy.

As the Moscow Statement of 1960 pointed out, the unity of the democratic and revolutionary forces can be achieved in struggle to safeguard and strengthen peace, national independence and democracy; to nationalize the key branches of the economy and to democratize their management; to harness the entire economy to peaceful purposes to meet the needs of the population; to carry out a deep-going land reform; to improve the living conditions of the working people and defend the interests of the peasantry and the urban small and middle bourgeoisie against the tyranny of the monopolies.

Hence the Communist parties in the capitalist countries *place the emphasis on struggle for economic and political democracy and in general on the inter-connection between democracy and socialism, the fusion of the two.* Lenin's thesis that the fight for democracy must be carried to the ultimate degree and must not be divorced from socialism remains valid to this day. *The dialectical unity and interrelation of the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism is the key issue of Communist strategy.* Needless to say, while this struggle has common features, it reflects in each given country the sum total of its historical, economic, social and political elements and its traditions, i.e., the struggle proceeds in a specific national context.

The fight for democracy has acquired a new content in the new conditions of today, but it would be wrong to say that the Communists merely seek to restore bourgeois democracy where it has been suppressed or to preserve it where it still, relatively speaking, exists. The Communists are striving for a

new democracy which in both the economic and political spheres would increasingly incorporate elements of people's democracy. This idea was voiced by Palmiro Togliatti at the Tenth Congress of the Italian Communist Party, and it found reflection in the decisions of the Eleventh Congress of that Party and in the programmes of other Western Communist parties. The Communist parties and other Left forces in the Western countries are guided by this in their indefatigable struggle to safeguard or to restore democratic freedoms, against the danger of authoritarian rule and neofascist trends.

This, however, does not exhaust the meaning of the fight for democracy. Something *more* is at stake in all the capitalist countries. The French and Italian Communists, for instance, are working for "genuine democracy", a "democracy of a new type" which implies extensive nationalization with consistent democratic control at all levels, a radical agrarian reform with the promotion of cooperation in accordance with the conditions of the given country, and democratization of the state, the safeguarding and extension of local and parliamentary democracy. Moreover, the concept of "democracy of a new type", the triumph of which the Italian Communist seek to hasten through the so-called structural reforms, includes the right of the people to participate in the management of the economy and such planning as is possible under capitalism in order to compel the capitalists to channel their "planning" closer to democratic lines. The Italian Communist Party holds that a democratic alternative in the interests of the working people should be counterposed to capitalist "planning". This idea is still a subject for debate among the Western Communist parties and needs to be elaborated further, but that it contains an element of sober realism is obvious.

The revolutionary trade unions of the Common Market countries not only wage a joint struggle in defence of the interests of the working people, but demand a share in the activities of the Common Market bodies. This is something the trade unions of the capitalist countries should fight for jointly, on the international plane. The French and Italian General Confederations of Labour have issued an appeal to all trade unions in Europe urging such joint effort. This appeal has been unanimously supported by all Communist parties.

In examining the economic social and political aspects of the struggle for democracy, the most important thing is to

assess them in their dialectical inter-relation. In the conditions of modern capitalism, when governmental power and monopoly capital are so closely interwoven, *economic and political issues cannot be separated from one another*. As a matter of fact, to do so has always been detrimental to the working-class movement. Hence the substance of the strategy and tactics of the Western Communist parties consists in *building the alliance of the working class and all other sections of the working people, democratizing the economy and governmental authority and thereby winning economic and political positions* making it possible to exert the maximum influence on the entire life of the nation.

Since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU there has been a good deal of discussion of the peaceful and non-peaceful paths of the socialist revolution. The decisions of this Congress, and the documents of the Moscow meetings we have cited, proceeding from Leninist principles, correctly stress that *thanks to the growth of both the external and internal forces of socialism, the socialist revolution need not necessarily be carried out by means of an armed uprising and civil war, but can be effected by peaceful, political means*. But at the same time these documents warn *against absolutizing either the peaceful way or the non-peaceful way associated with armed struggle and civil war*.

Armed struggle is always sparked off by the use of force by the bourgeoisie, to which the proletariat can reply only with armed force. This is the general rule. On the other hand, however, owing to the world balance of strength, the existence of the socialist world system, the internal situation in the capitalist countries, the strength of the revolutionary movements, etc., the peaceful development of the revolution is possible, not only in theory but also in practice. By restricting the freedom of action of monopoly capital both economically and politically, the working masses can curb the monopolies and find a relatively peaceful solution. It should be added, however, that apart from these factors, whether the revolution will take the peaceful or the non-peaceful way will largely depend on the internal and international situation of the given country as well as the "historical factor". *It should also be clearly seen that neither the peaceful nor the non-peaceful way can lead to the victory of the revolution if there is no anti-monopoly alliance led by the working class. This is the cardinal condition for the victory of the socialist revolution*.

be it effected by peaceful or non-peaceful means. The Communist parties would prefer to see the socialist revolution triumph by peaceful means, and are exerting every effort to bring this about. But they also allow for the possibility that the armed way might prove unavoidable. This is the only correct, Marxist-Leninist position.

Of prime importance for the success of the efforts of the Communist parties, especially as regards forming the anti-monopoly alliance, is the *building of unity*, united working class action, and, in the context of this unity, primarily promotion of *rapprochement* between the workers' parties. This is a complex task, for only step by step is it possible to eliminate the negative consequences primarily of Social Democratic policy which were aggravated by the sectarianism prevalent in the Communist movement for years. The Communist parties of the capitalist countries, each working in its specific conditions, seek to achieve working-class united action. But this undoubtedly is most difficult where the majority of the working class is under the influence of Social Democratic parties or organized in Social-Democrat-led trade unions. In such circumstances anti-monopoly united action can be built only gradually, displaying the maximum of patience, especially as far as work in the trade unions is concerned. The opportunities are better—although not necessarily in every instance—in the countries where the Communist movement is strong and where the bulk of the workers are led by the Communist parties or trade unions affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions. Here unity of action and joint political initiatives on the part of the working class parties are easy to achieve. From this standpoint the developments in France may be welcomed. At the last presidential elections the French Communist Party acted together with the Socialist Party, with the result that other Left democratic petty-bourgeois parties joined the alliance. The French Communist Party considers it its cardinal task to preserve the Left democratic front which today can be cemented only by the unity of the working class.

Paradoxical though it may seem, it is now more difficult to achieve unity of action in Italy, where the Left forces have the support of 43 per cent of the electorate and where the Communists and the Socialists, both the followers of Nenni and the breakaway Left Socialists, the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, wield considerable influence among the wage and salary earners.

Here it is the *turn to the Right due to the concept propounded by the leadership of the Nenni Socialists* that disrupted the unity of action which had existed for many years. This opening to the Right it threatening the working class with a new division. There is a danger of a *Right-wing Social Democratic Party emerging which would work hand-in-glove with the Christian Democrat reactionaries*. Clearly the task of the Italian Communists could be to bend every effort, while upholding the revolutionary traditions of the working class, to isolate the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders and to build a united front of the working masses taking in the following of all workers' parties and even the Left-wing of the Christian Democrats. This was the political line charted by the Eleventh Congress of the Italian Communist Party.

To build a united anti-monopoly front, more than Communist-Socialist cooperation is needed. *The problem of working-class unity is broader than this*. A considerable part of the working class in the capitalist countries is still under the influence of the Church or religious organizations. The picture is further complicated by the wide political and ideological spectrum of the classes and social strata which are capable by virtue of their position of becoming allies of the working class in the fight against the monopolies. In order to build a broad united front, the Communists seek to reach out to political forces and movements which still stand remote from them: *they search for points of contact on practical political issues also with trends which reject scientific Communism*. In many cases the Leftward swing of the vacillating petty-bourgeois masses takes the form of Left Catholicism, bourgeois anti-fascism and humanism as well as utopian reformism with all the illusions, hesitancy and blundering characteristic of these trends.

But the Communists know that they can dispel the illusions, end the wavering and stimulate the continued leftward movement of the hesitant if, *drawing on the common political aspirations, they will deepen and extend united actions on all possible issues*. This demands of the Communist parties both flexibility and firmness of principle.

Because of this the question of the clear-cut Marxist-Leninist stand of the Communist parties and their ideological and political independence assumes particular urgency in building broad political unity of action and promoting cooperation

between Communists and non-Communists. In order to ensure the fulfilment of the historical tasks facing the working class, the Communist parties seek constantly to improve their work, cement their political unity and strengthen the ideological and political grounding of their members. *They do not rule out the elaboration of new organizational forms, better suited in today's conditions to promote the achievement of revolutionary unity of the working class, to stimulate a dialogue even with the adherents of ideologies remote from Marxism* whenever this helps to build up and consolidate the united anti-monopoly front. It would be a grave mistake to assume that the united front will gain if the Communist parties *renounce* their Marxist-Leninist complexion and their ideological, political and organizational independence, mixing Marxism with reformism, bourgeois humanism, existentialism, or the Left Catholic ideology. On the contrary, it is only Marxist-Leninist firmness and ideological, political and organizational independence that make the Party strong and viable. Only this in the overall context of broad association can successfully counteract wavering and retreat. The broader the united front we strive for, the more important it is for the Party to adhere to firm, principled policy, the more important is it to give a resolute rebuff to every attempt, either from the Right or the "Left", to smuggle the spirit of reformism or sectarianism into the Communist movement.

The unity of the ranks of the Communist parties is of prime importance for the achievement of their strategic and tactical aims in the capitalist countries, for building working-class unity and winning over other sections of society. The complex class struggle under way on both international and national scale, and the discussions inside the Communist movement affect the ideological and political unity of each Communist party. The tactics to be pursued in political struggle are often evolved in the course of major controversies. Debates of this kind, even heated ones, are perfectly natural. An interesting example in this respect was afforded by the last, Eleventh Congress of the Italian Communist Party, where the question of the unity of the party came up in the course of a debate on tactics. It was not fortuitous that the Party's General Secretary Luigi Longo, while not denying the value of discussion, *drew the attention of the congress to the need for unity based on the solid groundwork of Marxist ideology*, to the importance of democratic centralism which rules out any freedom for

factions in the Party. Discussion, he said, should promote Leninist party unity based on discipline.

The Communist parties of the European capitalist countries examine the European and world situation and issues requiring joint action at *regional conferences*. Three such meetings have been held: in 1959 in Rome, in 1965 in Brussels, and in early May 1966 in Vienna.

The Western Communist parties are by and large successfully combating Right deviations in their ranks and especially sectarian, pseudo-revolutionary views and their proponents, who at times band together in small groups of their own.

The unity of action among the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries manifest in their regional conferences is part of the overall struggle for the unity of the world Communist movement. *Taking due account of national and regional specific features in no way contradicts the principles of the Communist movement as a whole and its general line, correctly formulated in the Moscow Statement of 1960.*

The developments of the past six or seven years have clearly shown that the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries are pursuing a Marxist-Leninist line, taking into account the changes in the international situation generally and in the capitalist world in particular. In many capitalist countries the Communist parties exercise a powerful influence on the entire life of their nations. Thanks to the correct policy pursued by the Communists in these countries, the other anti-monopoly sections of society are increasingly rallying around the working class; the process of the emergence of a broad united anti-monopoly front has begun. All this underscores the power which the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries represent. Their activities and cooperation with the socialist world system is a major factor in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.

III

**DISINTEGRATION OF THE COLONIAL
SYSTEM AND SOME PROBLEMS
OF THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE FORMER COLONIES**

The Moscow Statement of 1960 was drawn up at a time when the disintegration of the classical colonial empires had become obvious. In the light of the growth of the national-liberation movements and the multiform aid rendered them by the socialist countries it could be scientifically forecast that "the complete collapse of colonialism is imminent".

Before the First World War 62 per cent of the world's population lived in colonies and semi-colonies which accounted for 71.4 per cent of the world's area. Today the number of people under undisguised colonial rule barely exceeds 3 per cent, and the territory they occupy accounts for less than 5 per cent of the total area of the globe.

Assessing the epoch-making political significance of this change, the Moscow Statement declared: "The breakdown of the system of colonial slavery under the impact of the national-liberation movement is a development ranking *second in historical importance only to the formation of the socialist world system.*"

The disintegration of the classical colonial system caused further changes in the world balance. The majority of the newly emerged states has joined in a united front with the socialist countries on such cardinal world issues as the defence of peace, disarmament, and abolition of colonial bondage. In the late fifties and early sixties an anti-imperialist front crystallized in the United Nations and other international organizations, compelling the leading imperialist powers to give way on many questions.

From the colonies the national-liberation movement spread to the semi-colonies and dependencies, making itself felt with particular force in Latin America which until the victory of the Cuban revolution had seemed to be the bailiwick of the USA.

The Cuban revolution gave fresh impetus to the national-liberation movement in Latin America, which, after Asia and Africa, became an important arena of the anti-imperialist struggle.

The development of the newly-free countries, however, is proceeding in complex and extremely difficult internal and external conditions.

Although the Moscow Statement does not use the term "neocolonialism", it focussed attention on the fact that the imperialists "make desperate efforts to preserve the colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by new methods and in new forms". Already at the time of the 1960 Meeting it was clear, and this was underscored in the Statement, that the "United States is the mainstay of colonialism today".

And indeed, the fact is that imperialism has not given up its intention to retain its grip on and exploit the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Since it is too late to revert to the old, naked colonial exploitation, the leading colonial powers and those imperialist countries which have colonial ambitions have quickly adapted themselves to the new situation and resorted to neocolonialist methods.

The use of these methods is facilitated by numerous objective and subjective factors.

For one thing, the natural wealth of the overwhelming majority of the newly-free countries as well as their economic resources generally still remain in the hands of international monopoly capital, mainly U.S., British and French.

During the past ten years the former colonies have had to sell their traditional industrial and agricultural raw material exports on increasingly unfavourable terms owing to the decline in world prices caused by monopoly pressures.

In exchange for their exports, the countries with a predominantly monoculture economy are forced to import not only means of production and other manufactures but also steadily increasing quantities of foodstuffs.

Moreover, the newly-free countries started out either completely lacking the capital and trained personnel needed to

develop the economy and to raising the standard of living, or in a position to meet only a fraction of their requirements.

These and other facts show that imperialism still has a considerable economic foothold in the developing countries and that there are favourable opportunities for neocolonialist infiltration of the former colonies. And the imperialists are doing their utmost to make use of these opportunities. For one thing, the developed capitalist countries make their economic offers conditional on political obligations, exerting heavy pressure on the governments of the developing countries. But imperialism no longer holds the monopoly in rendering material and technological aid to the newly-free countries which have established multilateral economic relations of a new type with the socialist countries. Owing to this, the imperialist powers can no longer dictate the conditions of aid. The terms of cooperation between the newly-emerged countries and the advanced capitalist countries depend to no small extent on the resolve with which the former resist the imposition of fettering conditions.

The United Arab Republic, for instance, protested against the political conditions dictated by the USA in connection with deliveries of grain, and also rebuffed the attempts made by Federal Germany to undermine relations between the UAR and the German Democratic Republic.

The countries where governmental power is based on the support of the masses are successfully withstanding imperialist pressures, while in those where the reactionary forces carry weight in the government the opportunities for resistance are naturally more limited. From the standpoint of the external conditions, the decisive thing is to put an end to the monopoly of the imperialists. The establishment of relationships of a new type between the developing countries and the socialist countries provides the former with a solid foundation for resistance to political blackmail and pressure on the part of the imperialist powers.

"After the winning of political independence," the Moscow Statement points out, "the peoples look for an answer to the social problems posed by life as well as to questions bearing on the consolidation of national independence."

In the struggle to ensure the progress of a country the achievement of political independence is a stage which in itself does not solve but merely makes it possible for the former colonial peoples to solve their complex problems.

After winning political independence the newly-free peoples have to overcome their age-old backwardness and socio-economic underdevelopment inherited from the colonial past in order to forge ahead along the road of progress and become truly independent.

The newly-free countries have embarked on independent development at a juncture when capitalism has, historically speaking, outlived its time as a social system and, although in a number of countries it is still powerful and above all rich, is caught in the grip of its general crisis and decline, losing position after position. At the same time, socialism is gaining strength and spreading farther afield. In other words, the transition from capitalism to socialism has begun on the world wide scale.

The peoples of the newly-free countries, who for so long were, and partly still are, the victims of colonial exploitation, regard the capitalist system with understandable loathing, and are seeking for new roads of progress.

The world balance in our time makes it possible for the former colonies, including those where primitive tribal and feudal social relations still predominate, to forge ahead towards socialism by-passing the capitalist stage of development.

In many of these countries it is already generally recognized that there is only one way to strengthen national independence: consistent struggle against the imperialists, i.e., cooperation with the socialist countries in the sphere of foreign policy, and *non-capitalist development in the sphere of internal policy*.

Non-capitalist development is a new phenomenon engendered by our time, a phenomenon made possible thanks to the internal social conditions of the countries concerned and to the existence of the socialist world system, to the aid rendered by it and its influence on the international balance of forces.

On the basis of the experience of the countries which have taken the non-capitalist way, the main criteria of this road may be defined as follows:

stable governmental power representing and consistently upholding the interests of the broad masses—the workers, peasants, intellectuals, the petty bourgeoisie and the progressive section of the national bourgeoisie;

nationalization of resources, of the mines, raw material wealth and the big enterprises, as an expression of a conscious striving to build up a powerful state sector of the economy able gradually to oust the foreign monopolies;

solution of the land question in favour of the dispossessed peasant masses. Where feudal private ownership of the land already exists, this can be done through a land reform, an agrarian revolution, redistribution of the land, and where property relations have not yet developed enough to undermine communal ownership, through the preservation of the old tribal communities and the establishment on this basis of cooperatives;

a democratic cultural revolution, the creation of a national intelligentsia and rapid advance of the cultural level of the people generally;

establishment of a political vanguard party uniting the most advanced elements and relying on the masses, which would represent their interests and be capable of administering the state, organizing society and promoting economic upbuilding; struggle against the imperialists in foreign policy and against their agents in internal political life.

Non-capitalist development in itself does not mean building socialism, but it can lead to it by creating the material and social preconditions for this.

Needless to say, non-capitalist development is also accompanied by a sharp class struggle to overcome the resistance of the reactionaries at home—the feudal element, the comprador bourgeoisie and the reactionary national bourgeoisie—and to foil the attempts of the imperialists to intervene.

In the course of this struggle the forces loyal to the revolution and interested in carrying it further are united and a political vanguard party emerges, while in the process of economic upbuilding the working class takes shape and develops, and the internal objective and subjective conditions for the building of socialism are created.

The possibility of the class content of the national unity changing, the emergence of Right-wing elements and even counter-offensives by these elements, must of course be reckoned with. Such a possibility exists because following the realization of the general national tasks—the winning of independence and anti-imperialist struggle—the need to resolve concrete internal class problems comes to the fore, and inasmuch as the interests of the different classes vary, the class

struggle becomes more intense. Nasser, who in his *Philosophy of Revolution* still claimed that "the Arab society is free of class struggle", later declared on the basis of the experience of the UAR that "the inevitable and natural class struggle can neither be ignored nor denied".

In assessing the development of the former colonies it will be instructive to examine the behaviour of the national bourgeoisie after the winning of independence.

The polarization of this section of the bourgeoisie has become increasingly patent since 1960.

As the Moscow Statement points out, following independence the exploiter tendencies of the "two-faced" bourgeoisie increasingly overshadow its anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism. This is confirmed, with some exceptions, by a concrete examination of the changes that have taken place in the past ten years. In India the economic power of the home monopolies—the Tata and Birla concerns—and the upper middle bourgeoisie, who are increasingly influencing government, has been growing from year to year. The top crust of the middle bourgeoisie talks much about "socialism", but actually, cooperating with the feudal strata, it is coming more and more into conflict with the masses of workers and peasants. Defence of the class interests of the national bourgeoisie with monopoly tendencies and conflict with the worker-peasant masses are accompanied by economic and political concessions to foreign monopoly capital, especially American.

The Right-wing national bourgeoisie and their monopolist and feudal allies have latterly exerted particular effort to divert the working people and the exploited masses in general from the class struggle and to direct them onto the erroneous path of arch-nationalist or religious struggle, capitalizing on issues such as unsettled frontier problems inherited from the colonial period, religious contradictions and persecution of national minorities. This is a convenient device for the reactionaries to bring about a temporary lessening of internal tensions, to distract attention from differences between class interests by creating a semblance of national unity.

Inasmuch as the Communists represent the interests of the working people, of all the exploited, the reactionaries are stepping up their efforts, to use the words of the Moscow Statement, "to disrupt the national front and isolate the Communists under the banner of anti-communism".

As the class struggle waxes more intense, the army assumes a new role in many newly-free countries. The armed forces created in the course of the liberation struggle and subsequently consolidated organizationally in order to combat the danger of imperialist aggression are increasingly used to suppress opposition at home. Recent years have witnessed in Asia and Africa a succession of events long common in Latin America. The army as a "power standing above the classes" and prepared to take action at critical moments of the uncompleted bourgeois democratic revolution, comes to the fore as the decisive political force. In the Arab countries and Black Africa the political and governmental role of the army is clearly growing, despite the differences in conditions and class content. The growth of the role of the army becomes possible because the social structure in many former colonies has not yet fully crystallized and state authority does not extend to the entire country, while the social forces are as yet unorganized or are only beginning to be organized.

In these circumstances it is no wonder that the army, as an organized disciplined force, even when it is comparatively small, should be the decisive factor. The class struggle, of course, influences the army too. Hence the political actions of the military are only seemingly "above classes"; actually the army always acts in the interests of some particular class or group of classes, some political and social trend.

In Indonesia and Ghana the army temporarily checked non-capitalist development and even opened the doors wide to the class domination of the national bourgeoisie and the neocolonialist infiltration of imperialism. On the other hand, the change-over in Syria in which the army likewise played the main role strengthened the positions of the proponents of democratic development and created wider opportunities for progress, for more consistent pursuance of an anti-imperialist policy.

As can be seen from the above cursory review, substantial changes have taken place in the former colonies and new processes and contradictions have emerged since the publication of the 1960 Statement. It is an indisputable fact that by pursuing a neocolonialist policy the imperialist powers have succeeded in temporarily stabilizing their position in a number of newly-free countries. It should be added that wherever "peaceful" methods and neocolonialist devices did not suffice

the imperialists resorted to naked armed force, conspiracies and military putsches.

Let us examine the policy pursued in this situation by the countries of the socialist world system on the basis of the universally valid principles of the Moscow Statement.

Ever since its inception the international Communist movement has devoted much attention to the struggle waged by the colonial peoples. Ever since the Communist parties were founded the working class of the various countries has supported the national-liberation movement. The Communist International, pursuing a Leninist policy, gave high priority to questions pertaining to the anti-imperialist liberation struggle, stressing that the colonial peoples are the allies of the working class in the struggle with capital, and that emancipation of the working class will pave the way to the liberation of these peoples. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution gave the initial impulse to the disintegration of the colonial system, and the rise of the socialist world system after the Second World War intensified this process, as a result of which 65 new states have come into being. Were there no socialist world system to render powerful political, moral and material support to the national-liberation movements, the classical colonial system would not have collapsed and new independent states could not have emerged. *The initial epoch-making result of the alliance of the socialist world system and the national-liberation movement is the disintegration of the classical colonial system of imperialism.*

Experience shows that just as the winning of independence is unthinkable *without the existence of the socialist world system, so is it impossible without the support of that system to consolidate independence, to counteract the neocolonialist aspirations of imperialism and to ensure social progress.*

The preservation and deepening of the alliance of socialism and the national-liberation movement, i.e., the peoples who have freed themselves from colonial slavery and embarked on independent development, is an essential condition of human progress generally. The socialist countries are fully prepared to fulfil this condition and they have the wherewithal to do so.

The socialist states render the countries which have won their independence and are fighting imperialism multiform aid ranging from moral, political and economic assistance to the support of armed struggle.

The relations between the socialist countries and the developing countries in the political, economic, cultural and scientific spheres are relations of a new type founded on the sovereignty of each, mutual advantage and friendly assistance.

At present the socialist countries have extensive mutually advantageous trade relations with the developing countries. The fact that the former need the raw materials and some food products constituting traditional export items of the latter and that they are in a position to supply in exchange machines and other equipment badly needed by the newly-free countries to carry out their development plans provides a solid basis for the continued growth of this trade. Moreover, the socialist countries, supply machinery and equipment on long-term credit, provide technical plans and specialists and invite young people from the developing countries to study in their secondary and higher schools.

The newly-independent African, Asian and Latin American countries have built or are building 1,938 industrial projects with the aid of the socialist countries. By January 1965 the latter have provided them credits totalling 5,000 million rubles. Some 17,000 students from the developing countries attend colleges and universities in the socialist countries. Such major undertakings as the Aswan High Dam and Hydroelectric Station being built with Soviet aid in Egypt, the Bhilai Iron and Steel Works built, also with Soviet aid, in India, and the just completed Heluan Bridge and the El Tabin Hydroelectric Station in Egypt, built with the aid of the Hungarian People's Republic, testify to the growth of cooperation with the socialist countries.

This path should be pursued in the future as well, with a view to finding forms of cooperation still more advantageous for both sides. Experience gained to date proves that the establishment of joint enterprises is a promising new form of closer cooperation of advantage to all concerned.

As we see it, cooperation among the socialist countries in the matter of supporting the developing countries could be improved. No socialist country, with the exception of the Soviet Union, has a powerful enough economic base or the financial and material means to make substantial investments by itself in all or even in the most important developing countries. Hence the socialist countries should find forms and methods of joint, coordinated effort in this area too, so as to

render the developing countries more extensive and effective aid.

It is particularly important to establish and maintain contacts with the leading political parties in the developing countries which are pursuing progressive home and foreign policies. In countries where social development is more or less advanced and where there are a working class and its Communist parties, we, of course, seek close contact with these parties. But there are also countries embarked on the non-capitalist path which at the time of liberation had neither a proletariat organized as a class nor a Communist party. *Here the leading political force is national parties of revolutionary democratic unity, such as the Sudanese Union, the Democratic Party of Guinea, the National Union of Tanzania and the Arab Socialist Union.* These parties are sincerely interested in our experience in building socialism and in the organization, guidance and education of the masses. We should establish close ties with these parties. In Hungary, for instance, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Patriotic People's Front seek to build such contacts. Such ties will undoubtedly help to strengthen the social basis of non-capitalist development in the respective countries, and thereby heighten the efficacy of their anti-imperialist struggle.

To sum up what we have said about the so-called third world:

The colonial system in its old classical form has in effect disintegrated. This is a painful blow to imperialism. But the imperialist powers are unwilling to reconcile themselves to the loss of possessions which had brought them fabulous profits. Since the undisguised form of imperialist oppression has in most countries been swept away by the whirlwind of national liberation revolution, these powers are endeavouring to restore their domination by better camouflage and more insidious—mostly economic—means and neocolonialist methods. They stop at nothing to achieve this end: when they cannot realize their schemes by peaceful means, they resort to naked armed force, to military coups.

A cardinal lesson to be drawn from the struggle against colonial slavery is that *there can be no stopping half way.* This struggle will not succeed unless a consistent fight is waged against neocolonialism. The collapse of colonialism and the political liberation of the peoples still under colonial rule can be considered complete and final only when these

peoples have carried their struggle against all forms of neocolonialism to the victorious finish.

The socialist countries stand firmly on the side of the newly-free countries and support them in this historical battle.

However hard international imperialism may try to break up the anti-imperialist front by intensified neocolonialist intervention, this front exists and is gaining strength, playing an ever more effective part in international life.

The more multiform and closer the cooperation and alliance between the socialist and developing countries, the less chances of success there are for neocolonialism. This is a guarantee that on this sector of the front, too, the imperialists will suffer defeat after defeat.

IV

**THE WORLD BALANCE
AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN
THE TWO WORLD SYSTEMS**

On the basis of a scientific analysis of the balance of forces on the world arena, the Moscow Statement draws the conclusion that *in our time world war can be averted and the struggle between the two antagonistic world systems can be confined within the bounds of peaceful coexistence.*

Developments since 1960 confirm that the consolidation of the socialist world system, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the disintegration of the colonial system and the rise of the democratic and working-class movements continue to remain permanently operating factors of the balance of world forces. Thus, the principal tendencies have remained—*the balance of world forces has continued to change in favour of socialism, progress and peace.*

The consolidation of the socialist world system, the collapse of colonialism, the fact that many former colonies have embarked on the non-capitalist road, and the spread of socialist ideas have heightened the aggressiveness of the imperialists, who are seeking to hold back the march of history even if this means resorting to armed force, to war.

In our time two opposing trends are to be observed in international relations:

First—the path of naked imperialist aggression, the path of war. The nature of imperialism is such that it would doubtless have adopted this path long since had it held undivided sway in the world. But it can no longer do as it pleases. The forces of the socialist world system have placed imperialism within certain bounds. However, taking a realistic view of the situation, it must be admitted that imperialism has not yet been

totally immobilized. Witness its repeated provocations, its aggressive actions, the local wars waged against peoples fighting for their liberation. In the final analysis, however, the aggressive actions of the imperialists are doomed to failure. And should they unleash world war it is bound to lead to the complete and final collapse of the imperialist system.

The other alternative is peaceful coexistence. This is the alternative the socialist countries are offering capitalism. Socialism has no need of war either from the standpoint of its further spread or from the standpoint of its final victory. Peace is as characteristic of socialism as war is of imperialism. Hence the socialist countries are striving for economic, scientific and cultural cooperation with countries with different social systems on the basis of complete equality. Thus, in the world contest between the two systems, too, socialism, true to its nature, seeks the peaceful settlement of disputed issues.

Which of the two alternatives will prevail depends on how the balance of world forces will change in the future, and also on the results of the struggle for peaceful coexistence. The imperialists will never agree to peaceful coexistence voluntarily. They must be compelled to agree.

The struggle between socialism and capitalism is an uneven process, and, therefore, while the general tendency is for capitalism to lose ground, the struggle has its ups and downs.

If we examine the period from the end of the Second World War to the present it may be said that imperialism is waging a defensive struggle against the forces of socialism, the national-liberation movement, democracy and peace. But while being generally on the defensive, at certain brief stages it had and still has the possibility of counter-attacking, of taking retaliatory action. We witnessed such attacks, for example, in 1956–57. The counter-revolution in Hungary, the triple aggression in the Suez area, and the landing of U.S. troops in the Near East were all links in this chain. As we know, these attacks failed on all fronts and the forces of socialism, peace and national independence once again gained strength and moved forward.

The political, military and economic might of the socialist world system grew, the rapid disintegration of the colonial system, especially in Africa, continued, and the forces of peace won considerable positions in the United Nations, with the result that some positive decisions were adopted by that body

on the question of general and complete disarmament and the abolition of colonialism.

These developments caused the imperialists to exert every effort to change the situation. State intervention increased, the arms drive was stepped up and those forces which consider aggression to be the only alternative in world politics again emerged to the fore.

The U.S. imperialists began to reject the alternative offered them by the socialist world, and, encouraged by the differences in the international working-class movement, are now attempting to follow the road most akin to their nature, i.e., the road of aggression.

This explains the intensification of imperialist aggression at the present time.

Soon after his election to office, President Johnson forgot his election promises and, increasing military spending to an unprecedented degree, embarked on the road of dangerous military adventures. The United States, he declared, has the right to use armed force *to protect American interests* when and where it pleases, reserving the right to decide what can be regarded as American interests. What is in question, of course, is defence of the interests of U.S. big business and other imperialist circles. Thus, Johnson would like to extend the Big Stick policy to the whole world. U.S. aggression in the Dominican Republic, the Congo, and especially in Vietnam constitutes the new global strategy of Johnson and his supporters.

U.S. ruling circles do not hide their intention to continue along this course, to demonstrate to the world the might and power of the United States. All this taken together confirms the thesis contained in the Moscow Statement that U.S. imperialism is the "world gendarme" and the sworn enemy of social progress.

The U.S. imperialists simultaneously oppose the world liberation movement and the socialist world system. It is noteworthy, however, that they can no longer return openly to the policy of the cold war. Taking account of the changed international situation, they are compelled, even while resorting to aggression, to pay lip service to peace, conducting campaigns "in defence of peace" in an attempt to split the ranks of the progressive forces of the world. They are well aware that a frontal attack against socialism is a risky business and can lead to disaster for them. Therefore, as regards

the main force of socialism—the Soviet Union and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe—they are trying to achieve their purpose by the method of "fragmentation", of boring from within.

At a time when imperialism is attacking on many fronts simultaneously, resorting to a variety of means and employing the most diverse forms of struggle, the question again arises: what course, what strategy and tactics should be used to combat imperialism? Is it possible in general to continue the policy of peaceful coexistence?

The struggle with imperialism is too complex to permit of any stereotyped approach, simplifications, or solutions which, on the face of it, appear to be clear and simple, but which on closer scrutiny prove to be one-sided and primitive. To present the problem as a choice between class struggle or peaceful coexistence, i.e., as a matter either of peaceful coexistence or support of the national-liberation movement is as unscientific as it is unrealistic. In conditions when the adversary employs at once peaceful and non-peaceful means of economic, cultural, political and ideological struggle against us, *it would be well-nigh suicidal for the socialist world system to advocate one form of struggle only, rejecting all the others.* In the present conditions we must wage the struggle on different sectors of the front in different ways, utilizing a variety of the most effective means and weapons.

In the present international situation the building and consolidation of socialism, support of the national-liberation movement, the fight for peaceful coexistence and against world war must be carried on simultaneously along parallel lines. To separate these tasks or to oppose one to the other would be a fatal mistake.

The fight for the peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems *remains the fundamental principle of the foreign policy of the socialist states, regulating their relations with the capitalist world.* However, it can only be successful if the socialist countries consolidate their unity and strengthen their economic and political might, if, while developing their relations, they make no concession in principle to imperialism and continue to rebuff its attempts at "fragmentation".

In connection with the question of peaceful coexistence some important points should be clarified:

a) During the past few years bourgeois propaganda has changed its tactics with regard to peaceful coexistence. While formerly the possibility of peaceful coexistence was completely ruled out, *today bourgeois propaganda is also* talking about it and has, on more than one occasion actually accused the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of *not wanting "genuine"* peaceful coexistence. By "genuine" they imply the acceptance by the socialist countries of all the conditions monopoly capital demands as the price of peaceful coexistence. The essence of these demands is that the socialist countries should not support the national-liberation movement or display solidarity with the struggle of the workers in the capitalist countries. The socialist countries categorically reject these ridiculous demands. It is on these grounds that bourgeois propaganda is charging the socialist countries with having allegedly given up the idea of peaceful coexistence.

b) In a certain sense history itself has given rise in recent years to some illusions and misapprehensions with regard to peaceful coexistence. The latter 50's and early 60's witnessed a general revolutionary "offensive". The obvious economic and diplomatic achievements of the socialist countries, the Soviet accomplishments in missile technology and space exploration, the success of the national-liberation revolutions in Africa—all this fostered the illusion that the road to peaceful coexistence was clear and that the most difficult stage in the improvement of the international climate had been passed. The result was that the principle of peaceful coexistence came to be regarded as well-nigh the universal solution, the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the socialist countries, "its general strategic line". And this caused a great deal of misunderstanding.

Many of today's problems evoke a reaction diametrically opposed to the former illusions. People have begun to doubt the success of the policy of peaceful coexistence and even to question its feasibility. But there is as little justification for the pessimism to be observed in some quarters nowadays as there was for the excessive optimism of a few years ago.

Peaceful coexistence is a form of the contest between the two systems, a form of the world class struggle in general. But its course is not smooth; it does not develop in a steady upward curve. It is possible only insofar as it can contain and localize the aggressive foreign policy of imperialism.

It would be absurd and incorrect to regard the relaxation of world tension as a sweeping victory for peaceful coexistence and, on the other hand, at times of temporary aggravation of tension, to succumb to panic and question the validity and correctness of the policy. *Peaceful coexistence depends not on transient factors, but on factors exerting a constant influence on the international situation. In other words, it depends on objective factors—the existence of the two world systems and the changes in the balance of strength between them.*

c) Today the makers of U.S. foreign policy, while aspiring to "peaceful coexistence" with the main forces of the socialist world system—the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries—are waging a war of annihilation against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and committing a series of aggressive actions against peoples fighting for their national liberation. U.S. diplomats aver that the Vietnam war should not be an obstacle to the improvement of relations with other socialist countries. But this is impossible. Peace is indivisible and hence peaceful coexistence, too, must be regarded as indivisible. The biggest obstacle to peaceful coexistence today is the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. To repulse this aggression is the prime task in the fight for peaceful coexistence. Therefore, together with progressives everywhere, we demand an end to the colonialist war waged by the USA against the people of Vietnam.

Yet the cooling of relations with the USA need not lead to a worsening of our relations with all other capitalist countries, all the more so since serious contradictions have arisen within the imperialist camp on the question of relations with the socialist world. Many capitalist governments criticize Washington's policy. There are considerable capitalist circles which feel they can gain from trade with the socialist countries and, willing to accept the policy of peaceful coexistence, are seeking to influence their governments accordingly.

Instead of a global thermonuclear holocaust we offer the capitalist governments the principles and practices of peaceful coexistence.

In the present international situation the following political steps are essential to promote peaceful coexistence:

a stop to all aggression, a commitment on the part of the states to respect the sovereignty of other nations, their right to self-determination, the principle of non-interference in the

internal affairs of other peoples, and, on this basis, promotion of multilateral economic and cultural contacts between countries;

withdrawal of all troops within the bounds of the respective national territories and dismantling of military bases on foreign soil;

an end to underground nuclear testing, establishment of nuclear-free zones, destruction of nuclear weapons, and complete renunciation of the scheme to give Federal Germany nuclear weapons;

conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty Organization;

annulment of military pacts and their replacement with general collective security treaty systems. In preparation for this, negotiations should be initiated on European security, in particular on the eradication of the survivals of the Second World War in Europe and the peaceful settlement of the German question;

general and complete disarmament under strict international control;

heightening the role and prestige of the United Nations so that it should become, in the spirit of its Charter, a reliable guardian of peace and security.

The extension of economic cooperation between the socialist and capitalist countries would facilitate peaceful coexistence.

Recent years have shown that trade between the two world systems is overcoming the political restrictions artificially imposed by the imperialists and is growing to the benefit of both sides.

It is now patent that the embargo laid by the United States has not prevented, and, consequently, cannot in the future prevent the steady progress of the socialist countries. More, many Western firms have complained of the losses they have sustained as a result of these restrictions. Noteworthy in this respect is a statement made by Western political leader who attended the 1966 Budapest International Fair. The embargo, he said, was the biggest blunder made by the capitalist world, for it compelled the socialist countries to develop branches of industry the output of which they formerly bought in the West, thereby depriving Western capitalists of important markets. To make matters worse, he said, output in these branches of industry has already reached such a level in the social-

ist countries that they are successfully competing with capitalist firms on the world market.

This explains why certain groups of big capitalists want more trade with the socialist countries. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce asked the Administration to re-examine the restrictions imposed on this trade. This is why Johnson had to ask Congress for legislation empowering him to apply most-favoured nation treatment to the socialist countries whenever he considers this necessary. This move too is evidence that, with the changed world balance, more sober views are slowly but surely gaining ground. Trade on a most-favoured nation basis would indeed be mutually advantageous. It should not be forgotten, however, that the U.S. government is seeking to use even trade with the socialist countries for subversive ends. But that this, like all previous manoeuvres, will meet with failure is a foregone conclusion.

But if the strengthening of economic ties and the expansion of trade are placed on a proper footing, this can ease international tension and promote cooperation between states and peoples, in other words, it can serve the cause of peace.

There are also many opportunities to expand scientific cooperation between the capitalist and socialist countries. Man is still faced with a multitude of problems the solution of which requires scientific cooperation irrespective of differences in social systems. Here are some such problems:

search for and economic utilization of new sources of power, especially in the light of the exhaustion of existing sources;

cheap desalination of sea water;

increase of food production to meet the needs of the rapidly growing world population;

space research and use of outer space in the interests of man.

Many other problems could be cited which can be solved only through broad cooperation in research. One need hardly stress that scientific cooperation projected towards peace can only benefit the whole of humanity.

International exchange of cultural values has always helped to bring peoples together in friendship. True, along with culture, diverse ideas also are disseminated, but the competition and conflict of ideas can remain within the framework of peaceful coexistence and need not necessarily lead

to armed conflicts. Cultural exchange and cooperation may thus become positive stimuli to peaceful coexistence.

To sum up what has been said about the struggle between the two world systems:

The fundamental issue of our time is this: either a global thermonuclear war or peaceful coexistence. There is no other alternative.

Peaceful coexistence stems from the objective realities of our time, from the fact that there exist two world systems. Its feasibility and necessity are recognized by more and more political leaders in the capitalist countries. And all the peoples have a vital interest in it.

It is one of the chief features of our epoch that this objective can be achieved by the united efforts of the socialist world system and peace-loving people everywhere. This is a paramount condition for the preservation of universal peace.



Much has happened in the world since the publication of the Moscow Statement of 1960. These new developments should be thoroughly studied in order to draw the proper conclusions for the policy of the Communist movement. This, of course, cannot be done by any one man or any one party. It is the honourable task for the entire world Communist movement, a task to the solution of which each party can best contribute by generalizing its own experience.

At the present stage of the struggle for unity in the international Communist movement we believe that to convene a major conference of the Communist and Workers' parties would be correct in principle. Both the international situation and the development of the world Communist movement leave no doubt that the conditions for holding such a meeting are ripening and taking shape.

The fight for unity should be conducted so as to hasten the ripening of these conditions. This can be facilitated by bilateral talks, regional conferences, more concrete and profound examination and elaboration of fundamental political problems of the international Communist movement and world development generally, and also—what is most important—

joint pronouncements and united action by a growing number of parties against the aggressive acts of imperialism.

We shall truly be working in the spirit of the Moscow Statements of 1957 and 1960 if we do not confine ourselves to repeating the principles set forth in these documents, but if we look forward, forge ahead, creatively examining the developments since 1960 and concretely analyzing the conditions in which the aims posed in these Statements can be achieved, if we chart the further development of our correct general line in the context of the new conditions. This is an essential prerequisite of principled political unity of the international Communist movement, and will make for new major victories for the international Communist and working-class movement throughout the world.