

ANALYSIS OF THE KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 6, 1961

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

TESTIMONY OF DR. STEFAN T. POSSONY
JUNE 16, 1961

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1961

71712*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL
SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*
BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

ANALYSIS OF THE KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 6, 1961

FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1961

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:45 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Kenneth B. Keating presiding.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; Frank Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator KEATING. The subcommittee will come to order.

Our witness this morning is Dr. Stefan T. Possony, professor of international politics in the Graduate School of Georgetown University, and also associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Possony, will you rise and raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give in this proceeding will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. POSSONY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF DR. STEFAN T. POSSONY

Senator KEATING. Dr. Possony, have you made a study of Premier Khrushchev's speech of last January with regard to certain features which this committee desired you to investigate?

Mr. POSSONY. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Can you tell us something of your background?

Mr. POSSONY. I am professor of international politics, Graduate School of Georgetown University. I have been a student of strategy, military affairs, and communism for some 20 years or more, and I follow Communist strategy with a great deal of attention.

I have published a book on Communist strategy and tactics and the techniques of what I call conflict management, going back to Marx and through the whole history of communism up to the late 1940's and early 1950's. This book is quite old by now.

Since then I have always tried to keep up to date with changes in Communist strategy. Recently I coauthored a book suggesting a "Forward Strategy for America."

Senator KEATING. In connection with this study of the January 6, 1961, speech, some of the items which this committee asked you to investigate were chosen to give us a clear idea of how Premier Khrushchev used language connoting one thing to people of the free countries and another to people in countries to whom he was speaking—a language sometimes known, I believe, as the Aesopian language.

We would like to know what his real attitude is toward the question of disarmament; whether he really believes in the possibility of peaceful coexistence, and why he raises this issue; what types of war does Mr. Khrushchev believe to be necessary; does he believe in the possibility of using parliamentary institutions for revolutionary purposes; has he relinquished the use of uprisings for revolutionary purposes; what is the key to Mr. Khrushchev's strategy in underdeveloped areas, and what is Mr. Khrushchev's timetable for world conquest. We shall look for answers in the presentation you have prepared for us.

Mr. POSSONY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEATING. And perhaps others.

Mr. POSSONY. I have a prepared statement.

Senator KEATING. Would you proceed with your prepared statement at this time?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, might I ask just one question?

Senator KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. I notice you have titled this presentation, "Khrushchev's Mein Kampf." Why?

Mr. POSSONY. Well, I want to say, Mr. Sourwine, that I did not choose this title as a cheap trick to dramatize this analysis. I want to express my firm conviction that the parallels between Khrushchev and Hitler are becoming very clear indeed.

In the specific case of this January 6 speech, I would like to point out that Khrushchev made a programmatic announcement on Communist strategy. This strategy, in my estimation, will remain in force for the next 4 years or longer. Hitler wrote down Mein Kampf and laid down for the rest of the world to read what he was intending to do once he had come to power. Both the January speech and Mein Kampf are public announcements of strategic intentions.

However, the parallel is really more significant. I think there are, in addition to this programmatic comparison, other similarities which must be remembered.

First, Hitler was a man who thought that destiny had chosen him as a charismatic leader and that he was going to be the greatest man who ever lived in history. For example, he made a statement, "Providence predestined me to be the greatest liberator of mankind."

I think you will find many parallels in Khrushchev's speech.

May I call your attention to one passage where Khrushchev says that, "Heretofore history has worked for socialism; henceforth socialism is going to work for history," which is just about as much of a hybris, as the Greeks called it, as Hitler's ravings.

Another idea is that predestination plays a great role. The Communists believe in the predetermination of the course of history. There is no question in their minds that communism is going to win and bring about communism.

Equally, Hitler had no doubt that nazism was going to win and that he was to be the instrument of victory.

For example, he laid down this sentence:

I am walking, with the assurance of a sleepwalker, the road which providence has asked me to go.

Now, Hitler was perhaps more honest by calling his particular "providence" the assurance of a sleepwalker, while Khrushchev derived his assurance from Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the Communist doctrine.

In both instances, these men had the same arrogance; both assumed they knew what "history" is planning—and that it is planning to satisfy their hopes and desires.

Mr. SOURWINE. Both regarded themselves, and Khrushchev now regards himself, as a judge of history.

Mr. POSSONY. These men arrogate to themselves the power of a creator. As to the next point, both have the same notion as to who or what pushes history. In Khrushchev's speech, while he makes all kinds of qualifications on the so-called "cult of violence," nevertheless he says very clearly, and says this repeatedly, that if the Western world does not surrender, he is going to force their surrender. In other words, he is upholding the idea that force and violence are the decisive elements in history, subject to a few qualifications. Exactly the same theory was presented by Hitler, who asserted that violence is the "motor of history."

The Hitlerian "motor of history" is just another expression for Lenin's "locomotive of history."

The parallel here is not just a superficial one. All aggressors in history were worshippers of force.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there also, Professor, a parallel in the fact that Hitler's "Mein Kampf" was not given proper recognition; it was not understood for what it was; that is, an actual blueprint of what he intended? Is there some of this also with regard to Khrushchev's speech? Is there a tendency on the part of people in the free world not to give it sufficient credence; not to understand the seriousness of it and what he intends?

Mr. POSSONY. That is very true. However, it was easier to read "Mein Kampf," one single book which, together with a few subsequent books, explained nazism. In the case of the Communists, there is an avalanche of information. Practically every week Communists restate their goals and policies and, of course, it is very hard to keep up with all the little nuances.

In fact, many people accuse me of being irrational because I am spending most of my time reading this Communist material. I must agree that it is entirely irrational—and boring. It is more rational to do something else: go fishing or swimming, or read satisfying literature.

The fundamental difficulty is that you have to read Communist pronouncements and writings very carefully. It is not good enough to peruse them superficially. If you do, you will misinterpret and draw false conclusions—usually in the direction of overestimating U.S. security and underestimating Communist singleness of purpose.

May I, in this connection, refer to one incident that happened only yesterday evening. I was driving home, and over the radio—I forget the station—there came a reannouncement of the speech Khrushchev made yesterday. The interpretation was that the speech, by and large, was conciliatory and moderate. This speech was essentially interpreted as a peaceful contribution.

Now this morning, of course, we read it slightly differently and are inclined to interpret the speech as an implied ultimatum. Whatever this new speech may mean, our initial American reaction to Communist statements tends to be optimistic. We have an almost compulsive belief that the Kremlin desires peace and will, sooner or later, reconsider its avowed intent to “bury” us.

Let me draw one other parallel with Hitler and Khrushchev, if I may. Hitler said that his task consisted in exploiting the weaknesses of other people. I think this same notion characterizes Khrushchev’s strategy today. His alleged or genuine confidence that he can bring about the surrender of the free world by using peaceful coexistence tactics or disarmament decoys, ploys, together with frightening people—the oldest trick of psychological warfare—aims at nothing but the exploitation of the weaknesses of men, especially cowardice and self-deception.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry I interrupted you so long, but I think this is very valuable.

Go ahead with your presentation, sir.

Mr. POSSONY. My purpose today is to analyze the speech which N. S. Khrushchev, on January 6, 1961, delivered to a meeting of the party organizations in the Higher Party School, the Academy of Social Sciences, and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Khrushchev’s speech was one of the most outspoken and significant statements by a leading Russian Communist in recent times. The choice of the audience—the party organizations entrusted with ideology and perhaps with overall strategic planning—attests to Khrushchev’s intent to make a programmatic announcement of great importance. The speech was very carefully written and widely disseminated all over the world. The speech was not delivered in impromptu fashion but must have been written several weeks before delivery. Otherwise it could not have been printed in the January issue of World Marxist Review.

In making this presentation, I beg your indulgence if I follow a seemingly clumsy procedure. I have broken down Mr. Khrushchev’s speech into more than two dozen topical portions. It is my purpose to make a few comments on each of these chapters and then place the pertinent quotes behind each of my comments. I have chosen this method because I believe that, though it lacks stylistic grace, it may facilitate orientation and comprehension of Mr. Khrushchev’s statement.

Senator KEATING. Dr. Possony, one of the great problems which we face here, as you probably know, is the matter of time. The acting chairman just came from one committee, has promised to go to another at 11:30.

I do have a few questions I would like to put to you. We are very grateful to you for the great amount of work that you have done for

this presentation. It will be carefully studied by this committee, and will be the subject of a report at a later time.

I would ask that, if it is satisfactory to you, the entire statement be printed at this point in the record as though you had read it, and that then you answer a few questions which I would like to put to you.

Is that satisfactory to you?

Mr. POSSONY. Yes.

Senator KEATING. That will be the order, then, of the chairman.

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Possony appears at the end of his oral testimony.)

Senator KEATING. I want to turn, if I may, from this January 6, 1961 speech which you have analyzed for us in considerable detail to Mr. Khrushchev's speech of yesterday.

I realize that you probably have not had an opportunity to study it in the detail with which you studied the other one, and also you don't have the full text as yet, I presume.

Mr. POSSONY. This is correct.

Senator KEATING. But you have had an opportunity, I assume, to examine at least the press accounts of this speech.

Mr. POSSONY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEATING. From those accounts would you say that yesterday's speech logically follows the remarks delivered by Mr. Khrushchev before the higher party school?

Mr. POSSONY. Yes, sir. Actually, there is complete consistency among the most recent pronouncements by the Communists, dating back to the meeting of the Communist Parties in November 1960, which took place in Moscow, through Khrushchev's speech of January which is essentially an interpretation of the declaration of 81 Communist Parties issued at the November meeting. The various statements that have come out since that time are essentially identical in intent and content and merely amplify the line formulated in November.

There is one point, though, which sets this speech of yesterday, I think, a little apart from the January speech. Any time the Communists go into a negotiation or, let us say attend a quasi-summit meeting with the West, they must explain to their own party organization, globally, what this means. There is the danger that many of the vacillating party members may think that perhaps negotiation is an attempt by the Soviets to accommodate themselves with us. Furthermore, there is, I am sure, a great deal of opposition inside the Soviet Union against "negotiations," and more generally against the various tactics which Khrushchev is employing.

Hence any time a summit conference takes place, he is compelled to set the record straight and notify the Communist world movement that Communist objectives are unchanged and that the "negotiation" is merely a method to advance communism.

You may remember the first Geneva summit conference with President Eisenhower. There was a great deal of "atmosphere" that the world problems had been solved or would be solved by mutual "good will." As soon as Khrushchev came home, he started to pour arms into Egypt. That was a clear-cut warning to the world that nothing had changed; that the summit conference was just a tactical ma-

neuver; that the Kremlin was going to exploit the opportunity and that Khrushchev thought he had gained in Geneva enough security that he was able to warm up the Middle East.

In the Paris conference that followed the U-2 incident, there was no need to warm up the cold war; it was already pretty warm at that point.

It is significant, therefore, that after the Paris meeting, Khrushchev went back to Moscow via East Berlin and there delivered a "cooling down," moderate speech.

If you remember the photographs of the meeting, the postures in the hall where he spoke were very violent and radical, almost as though the seizure of East Berlin was impending. But then a "peaceful" Khrushchev, probably to the surprise of the East Germans, calmed the situation down.

Now in the present case, after the Vienna meeting, he apparently feels the need to reassure the world Communist movement that the world conquest goes on and that he went to Vienna to advance communism, not to seek accommodation.

There is a second point. There is a new U.S. administration and he feels compelled, I think, to show that he is not going to be intimidated and that he is not particularly impressed with what the new President told him; that, irrespective of Mr. Kennedy's warnings, he is going to continue on his merry way. Furthermore, I believe that he wants to establish a sort of moral ascendancy over the present American administration. He wants to test our resolution, as he has done in earlier instances. Above all, he wants to intimidate the new leaders.

An old Communist trick is to execute "tests of strength" at the beginning of a new administration to find out how far they can go. Once the limit has been established, once the Kremlin thinks it has gained moral superiority, once it has determined what it might get in this situation, it will then embark on the operation of getting what it thinks is available.

Senator KEATING. Is this strategy of alternately blowing hot and cold a well-known Communist strategy?

Mr. POSSONY. Yes. This has been a standard operating procedure, really. However, I think it isn't alternating; it is simultaneously growing hot and cold. The very essence of this allegedly newfangled strategy of Khrushchev is that, on the one hand, he is pushing forward with his military pressure, or concealed military pressure and, on the other side, he is moving on the so-called disarmament front. Incidentally, this procedure was formulated by Lenin about 40 years ago but we still don't understand it.

Senator KEATING. In your analysis of Mr. Khrushchev's speech before the Higher Party School in January of this year, did it come to you as any surprise that he would now issue an ultimatum as he did yesterday on Western rights in Berlin?

Mr. POSSONY. No, sir. As a matter of fact, this ultimatum—or blackmail, or bluff—was foreshadowed in the January speech. I have some comment in my prepared text on this point. Basically, Khrushchev is talking about the current strategic situation and comparing it with the situation preceding the two World Wars. He points out that before the two World Wars the world was dominated by imperialist

nations were split into hostile camps, fighting each other. These cleavages offered many advantages to Communist strategy, including what he does not mention, that Imperial Germany helped Lenin to power in 1917 and that, in 1939, Stalin enabled Hitler to go to war against Poland, France, and Britain.

Now, Khrushchev says, the situation has changed. The imperialists are united, in a fashion, and this is not an advantage to Communist strategy.

Yet, Khrushchev argues the unity of the Western camp is not a perfect unity and can be broken. Obviously, the Communists have assumed the task of breaking the free world alliance systems.

The Berlin issue, and German rearmament in a broader sense, are the levers by which the Kremlin wants to unhinge Western unity. Khrushchev is not interested in solving the Berlin problem *per se*. He says Berlin is a bone in his throat, but he uses the Berlin issue to destroy NATO. He wants to ram this bone down and through our throats.

In the case of Mr. Ulbricht, the situation is a little different. He has a specific problem in Berlin. If Berlin comes to him, then his shaky regime is propped up.

The point is, though, that there will be no Berlin crisis unless the Soviets desire such a conflict. There is no current difficulty in the Berlin status which requires a "solution." Berlin is an opportunity for offensive Communist action, just as, in 1939, the Polish corridor offered an opportunity for Nazi political action.

Senator KEATING. Since he actually issued this ultimatum on Berlin before the entire Soviet population in this well-prepared television address, do you feel that he really means it this time, or is there a possibility that he is carrying on a bluff?

Mr. POSSONY. I don't know the answer to this, Senator. I don't think he means it to the extreme of a global war at this moment. I don't think the time has come yet for the Soviet to shoot it out. Hence we should not be intimidated.

If you take his speech, you will find there a discussion of the strategic timing problem.

He says the present era—this is a period of about 15 to 20 years—will see the downfall of capitalism and the victory of communism. This present era is broken down into two phases. The first phase is characterized by the fact that the "active fronts," as he calls them, are in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and not in Europe or North America. The turning point, terminating this first phase, will come when the Soviet Union achieves economic superiority—in other words, when the Soviet bloc will have obtained the free world, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Khrushchev specifically puts this turning point into the 1965-70 period. The second phase would see the decisive struggle between communism and the free world and, according to Khrushchev's anticipation, free world defeat through surrender or destruction.

Naturally, if the Soviet Union does not overtake the United States economically—or what is far more important, in weapons technology—according to the enunciated timetable, the onset of the second phase will be delayed. Whenever this turning point comes, even if it occurs only on the Greek calendar, the decisive battle with the United States must follow.

Now, to make Europe into an active front at this point will be premature from the point of view of the force relationships. Khrushchev is very careful, in one passage, warning against disregard of these relationships. He insists that the Communists must proceed on a realistic appraisal of force relationships, which means that they must not fight before they can win. Consequently, I feel that Berlin is a psychological test of strength, rather than a military test of strength, even though some shooting may occur.

However, in order to be psychologically convincing, Khrushchev must persuade us that he will be going to the entire length of the problem. Speaking purely in military terms, if Khrushchev were intent to fight at a time when he is not ready, it would be to our advantage to oblige him.

Senator KEATING. In the light of the speech made in January before the higher party school, do we have reason to believe that the talks recently held between Mr. Khrushchev and President Kennedy will make a contribution to world peace in any manner?

Mr. POSSONY. I don't think, so far as I can understand our policy, that this was the U.S. hope. I don't believe that the President had any illusions on this point and, in fact, he stated repeatedly that he merely wanted to explore the problem of Soviet-American relations.

This is a perfectly legitimate procedure. I am sure that if I were President, I would like to know with whom or against whom I am dealing. I think the same desire for personal reconnaissance existed on Mr. Khrushchev's part.

The trouble with these desires is that the President is a public figure, and so is Mr. Khrushchev. They cannot meet in private without the world knowing, interpreting, fearing, and hoping. Consequently, all kinds of arguments and rectifications, propaganda and counter-propaganda campaigns, fireside chats and solemn orations follow such meetings like payments follow purchases. And so while this was basically an exploratory meeting, nevertheless, it was interpreted by many people to be a sort of summit meeting after all.

It was not entirely excluded that some agreement could have been reached on some points. You may remember the President stated that he hoped the Laos situation would be improved. If so, Vienna would go into history as more than an exploratory meeting.

Senator KEATING. Is there any evidence the Laos situation was improved?

Mr. POSSONY. No, I would say the contrary is true. If Khrushchev really wanted to insure peace, then I would expect him to go to a meeting like in Vienna and make a real broad concession or offer a mutual advantage deal. The fact is that he didn't go to Vienna to make concessions. He failed to offer us any advantages. He asked us to give but he did not offer to give in return. The free world is invited to weaken itself to make communism strong—that is Khrushchev's definition of "peace." In the Berlin case, for example, the Communist champions of self-determination don't even desire to consult the will of the Berlin population. Khrushchev's insistence on one-sided "deals" is really clear-cut evidence that he does not intend to work for peace, as the United States interprets this much-abused word.

Senator KEATING. Well, now, yesterday in his speech he indicated that he was happy with the meeting with President Kennedy in Vienna, and that it proved worth while. He stated in substance, that no one could expect an agreement when both nations have such divergent views.

Now as you know, President Kennedy said after his meeting with Khrushchev, that it was very sober.

Can you explain in any way why Mr. Khrushchev was able to state that he was happy with the meeting with Mr. Kennedy and that it proved very worth while, and that he knew that no concrete agreements could be made by either side, by the two principals on behalf of their governments?

What was he happy about?

Mr. POSSONY. Well, I don't know that we should ascribe too much importance to this phraseology, because after all, he has to comply with the rules of international manners to some extent, and so he has to make a statement of this sort.

On the other hand, I would say that he probably found the experience rewarding because it allowed him to size up his opponent. This is certainly a very significant gain in any strategist's book.

Senator KEATING. As an expert on Soviet strategy and on communism, do you feel that if the United States should, in any way, soften its position on standing firm in Berlin, that this would have a tendency to weaken the position of the free world in other areas around the world?

Mr. POSSONY. Senator, I think any time you weaken a Western position you make a mistake in the present period of history. If we weaken any of our positions, we strengthen the positions of communism. I think the record is absolutely clear on this point. It is as clear on this same point as it was during the Hitlerian period.

The President himself repeatedly stressed the futility of appeasement. History proves that appeasement does not lead to peace but causes wars—in fact, in my judgment, it makes them inevitable.

If, by taking a strong stand in Berlin, we were forced to weaken our position, let us say in southeast Asia, I would say this would be a very clear-cut proof that our current military strength is inadequate.

Consequently, if we want to win this battle—and especially if we want to win the protracted conflict—we have to get more muscle.

Senator KEATING. I presume you have not studied the proposition sufficiently in order to make any comment on the suggestion that West Berlin be made a free city.

Mr. POSSONY. No, Senator. I think you refer to Senator Mansfield's suggestion.

Senator KEATING. Yes.

Mr. POSSONY. I have not seen the text, so I don't think I should comment on it.

This is really not germane to your question, Senator, but as another comment, I think we must remember that what is a rational solution in a dispute, for example, between Germany and France or between the United States and Britain may not be a rational solution within the framework of the conflict between the free world and the Communist world.

The Communists are not interested in achieving rational, let alone durable and mutually advantageous solutions. They want to use any type of crisis to advance their positions. If there is no ready-made crisis, they would fabricate an artificial "tension."

Consequently, while it is quite simple to work out a "rational" solution for Berlin, I don't think a rational solution could be attained by negotiating about it. I think, in actuality, "rational solutions" soon would degenerate into surrendering Berlin on the installment plan.

The Communists probably are anxious to stretch out this conflict, for some time. If the Berlin crisis were ended, a very important lever to interfere with NATO relations would be eliminated. Consequently, they want to keep the Berlin crisis alive. On the other hand, they must move forward and gain certain advantages, lest the maneuver backfire.

The proper solution for this "dialectic" problem is to go one step at a time. "Rational" solutions, which we may offer probably would enhance their ability to proceed in this manner.

Senator KEATING. Well, I must say that as one member of this committee I feel very strongly that your position is correct.

Mr. POSSONY. Thank you.

Senator KEATING. We must stand firm in Berlin and if we do not do so, we will weaken our position throughout the world.

Mr. POSSONY. This is correct.

Senator KEATING. It is not only for Berlin. It is not for Berlin as a piece of real estate. It is not even for the people of West Berlin to whom we have a deep obligation, but it is for our position throughout the world.

Mr. POSSONY. May I make a comment?

Senator KEATING. Yes.

Mr. POSSONY. I think the Berlin question must be seen on several levels or in several phases. If we suffer the loss of West Berlin today, it would be rather overly optimistic, in my judgment, not to expect a revival of very strong nationalism in Germany. Now, once you have such a revival, perhaps even of nazism—mind you, I am not saying there are any indications of this at the present juncture—but if there is a great national loss, a nationalistic action might be inevitable. In this case, the world situation could become utterly uncontrollable. Western unreliability in Berlin also might lead to the revival of tendencies in Germany seeking accommodation and collaboration with Russia.

In other words, by postponing a crisis, you don't necessarily improve the world situation. On the contrary, you make it worse. A surrender in Berlin would not pacify central Europe but result in an all-German crisis. This is one of the reasons why Khrushchev pushes the Berlin issue.

Senator KEATING. Well, undoubtedly we will desire to have you analyze for us in detail Mr. Khrushchev's speech of yesterday. I realize that this is what some lawyers call a horseback opinion, but is it your general impression that most of the analysis of the January speech will also apply to his speech of yesterday?

Mr. POSSONY. Yes.

Senator KEATING. You have a summary of the conclusions contained

Mr. POSSONY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEATING. I think we should hear that.

Mr. POSSONY. I would like to summarize it.

(1) Khrushchev's speech of January 6, 1961, together with the declaration of the Communist Parties of November 1960, disclosed Communist strategy as it will be employed for the next 5 years or so.

(2) The traditional goal of communism, the conquest of the entire world, is not only reaffirmed but is held far more strongly and hopefully than in the past. It is "unthinkable" that the Communists will abandon their goal of world domination regardless of the price they have to pay. They are willing to pay any price to obtain this objective.

(3) The Communists probably are honestly convinced that they are invincible, (a) because of the alleged predetermination of history, (b) because of their combined military-political strength, (c) because of their anticipated military superiority, and (d) because of the anticipated demoralization of the free world.

(4) Communist strategy has become more sophisticated than it was under Stalin.

(5) The Communists believe that the final decision in the world struggle, and specifically the victory of world communism, will be attained in the present era of history. In their conception, this era seems to extend to 1975, approximately.

(6) Armed struggle is inevitable. Such specific forms of armed struggle, as liberation wars, uprisings, and "pressure from below" also are inevitable.

(7) A global thermonuclear war is not entirely inevitable. If the free world, and especially the strongest democratic countries like the United States capitulate, then such a war may be avoided. However, while preferable, such a development is unlikely.

(8) The Communist Parties in the free world and their sympathizers must do everything in their power to facilitate nuclear blackmail by the Soviet Union and to prevent military resistance by the free world.

(9) The Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc must not leave any stone unturned to increase their military power in order to fight the probable—albeit not inevitable—world war and to win a global thermonuclear conflict.

(10) For the time being, such conflict must be avoided. The turning point in history will come when the Soviet Union overtakes the United States sometime between 1965 and 1970. Khrushchev talks as though he conceives this competition in terms of an "economic" production race. It is more likely that he is thinking about a race in military technology. Consequently, the great turning point in history will come when the Soviet Union, irrespective of per capita production in industrial and consumers' goods, achieves technologically superior armaments and attains a military force which, qualitatively and quantitatively, will be superior to the military forces of the United States. If necessary, this force will be employed in the second phase of the current era.

(11) In the first phase, the armed struggle will mostly take the form of liberation wars and uprisings, plus deterrence by nuclear blackmail, on the part of the Soviets, of any military initiatives undertaken by the free world.

(12) Also, in this first phase, the struggle must be intensified on the "active fronts." In particular, it must be pushed in Latin America.

(13) In this phase, strong efforts will be made to improve the effectiveness of uprisings. Henceforth uprisings will be planned as major military undertakings. The insurrectionists will be properly trained and be armed with the most modern equipment. They will be provided with strategic support and power by Soviet nuclear long-range forces, under a coordinated strategy. International crises, such as threats of war and war alerts, may be exploited to launch insurrections.

(14) The achievement of a military, political, and psychological paralysis of the free world is a paramount objective of Soviet strategy.

(15) This objective can be attained by such means as peace propaganda, Pavlovian conditioning, infiltration, threats, and diplomatic negotiations.

(16) Propaganda on disarmament, specifically nuclear disarmament, and disarmament negotiations are an integral part of the Soviet strategy aimed at paralyzing the free world and strengthening the power of communism.

(17) Soviet strategy is based, on the one hand, on achieving optimal military power and building and strengthening Communist political armies throughout the free world. On the other hand, Soviet strategy utilizes massive deception to bring about the capitulation of the United States through (a) the unilateral military weakening of the free world, (b) the moral paralysis of free world governments, and (c) the demoralization of public opinion.

(18) Failing in this strategy, it is the Soviet intent to destroy the United States by nuclear weapons.

Senator KEATING. We are very grateful to you, Dr. Possony, and you have performed a great service to this committee and your country in preparing this summary and answering there questions which we have put to you.

Mr. POSSONY. It was a great honor to appear before you.

Senator KEATING. The hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(Dr. Possony's prepared statement follows in full:)

STATEMENT BY DR. STEFAN T. POSSONY, PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY AND ASSOCIATE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, JUNE 6, 1961

My purpose today is to analyze the speech which N. S. Khrushchev on January 6, 1961, delivered to a meeting of the party organizations in the Higher Party School, the Academy of Social Sciences, and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Khrushchev's speech was one of the most outspoken and significant statements by a leading Russian Communist in recent times. The choice of the audience—the party organizations entrusted with ideology and perhaps with overall strategic planning—attests to Khrushchev's intent to make a programmatic announcement of great importance. The speech was very carefully written and widely disseminated all over the world.

In making this presentation, I beg your indulgence if I follow a seemingly clumsy procedure. I have broken down Mr. Khrushchev's speech into more than two dozen topical portions. It is my purpose to make a few comments on each of these chapters and then place the pertinent quotes behind each of my comments. I have chosen this procedure because it lacks stylistic grace, it may facilitate orientation and comprehension of Mr. Khrushchev's statement.

The translation I used is based on Mr. Khrushchev's speech as it was broadcast by the Soviets in Russian. I have compared all questionable passages with the English language text published in the "World Marxist Review, Problems of Peace and Socialism," January 1961, pages 3 to 38. This presumably is the English version approved by the Communists themselves. In several instances, however, I have used the wording of the "World Marxist Review" and, in every case I have indicated this in the quotes.

Since the speech by Mr. Khrushchev covered the peaceful coexistence question inadequately, I added a few paragraphs from the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow during November 1960. In these quotes I have used the translation published by the New York Times, December 7, 1960.

Finally, since Mr. Khrushchev has referred to the role of parliaments within Communist strategy, I wish to put into the record pertinent quotes from a book by a Czech Communist, Jan Kozak. This Communist wrote a book entitled "About the Possible Transition to Socialism by Means of the Revolutionary Use of Parliament and the Czechoslovak Experience." Two chapters of this book entitled "How Parliament Can Play a Revolutionary Part in the Transition to Socialism and the Role of the Popular Masses," were published by the Independent Information Center, London, in February 1961, with an introduction by the Right Honorable Lord Morrison of Lambeth, C.H. It is not quite clear when Kozak's book was published, but from internal evidence, I would judge that its date of publication was sometime between 1950 and 1955.

ON THE SOVIET BLOC

I first turn to a consideration of Khrushchev's evaluation of the Soviet bloc. The Communist bloc is described as a community or association of states—you may recall that in recent U.S. nomenclature, we sometimes, I think erroneously, use the term "commonwealth" to describe what more informally we refer to as the "bloc."

Khrushchev asserted that there is no single center of leadership and that all Communist Parties and Communist States are independent and are enjoying equal rights. However, there must be solidarity and unity. Although, as he asserts, there are no regulations or directives, every party bears joint responsibility for the fate of communism. All Communists share a common ideology and are loyal to it. The Communist cadres of the various parties are perfectly capable of leading their own parties and their own nations, but plans must be coordinated. All shortcomings which undermine the solidarity of the Socialist camp must be removed and basic policies are agreed to unanimously.

There is allegedly no specific leader issuing directives to the various parties. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union is the most powerful country within the bloc and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the most experienced and hardened, universally acknowledged "vanguard" of the international Communist movement. The Soviet Union is fulfilling its "international duty." Placing the "unity of the Socialist camp, of the international Communist movement, above all else," the Soviet Union is using "unswerving determination" to insure unity. In plain English, the word "leadership" is translated into communist jargon by the "universally acknowledged vanguard."

Incidentally, Mr. Khrushchev took some pains to point out that there are no basic or insoluble contradictions among the Socialist countries. By implication, he admitted that there are current contradictions which he considers to be soluble. He also praised the "unselfish brotherly help" which the Soviet Union has been giving to "fraternal Socialist countries"—a total of 7.8 billion new rubles—on credit. This unselfishness, so-called, becomes less impressive if we calculate that, according to this disclosure, the Soviet Union has been spending 10 rubles per head for all the bloc countries (except the Soviet Union) and this grandiose program has been in operation for 5 years or more. Hence, the "unselfish" Soviet help amounts to 20 U.S. cents per year per capita in all satellite countries.

I now want to place the quotations dealing with the Soviet bloc in the record. They are as follows:

"The world Socialist system at the present time is an association (sovkupnost) of the national economies of sovereign, independent countries."

"The growing strength of the links between the national economies of the socialist countries is a natural law of the development of the world Socialist

"* * * the fraternal parties have agreed with the conclusions of our delegation. The question may arise: Will our international solidarity not be weakened by the fact that this provision is not written down in the statement? No; it will not be weakened. At the present time, there is no statute which could regulate relations between parties. Instead, we have a common Marxist-Leninist ideology, and loyalty to it is the main condition of our solidarity and unity" (p. 76, par. 8).

"The role of the Soviet Union does not lie in the fact that it leads other Socialist countries, but in the fact that it was the first to blaze the trail to socialism, is the most powerful country in the world Socialist system, has amassed a great deal of positive experience in the struggle for the building of socialism, and was the first to enter the period of comprehensive construction of communism. It is stressed in the statement that the universally acknowledged vanguard of the world Communist movement has been and still remains the CPSU, as the most experienced and hardened unit of the international Communist movement" (p. 76, par. 5).

"At the moment, when there exists a large group of Socialist countries, each of which is faced with its own tasks, when there are 87 Communist and Workers Parties functioning, each of which moreover is also faced with its own tasks, it is not possible for leadership over Socialist countries and Communist parties to be exercised from any center at all. This is neither possible nor necessary" (p. 76, par. 6).

"There have grown up in the Communist parties hardened Marxist-Leninist cadres capable of leading their own parties, their countries. However, in practice, as is well known, the CPSU does not give directives to any other parties. The fact that we are called the leader gives no advantages either to our party or to other parties. On the contrary, it only creates difficulties" (p. 76, par. 7).

"* * * we declared before the whole world that in the Communist movement, just as in the Socialist camp, there has existed and exists complete equality of rights and solidarity of all Communist and Workers Parties and socialist countries. The CPSU in reality does not exercise leadership over other parties. In the Communist movement there are no parties that are superior or subordinate. All Communist parties are equal and independent. All carry responsibility for the destiny of the Communist movement, for its victories and failures" (p. 76, par. 4).

"The CPSU is filled with unswerving determination to strengthen the unity and friendship with all fraternal parties of Socialist countries and with the Marxist-Leninist parties of all the world" (p. 78, par. 1).

"The CPSU and Soviet people will do everything to insure that the unity of our parties and our peoples will increasingly strengthen so as not only to disappoint the enemies but to shake them even more with our unity and to attain our great goal—the triumph of communism" (p. 78, par. 3).

"A resolute defense of the unity of the international Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and a prevention of any action capable of undermining this unit constitute a necessary condition for a victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy, and peace, and for a successful solution of the tasks of the socialist revolution, the building of socialism and communism. A violation of these principles would lead to a weakening of the forces of communism" (p. 75, par. 9).

"Coordination of national economic plans has become the basic form of combining the productive efforts of Socialist countries at the present stage" (p. 61, par. 8).

"Of course, in so new and major a matter individual shortcomings and some rough edges are unavoidable" (p. 62, par. 4).

"The Socialist commonwealth (World Marxist Review version: community), however, is characterized not by these shortcomings of a private nature, but by the essentially internationalist nature of socialism, the internationalist policy of the fraternal parties and countries, and the world-historic successes achieved because of it" (p. 62, par. 4).

"Regarding the shortcomings, we must remove them * * * keeping as the main aim the solidarity of the Socialist camp. The Soviet Union has always sacredly fulfilled and is fulfilling its international duty, placing the unity of countries of the Socialist camp, of the international Communist movement, above all else" (p. 62, par. 5).

"There are not and cannot be any insoluble contradictions between the Socialist countries. The more highly developed and economically powerful countries give unselfish, brotherly help to the economically undeveloped. About 500 industrial enterprises and installations have been built in the fraternal Socialist countries with the help of the Soviet Union; loans and credits advanced by us to these countries total 7.8 billion new rubles" (p. 61, par. 5).

"* * * I would like to refer to our invariable endeavor to strengthen the bonds of fraternal friendship with the Chinese Communist Party, with the great Chinese people. In our relations with the Chinese Communist Party our party is always guided by the fact that the friendship of the two great peoples, the cohesion of our two parties—the largest in the international Communist movement—is of exceptional importance in the struggle for the triumph of our common cause. Our party has always made, and will continue to make, every effort to strengthen this great friendship. With People's China, with the Chinese Communists, just as with the Communists of all countries, we share one goal, the safeguarding of peace and the building of communism; we share common interests, the happiness and well-being of the working people; and we share the common basis of firm principles, Marxism-Leninism" (p. 78, par. 2).

"After all, the Communist and Workers Parties attending the conference unanimously worked out their decisions. Every party will adhere to these decisions in a strict and sacred manner, throughout its activities" (p. 77, par. 5).

(World Marxist Review version, p. 27, second column, par. 2: "Now that all the Communist and Workers' parties have adopted unanimous decisions at the Meeting, each Party will strictly and undeviatingly abide by these decisions in everything it does.")

ON AESOPIAN LANGUAGE

I now turn to Khrushchev's discussion of Aesopian or trick language. There is a general understanding within the Communist world movement, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would "spare no efforts to fulfill its international obligation." This obligation is considered to be "sacred." Upon proposal by the CPSU delegation, a statement to this effect was not included in the Declaration of the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of November 1960, obviously because it might prove embarrassing.

Khrushchev's speech, which incidentally is in the nature of a commentary on this international statement, includes specific injunctions to the Communist Parties on the proper use of language. The Communists must use only those terms which are acceptable in their respective areas. "Sectarianism" which is Communist lingo for the use of the original Marxist-Leninist language, "can do great harm to our cause."

Mr. Khrushchev proclaimed that the Communists propose to renovate the world on "the principles of freedom, democracy, and socialism." He referred to the "Manifesto" of the First International, written by Marx which contained an appeal that "the simple laws of morality and justice, which ought to guide private individuals, should become the highest laws in relations between nations." He thus created the impression as though the Communists, for all time, have been upholding morality, justice, freedom, and democracy, both in private and in international life.

It is perhaps worthwhile to recall that on November 4, 1864, Marx wrote a letter to Engels in which he disclosed that he had been obliged by the committee drafting the statutes of the International Workingmen's Association to put into the preamble two cliché sentences on "duty" and "right," and to refer to "truth, morality, and justice." However, he assured Engels that he had placed these phrases in such a manner that they could do no harm and added that it takes time till the "reawakened movement allows the old boldness of language." In the meantime, it was necessary to follow the old Latin proverb, "Fortiter in re suaviter in modo."

It is quite certain that Khrushchev is aware of this revealing passage in Marx's correspondence. He referred to the statute of the first international in order to indicate to the Communist world movement that it should have no doubts about the unchanged allegiance of the Kremlin to the orthodox Marxist creed (see app. I for a passage from this first international document).

In his January 6 speech, Khrushchev said:

"Our party, nurtured by Lenin, has always regarded it as its foremost duty to fulfill international obligations to the international working class. The delegation assured the participants of the conference that the party in the future too would bear high the banner of proletarian internationalism and would spare no effort to fulfill its international obligations. At the same time, the CPSU delegation proposed that the wording should not be included in the declaration or other documents of the Communist movement" (p. 76, par. 2).

"These parties have concentrated their attention on what is most important: how to approach their own peoples correctly, to convince the broadest masses that their best future is indissolubly connected with the struggle against imperialism and reactionary internal forces, and also how to strengthen international solidarity between Socialist states and the Communist advance guard of the world of toilers. 'The renovation of the world on the principles of freedom, democracy, and socialism in which we are participating is a great historic process in which various revolutionary and democratic movements unite and work in concert under the determining influence of Socialist revolutions'" (p. 70, par. 3).

"* * * the constituent manifesto of the First International, written by Marx, contained an appeal that the simple laws of morality and justice, which ought to guide private individuals, should become the highest laws in relations between nations" (p. 67, par. 6).

(World Marxist Review version, p. 17, par. 5, second column: "Peace and progress are our cherished ideals. After all, the inaugural manifesto of the First International, written by Marx, contained the appeal 'to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.' (Marx, Engels, *Selected Works*, F.L.P.H., Vol. I, p. 385).")

"The Communist movement has another danger: Dogmatism and sectarianism. At the present time, when a rallying of all forces for the struggle against imperialism, for the prevention of war, and for the overthrow of the monopolies is required, dogmatism and sectarianism can do great harm to our cause. Leninism is uncompromising toward dogmatism" (p. 75, par. 2).

"Dogmatism and sectarianism are in irreconcilable contradiction to the creative development of revolutionary theory and its creative application in practice. They lead to the isolation of Communists from the broad strata of the workers; they condemn them to passive temporizing or leftist-adventurist activities in the revolutionary struggle; they prevent full use of all opportunities in the interests of the victory of the working class and all democratic forces" (p. 75, par. 3).

"* * * dogmatism and sectarianism may even become the main danger at one stage or another of the development of individual parties" (p. 75, par. 4).

ON THE CURRENT "ERA"

Khrushchev devoted some time to discussing the question of periodicity. A problem of this sort will appear abstruse to all listeners who do not believe that history is foreordained and developing according to predetermined phases. For a Marxist, however, the determination of the exact epoch in which he is living is of the greatest significance. It is on the basis of this determination that a Marxist planner formulates the general principles of his strategy. It is necessary to stress this point because within the framework of Western thought, such a methodology appears entirely irrational.

Now, according to Mr. Khrushchev, capitalism has been hurt irreparably, socialism is becoming increasingly strong, and is moving into a position where it can determine the course of international relations. In fact, it is becoming the decisive factor of world politics. While previously history was working for socialism, henceforth, according to the Kremlin spokesman, socialism is going to work for history. This is as good an example of hybris as I know in recent times. Hitler said: "Providence predestined me to be the greatest liberator of mankind."

Says Khrushchev: "Communism has become the invincible force of our century." This statement is no less extraordinary in that, in past times, many revolutionists and aggressors have felt as optimistically about their future.

Khrushchev pointed out, and here I must agree with him, that the prospects for communism have been developing in an unexpectedly favorable manner.

The meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties concerned itself with the current "era" and ascribed to it a quadruple meaning: In the current era, "diametrically opposed social systems" are struggling against each other; socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions are taking place, and the colonial system is being liquidated; capitalism is collapsing; and Marxism-Leninism is triumphing on a world scale.

From the January 6 speech:

"* * * Marxist-Leninist appraisal of our epoch * * * should provide a clear idea of which class stands in the center of the era and what the essence, direction, and tasks of social development are" (p. 54, par. 10).

"* * * The question of the character of the era is by no means an abstract or a narrow theoretical question. The general strategic line and tactics of world communism, of each Communist Party, are closely related to it" (p. 54, par. 6).

"* * * there no longer exists an all-enveloping chain of imperialism. The dictatorship of the working class has stepped out of the boundaries of one country, has become an international force" (p. 55, par. 7).

"The losses of capitalism as a result of these blows are irreparable. This refers both to the entire system of capitalism and to its main power, the United States" (p. 56, par. 3).

"Under present conditions, prerequisites have been created for socialism to determine increasingly the nature, methods, and ways of international relations" (p. 55, par. 9).

"Socialist revolution has achieved victory in a large number of countries, socialism has become a powerful world system, the colonial system of imperialism verges on complete disintegration, and imperialism is in a state of decline and crisis. The definition of our epoch must reflect these decisive events" (p. 55, par. 1).

"* * * the world Socialist system is becoming a decisive factor in the development of human society" (p. 55, par. 9).

"* * * life has greatly surpassed even the boldest and most optimistic predictions and expectations. Once it was customary to say that history was working for socialism; at the same time, one remembered that mankind would dump capitalism and that socialism would be victorious. Today, it is possible to assert

that socialism is working for history, for the basic content of the contemporary historical process constitutes the establishment and consolidation of socialism on an international scale" (p. 53, par. 6).

* * * "The historical epoch brilliantly foreseen by Vladimir Ilich Lenin has become a qualitative, basic, new era in world history. Not a single preceding era can be compared to it" (p. 53, par. 7).

* * * the Marxist-Leninist definition of the current era * * * shows the fresh prospects opening before the international communist, workers, and liberation movements (p. 53, par. 1).

* "The statement of the conference provides the following definition of our era: "Our era, whose essence is the transition from capitalism to socialism begun by the great October Socialist Revolution, is an era of the struggle of two diametrically opposed social systems, an era of Socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions, an era of the collapse of capitalism and of liquidation of the colonial system, an era of the change to the road of socialism by more and more nations, and of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale" (p. 53, par. 2).

* "Our epoch is the epoch of the triumph of Marxism-Leninism" (p. 53, par. 5).

* * * we live in a splendid time: communism has become the invincible force of our century" (p. 73, par. 4).

ON COMMUNIST INVINCIBILITY

Khrushchev attempted to explain why he considers the Communists to be "invincible." He predicts that the Communist ideology will conquer the minds of the majority of the world population but he doesn't bother to produce, so far as I can see, the evidence for this extraordinary assertion. Communism has not made much ideological progress and it has stagnated even in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev is a little bit more explicit about economics and he has a field day playing around with rather amazing statistics. For example, he asserts that the annual average growth rate in all the socialist countries amounts to 17 percent. This, according to his arithmetic, is more than four times higher than the average growth rate of the capitalist countries, whoever they may be. If the socialist countries indeed are achieving a growth rate of about 17 percent, they would be investing more than 50 percent of their gross national product, which of course they are not doing. Khrushchev's statistics, as usual, confuse net and gross figures. Otherwise, they presumably constitute overfulfillment of the production plan that was assigned to the statistical office.

Khrushchev predicts that Soviet industrial output will exceed the plan by about 90 billion new rubles. This sounds impressive but actually merely means an increment of \$40 per head of the Soviet population. I am pointing this out, not in order to belittle the accomplishment of Soviet economic growth, but to stress that Khrushchev is putting the best possible interpretation on Soviet economic development.

By contrast he asserts that U.S. production just is keeping abreast of the population increase. He even suggests that U.S. production actually is declining. He overplays American unemployment, makes great fuss about the alleged decline of the American international economic posture, and alleges that Western Europe also is declining economically, which is nonsense. It would lead too far to show why and where these various interpretations are false.

The point is that Khrushchev predicts Soviet victory in the economic competition with the United States. This looked-for victory will be a major, or even the biggest, turning point in history. According to this speech, much of Soviet strategy is based upon the expectation that this turning point in history will be reached soon, by 1965-70.

It is hard for me to imagine that the Soviet leaders, in their secret councils, actually believe that they can catch up, let alone overtake the United States economically within the next 5, 10, or 15 years, or even in any predictable future. If they really do not believe this, then we must consider that the entire strategy is based upon the expectation that this turning point in history will be reached soon, by 1965-70. We have additional comments on this point later.

On the other hand, if they do believe that the Soviet Union will overtake the United States, they are in for a bitter disappointment.

Consequently, we must expect that the current Soviet strategy will be modified within the next 5 years, or at any rate after the demise of Khrushchev, regardless of whether Khrushchev, because of the failure of the strategy, will be kicked out, or whether Soviet strategy will be changed after he has become incapacitated.

At any rate, there is good reason to assume from the wording of Khrushchev's speech, that Soviet strategy, in the present era, is predicated on the unrealistic but major premise that the U.S.S.R. will outstrip the United States in volume of production by 1965. I believe that the Kremlin is not aiming at winning the economic competition but is making every effort to win the technological race. This goal is far less unrealistic.

* * * "The revolutionary emergence of more and more peoples into the world arena creates exceptionally favorable conditions for an unprecedented broadening of the sphere of influence of Marxism-Leninism."

"The time is not far way when Marxism-Leninism will possess the minds of the majority of the world's population * * *" (p. 54, par. 2).

* * * the march of socialism [is] invincible. * * * Marxism-Leninism today dominates the minds of literally hundreds of millions of people and thereby constitutes, if one is to apply Marx's words, a mighty material force" (p. 53, par. 10).

Since 1957 [supplied] "the volume of industrial production in the Socialist countries rose 37.1 percent and the industrial output in the capitalist countries increased 7.4 percent. During the same time industrial production in the U.S.S.R. rose by 23 percent and in the United States by only 4.6 percent. The average annual rate of increase in all the Socialist countries amounted to 17 percent and in the capitalist countries to 3.6 percent. The average annual rate of increase in the U.S.S.R. in that period amounted to 10.9 percent and in the United States to 2.3 percent" (p. 57, par. 9).

"As shown by calculations of economists, by 1965 the U.S.S.R. will outstrip the United States in volume of production, and will outstrip the United States in per capita production by approximately 1970" (p. 58, par. 10).

"We will switch over part of the capital investment into agriculture and into light industry. It is impossible to build communism by offering only machines and ferrous and nonferrous metals. People should be able to eat properly and dress well, to have adequate housing conditions, and other material and cultural advantages. This is not a revision of our general line but a sensible utilization of our material possibilities" (p. 58, par. 4).

"If the present rates are preserved, industrial output will not increase 80 percent in seven years as envisaged in the plan, but will almost double. This will mean that industrial production in an amount of about 90 billion new rubles will be produced in excess of plan" (p. 57, par. 12).

"To explain more clearly what this figure means, let me remind you that Vladimir Ilich Lenin reported with pride to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International that our country in 1922 for the first time had been able to invest 20 million rubles in heavy industry. You see how modest the figures of 1922 were and what possibilities we have today" (p. 58, par. 2).

"In the postwar period, the United States has experienced three critical production slumps: 1948-1949, 1953-1954, and particularly 1957-1958. During the past year, according to estimates of the American press, U.S. industrial production increased by only 2 percent. For 1961, American economists predict not an increase but a decline of about 3.7 percent in production, and may be even more. In the U.S.S.R. production increased about 10 percent in 1960" (p. 56, par. 4).

"* * * that country [United States] has been falling off in postwar years and is now just managing to keep ahead of the population increase" (p. 56, par. 7).

"According to clearly optimistic official statistics (obviously garbled official U.S. figures), the number of unemployed in the United States rose from 2.6 million people in 1956 to 3.8 million in 1959, and to more than 4 million by the end of 1960. Moreover, there is a multimillion army of semiunemployed in the United States" (p. 56, par. 5).

"The U.S. share of industrial output of capitalist countries has fallen from 54 percent in 1950 to 47-48 percent in 1959."

"The U.S. share in the exports of capitalist countries sank from more than 30 percent in 1946 to 21 percent in 1953, and to 17.4 percent in 1959" (p. 56, par. 8).

"As regards the economy of the other capitalist countries, it is also characterized by increasing instability" (p. 56, par. 10).

"The conference reached a conclusion which is of great theoretical and political significance. This conclusion states:

"The development of the common crisis of capitalism has reached a new stage.

"The peculiarity of this stage is that it emerged, not in connection with the world war, but in conditions of competition and struggle between the two systems; in the ever-increasing change in the correlation of forces to the advantage of socialism; in the acute aggravation of all the contradictions of imperialism; under conditions when the successful struggle of the peace-loving forces for establishment and stabilization of world coexistence has prevented the imperialists from undermining world peace with their aggressive actions; and under conditions of an increasing struggle by the masses for democracy, national liberation, and socialism" (p. 57, par. 3).

"* * * in the economic field as well as in the field of international politics, the main power of capitalism has entered a phase of growing difficulties and crises—the phase of its decline" (WMR version: "the twilight phase") (p. 56, par. 9).

"The victory of the U.S.S.R. in economic competition with the United States, the victory of the whole Socialist system over the capitalist system, will be the biggest (WMR version: 'a major') turning point in history, will exert a still more powerful, revolutionizing influence on the workers movement all over the world. Then, even to the greatest skeptics, it will become clear that it is only socialism that provides everything necessary for the happy life of man, and they will make their choice in favor of socialism" (p. 59, par. 2).

ON COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

I now turn to the Communist objectives as enunciated by Mr. Khrushchev. First and foremost, he reasserts the objective of a worldwide triumph of communism, and for clarity's sake, I should add that this objective, of course, includes the communization of the United States. In one instance, Khrushchev departed from the current practice of employing the Aesopian language and referred specifically to proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The prototype of the society which the Communists intend to introduce in all continents is presently being built up behind the Iron Curtain. He says, I am sure that the young idealists within the free world who are dreaming about a Communist egalitarian society have a more appealing Utopia in mind.

Khrushchev assigns specific objectives to the working class, namely to carry out revolution and rebuff imperialist reaction; to the national independence movements (which he considers to be part of the world Communist system), namely, to end Western and Western-oriented regimes in the underdeveloped areas and draw the new countries into the Soviet system; and to pacifists, namely, to give strategic protection to the Soviet bloc and to contribute their share to the successful implementation of the strategy of peaceful coexistence. The working class, the national independence movements, and the pacifists are joined together, as two prongs of a pincer movement in worldwide political warfare.

According to Communist doctrine, universal peace can prevail only after the worldwide victory of communism has been accomplished. This point is reiterated, though largely by implication, by Mr. Khrushchev.

The significance is that the Communists do not believe that peace, and hence disarmament, are feasible before they have won the world. In fact, in their parlance, total peace is a synonym for communism. But the peace slogan and disarmament policies are being used as part of Soviet strategy to win the struggle against the United States and its allies. Furthermore, the incessant insistence on the blessings of peace is a propagandist detour to enlist new adherents to communism. I will have additional comments on this subject later.

Khrushchev said, on this subject:

"The unity of the ranks of every communist party and the unity of all communist parties constitute the united international communist movement directed at the achievement of our common goal—the triumph of communism throughout the world" (p. 77, par. 6).

World Marxist Review version, p. 27, second column, par. 4: "The unity of every Communist Party, the unity of all the Communist parties, is what makes up the integral world Communist movement, which is aimed at achieving our common goal, victory for communism throughout the world. The main thing that is required of all the Communist and Workers' parties today, is perseveringly to strengthen to the utmost the unity and cohesion of their ranks. The unity of the ranks of the Communist movement is especially important in present conditions. This is due to the historic tasks the Communist movement is called upon to perform."

* * * * *

"Recognition of the necessity of a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into a Socialist society is an axiom for us Soviet Communists, sons of the October Revolution. The path to socialism lies through proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (p. 73, par. 1).

* * * * *

"In the part of the earth occupied by the world Socialist system, the prototype of a new society for all mankind is being created" (p. 61, par. 4).

* * * * *

"The working class, the workers of the capitalist countries, awaited the answers to the questions on how best to carry on the struggle for their revolutionary aims, for social progress, for democratic rights and freedoms, and how to give a more successful rebuff to imperialist reaction.

"The fighters for national independence awaited an answer to the questions on how one can rapidly put an end forever to the shameful system of colonialism and insure the development of the countries that have become liberated on the path of national independence, peace, and social progress.

"All peace-loving mankind awaited the answer to the most burning question of the present day—how to prevent a world thermonuclear war and attain lasting peace on earth and friendship among all the peoples, and how to insure peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems" (p. 52, pars. 1, 2, 3).

* * * * *

"The documents of the conference point the way for the development of the world Socialist system and for further unification of the Socialist camp. They determine the major problems of the struggle by the working class in capitalist countries, the struggle for liquidation of the disgraceful colonial system and unification of all forces acting against the threat of a new war" (p. 53, par. 1).

* * * * *

"The peoples believe that Communists will use the entire might of the Socialist system and the increased strength of the international working class to deliver mankind from the horrors of war. Marx, Engels, and Lenin considered that the historic mission of the working class and its Communist vanguard consisted not only in abolishing the oppression of exploitation, poverty, and lack of rights, but in ridding mankind of bloody wars" (p. 62, par. 8).

* * * * *

"One of the decisive sources of the moral strength of communism, of its great influence on the masses, is that it comes forth as a standard-bearer in the struggle for peace. It is the banner of peace that enables us to rally the broadest

popular masses around us. If we carry high the banner of peace, we shall score even greater successes" (p. 68, par. 9).

* * * * *

"Wars have followed the division of the society into classes, i.e., the basis for the beginning of all wars will be finally eliminated only when the division of the society into hostile antagonistic classes is abolished. The victory of the working class throughout the world and the victory of socialism will bring about the removal of all social and national causes of the outbreak of wars, and mankind will be able to rid itself forever of that dreadful plight" (p. 63, par. 2).

* * * * *

"We can be proud of the fact that the peoples' notions of peace and communism are all the more being identified as a single unit" (p. 68, par. 7).

* * * * *

"The Communists see their historical mission not only in abolition of exploitation and poverty all over the world and in excluding forever the possibility of any war in the life of human society, but in delivering mankind in the current era from the nightmare of a new world war" (p. 68, par. 11).

* * * * *

"The CPSU * * * will always struggle for universal peace, for the victory of communism * * * (p. 78, par. 5).

ON THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF STRATEGY

Soviet strategy is based on three general principles, according to Mr. Khrushchev's January 1961 speech. These principles are, first, the correct determination of the correlation of forces, specifically—presumably—the correct determination of the force relationship between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. The second principle is to exploit opportunities which present themselves. The third principle is to continue the advance of communism. This third principle used to be applied by Stalin under the heading of "constant pressure."

Khrushchev's views:

"We always seek to direct the development of events in a way which insures that, while defending the interests of the socialist camp, we do not provide the imperialist provocateurs with a chance to unleash a new world war" (p. 66, par. 9).

* * * * *

"* * * We must * * * determine correctly the correlation of forces, to exploit new possibilities which the present era opens up for the further advancement of our great cause" (p. 54, par. 9).

ON MASS MOVEMENTS

Communist strategy is predicated on the utilization of mass movements and above all upon the building and training of the "political army of the Socialist revolution." The term "political army" is a Communist expression of long standing to describe the Communist Party and its subsidiary organizations. The term denotes the idea that within the Communist conflict machine, the military forces and the political army must be developed into an integrated whole.

Otherwise, Mr. Khrushchev's speech highlights some of the standard mass movements of Communist history, the workers, peasants, women, and youth. The listing of young national states and countries opposing war in a paragraph referring to mass movements is perhaps novel but peace partisans who also are listed in this passage have been considered perhaps the most important single Communist mass movement since 1950.

I call your attention to the fact that infiltration into the armed forces of the free world is again, like in the late twenties and early thirties, emphasized as an important strategic operation. In short, we have two new types of "mass movement"; and military infiltration must be expected to be undertaken on a mass scale. I hope this warning will not go unheeded throughout the free world.

These are Khrushchev's statements on the subject:

"The Communists feel that if all progressive and peace-loving forces of our times, countries belonging to the Socialist system, the international working class,

the national liberation movement, young national states and all countries opposing war, all peace partisans, will wage a resolute struggle against the danger of war, they can tie the hands of warmongers and prevent a new world war catastrophe" (p. 68, par. 8).

* * * youth is a great revolutionary force. No other political party can attract young people in the same way as the Communists, the most revolutionary party. And young people like bold revolutionary actions" (p. 68, par. 2).

* * * "It is a very complicated thing to lead the masses to Socialist revolution. It is known from our party's experience that the Bolsheviks, struggling for power, devoted their principal attention to working among the masses, to establishment and consolidation of the union of the working class with the peasantry, to training the political army of the Socialist revolution. Leninists worked wherever there were masses—among the workers, peasants, women, young people, in the army" (p. 74, par. 1).

ON THE STRATEGY OF THE PEACE SLOGAN

Here are a few key quotes from the January speech which show that the peace slogan serves above all to mobilize the political army:

* * * the very appreciation of the threat of devastating war strengthens the will of the masses to struggle against war. Therefore it is essential to warn the masses of the most dangerous consequences of a new world war and, thereby, to rouse the sacred wrath of the peoples against those who are preparing this crime" (p. 65, par. 10).

* * * "We warn of a threat of war in order to raise the vigilance and energy of the peoples and to mobilize them for the struggle to prevent world war" (p. 63, par. 1).

* * * a persistent pursuance of a policy of preventing war and of mobilizing the masses for the solution of this task" (p. 65, par. 9).

* * * "The present international Communist and Workers movement has attained such might and organization that it poses for itself the practical task of delivering mankind from the calamities of a new war. The statement of the conference says: The Communists see their historical mission not only in abolition of exploitation and poverty all over the world and in excluding forever the possibility of any war in the life of human society, but in delivering mankind in the current era from the nightmare of a new world war" (p. 68, par. 11).

ON TACTICAL FLEXIBILITY

Ever since Lenin wrote his treatise on Left Radicalism, the Communist leaders have been placing great emphasis on the need for tactical flexibility. Lenin stressed above all, the need for Communists to master all forms of struggle. This point is still held in high esteem by the Communists of today, but equal emphasis is laid on the need for local strategies which Communists must pursue in the several countries. In brief, the injunction is to use those slogans which hold the greatest appeal to the masses. Local appeal is more important than worldwide consistency.

This particular strategy is related to the technique of the Aesopian language. Also, it has a bearing on the relations between the countries within the Soviet bloc, each of which, within limits, may use its own particular methods.

It is very important to understand that flexibility in tactics and operation, and even broad divergences of policies, are considered permissible and even necessary by the Kremlin, provided the differences are synchronized in such a manner that the unity of the world Communist movement is not impaired. Obviously, this is a very grave problem but the Communist leaders are fully aware of it and apparently are devoting a great deal of attention to the best methods of reconciling contradictory operational requirements within a unified strategic framework.

Some quotations on this matter from the speech and elsewhere:

"* * * we must understand such strivings by the fraternal parties, who know better the conditions and peculiarities in their countries. We are proceeding from the statement by the great Lenin that all nations will come to socialism. This is unavoidable. But all will not come in the same way. Each of them will bring its own traits into one or another form of democracy, into one or another variety of dictatorship of the proletariat, into one or another rate of Socialist transformations in various aspects of social life. But, of course, there is no need to exaggerate the significance of these peculiarities * * *" (p. 77, par. 4).

World Marxist Review version, p. 27, par. 4: "We act upon the behest of the great Lenin that 'all nations will come to socialism; that is certain, but all of them will come to it not in entirely identical ways and each will contribute something of its own to this or that form of democracy, this or that variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this or that rate of Socialist change in the various aspects of social development'" (Collected Works, Russ. Ed., Vol. 23, p. 58).

* * *
"Each party can see better which slogan at any moment corresponds best with the task of winning the masses, leading them forward, stimulating cohesion of the political army of the socialist revolution" (p. 74, par. 1).

* * *
"The correct application of this experience, the correct determination of which policy should be pursued, naturally can be done only by the actual party functioning in the given country" (p. 70, par. 2).

ON ALL FORMS OF STRUGGLE

As pointed out, Communists are enjoined to master "all forms of struggle." This reminder by Khrushchev is in the truest tradition of Lenin. I call your attention to his emphasis that these forms of struggle include peaceful and non-peaceful means, or as we would put it, violent and nonviolent, or military and peaceful methods. Under this heading, the utilization of violent methods, which of course include war, becomes legitimate whenever the situation can best be handled by war and whenever communism cannot be advanced except through war.

Khrushchev says:

"The Communists regard it their sacred duty to make full use of all possibilities created for the peoples by the present era to curb the bellicose forces of imperialism, to prevent a new war" (p. 68, par. 10).

* * *
"They direct Communist parties toward cohesion of the working class and the majority of people to master all forms of struggle—peaceful and nonpeaceful, parliamentary and nonparliamentary. Lenin taught the Communists to be ready, depending on the situation, to make use of one form or another of struggle and to educate the working masses in the spirit of readiness for resolute revolutionary actions" (p. 73, par. 8).

ON STRATEGIC COORDINATION

The following invocations on the need for the Communist Parties to "synchronize their watches" are an essential complement to the requirement for tactical flexibility. Synchronization necessarily demands that one watch be selected as the time master. Hence, this international Communist synchronization must needs take place under Kremlin control. One of the main international and "sacred" obligations of the Soviet Union is to supervise the synchronization within the world Communist movement. Synchronization is an Aesopian term for leadership and control although, no doubt, the old control methods which still could be used in Stalin's time no longer are effective.

These are Khrushchev's words:

"Our party, nurtured by Lenin, has always regarded it as its foremost duty to fulfill international obligations to the international working class. The delegation assured the participants of the conference that the party in the future too would bear high the banner of proletarian internationalism and would spare no effort to fulfill its international obligations" (p. 76, par. 2).

* * *
"We must synchronize their watches" (p. 77, par. 5).

ON THE BASIC STRENGTHS OF COMMUNISM

Strategy is the planned and directed employment of forces and strengths. According to Khrushchev, the Communist world movement has three basic strengths: First, the military might of the Soviet bloc; second, the revolutionary movements within the free world; and third, the sympathizers of communism, notably at present, the various types of pacifists.

The strengths could be described as (a) the military forces under Communist command (b) the "political armies" and political parties under Communist command or secret control, including secret organizations dealing with espionage and the like; and (c) the numerous front organizations operating throughout the free world.

In this analysis, Khrushchev shows himself to be a highly orthodox Stalinist; and like Hitler he apparently desires to go down the road which providence prescribed for him. The difference is that Hitler relied on "sombambulist certainty" and Khrushchev relies on the "certainty" of the Marxist-Leninist theory.

He had this to say:

"There is only one way of bringing imperialism to heel, the unflagging consolidation of the economic, political, and military might of the Socialist states, an all-out unification and consolidation of the world revolutionary movement, and the mobilization of the broad popular masses for the struggle to prevent the danger of war" (p. 66, par. 9).

* * * * *

"The CPSU (Central Committee) and Soviet Government will continue with determination to do everything to enhance the military might of our country * * *" (p. 66, par. 10).

ON BASIC STRATEGIC UNDERTAKINGS

The basic undertakings of Soviet strategy, according to Khrushchev, include the advancement of the economic power of the Soviet bloc, industrialization throughout the bloc, and the advancement of Soviet technology—all of this as quickly as possible; as well as the molding of men suitable for the future Communist society, an undertaking which we would describe as morale building.

Khrushchev admits that there are no ready answers for many newly arising problems, a remark to which I feel not too much ideological weight should be attached. It is significant, however, that he describes the winning of time in the economic contest with capitalism as "the main thing." This, to some extent, is contradictory to his other statements on the twilight of capitalism and the possibility that communism may win the struggle even within the current historical era.

This is his language:

"* * * the primary task of Socialist countries is to exploit possibilities inherent in socialism to outstrip, as soon as possible, the world capitalist system in absolute volume of industrial and agricultural production and then to overtake the most developed capitalist countries in per capita production and living standards" (p. 57, par. 7).

* * * * *

"Chief among these tasks are creation of the material-technical base of communism, development on this foundation of communist social relations, and molding the man of the future Communist society" (p. 57, par. 11).

* * * * *

"The assistance of the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist states to countries which have won their independence pursues a single goal: To contribute to the strengthening of the position of those countries in the struggle against imperialism, to the development of their national economies, and to the improvement of the living conditions of their peoples" (p. 71, par. 6).

* * * * *

"The effectiveness of this [assistance by U.S.S.R.] was first demonstrated by the example of certain central Asian and Caucasian peoples, backward in the past, who when greatly assisted by the more advanced Socialist nations, notably by the Russian nation, quickly overcame their backwardness and have now taken their place in the ranks of the industrially developed regions of the country.

The process is now taking place within the whole Socialist system" (p. 62, par. 2).

"By solving the task of gradually overcoming the differences which have arisen in the course of history in the levels of economic development, we are showing to the peoples of the whole world the Communist way toward liquidation of economic and cultural backwardness to which they have been doomed by imperialism" (p. 62, par. 1).

"The practice of Communist construction raises many such questions, which have no ready answers. We advance along unexplored paths in building communism. Mankind still does not possess the complete theoretical background and the experience of organizing all aspects of society's life under communism" (p. 59, par. 10).

"To win time in the economic contest with capitalism is now the main thing. The quicker we increase economic construction, the stronger we are economically and politically, the greater will be the influence of the Socialist camp on historical development, on the destiny of the world" (p. 59, par. 3).

ON CURRENT THRUSTS

In addition to their long-range undertakings, Communist strategists recognize the need for current thrusts. Khrushchev refers to the division among the "Imperialists" during the period of the two World Wars which was one of the key conditions enabling communism to advance. It may be recalled that Stalin, by concluding an alliance with Hitler, rendered World War II inevitable. Stalin's maneuver was entirely in line with old Communist rules about the need to take advantage of, and to create antagonisms within, the camp of the opponents. Under current circumstances, of course, the free world is more or less united and Khrushchev acknowledges as much, but he adds that possibilities of creating strategically significant antagonisms and cleavages, do exist.

One of the main objectives of the Soviet Union is to destroy the free world alliances and to divide the free world into several hostile blocs. It is quite clear from Khrushchev's statement that he thinks the Berlin question and German rearmament provide an opening through which the free world could be disunited. It is for this strategic purpose—and not because Berlin is a "bone in his throat"—that the Berlin-German issue which could very well be entirely dormant, is brought up time and again.

Khrushchev said in the January speech:

"* * * the capitalist world is not divided into two imperialist camps, as it was on the eve of both world wars. Nevertheless, it is far from united and is divided by a cruel internal struggle" (p. 66, par. 11).

"We set ourselves the task of exposing the aggressive essence of all military-political alignments of the imperialists like NATO, SEATO, and CENTO, of seeking their isolation and ultimate liquidation. * * *

"The program of peaceful German settlement submitted by Socialist states and the solution on this basis of the question of West Berlin have to a great extent assisted an exposing of the aggressive circles of the United States, the German Federal Republic, and other NATO participants as opponents of a relaxation of tension.

"The international positions of the GDR—the outpost of socialism in Western Europe—have become stronger. The positions of the United States, Great Britain, and France have turned out to be particularly vulnerable in West Berlin" (p. 67, par. 3).

(World Marxist Review version (p. 17, par. 5): "Of special importance for peace in Europe, and not only in Europe, is the struggle against renascent West German militarism. The Soviet Union is waging this struggle together with the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Socialist countries in various ways, the most important being the struggle for a peace treaty. The initiative of the Socialist states in advancing a program for a peaceful settlement of the German question and the solution, on this basis, of the question of West Berlin, had done much to unmask the aggressive elements in the USA, the Federal Republic and other NATO countries as opponents of a detente. The international position of the German Democratic Republic—the outpost of socialism in Western Europe—has been strengthened.")

“* * * to do away with the occupational regime in West Berlin, and, thus, to eradicate this splinter (WMR: *thorn*) from the heart of Europe” (p. 67, par. 8).

“The struggle against the revival of German militarism is of particular importance for the consolidation of peace in Europe, and not only in Europe” (p. 67, par. 1).

“The revival of German militarism and revanchism * * * restores a most complicated range of Anglo-German, Franco-German, and other imperialist contradictions. If we compare the present position of capitalism with its position after World War II, it becomes clear that a great deepening in the general crises of capitalism has taken place” (p. 57, par. 1).

ON THE ROLE OF WAR

In all strategic discussions the question of war looms high. It will be recalled that, shortly after World War I, when it became apparent that the 19th-century Communist technique of uprising was inadequate to bring about revolution, war came to be considered as the main instrument of Communist seizures of power. Stalin, supported by Frunze and Tukhachevski, was the main theoretician who upheld this point of view. Trotsky was more ambiguous on the subject. (This did not prevent him from conquering Georgia by an aggressive war.)

Khrushchev now points out that war is not a necessary condition for Communist successes because proletarian revolutions are “first of all, a consequence of the development of the class struggle.” In this modification of Stalin’s original doctrine, Khrushchev is justified, and I would think that he has taken to heart the lesson of World War II, which war did not lead to Communist takeovers in Germany, Italy, and France.

Communism, in other words, has little chance of success, even in case of war, if there are no effective Communist Parties capable of exploiting the chaos of defeat.

Political crises can occur in the absence of a general war, and if they do, Communists must exploit them effectively; this applies particularly to crises occurring before a war and to war alerts.

I call your attention to the fact that Khrushchev does not talk, in this context, about war in general but about world war. It is true that world war is not a necessary condition for Communist seizures of power but it has been a frequent condition. No Communist regime has come to power without the immediate or remote help of war. In the future, war will continue to be a necessary condition, at least in some—and presumably in the most important—instances.

Khrushchev does not discuss these problems. He states merely that an “acute class struggle” must be waged against strong capitalist states. In Communist parlance, “acute class struggle” may mean anything from world war to general strikes and mass sabotage. It is perfectly clear, from Communist doctrine, that the stronger the capitalist state which is to be toppled, the stronger and more violent must be the means used to destroy it.

It is interesting that in this speech, Khrushchev does not use the expression, “war is not fatalistically inevitable.” He points out that force must not be used in all cases and that new methods substituting for force can be developed. He stresses that a peaceful revolution is preferable to a “nonpeaceful” upheaval. But if the “ruling classes * * * are unwilling to bow to the will of the people, the proletariat must break their resistance and start a resolute civil war.” This is a plain warning that unless the free world surrenders, war will become necessary.

In brief, Khrushchev has not really departed from Stalin’s war doctrine. He has merely introduced greater flexibility and sophistication and he may be inclined to use war as a last rather than an early resort.

He said:

“* * * both World War I and World War II exerted enormous influence on the emergence and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Does it follow from that that a world war is a necessary condition for a further intensification of the general crisis of capitalism? Such a conclusion would be profoundly incorrect since it distorts the Marxist-Leninist theory of the Socialist revolution and conflicts with the real reasons for revolution (WMR version: revolution does not

result from military cataclysms; it is first of all a consequence of the development of the class struggle and of the internal contradictions of capitalism" (p. 56, par. 2).

* * * * *

"It is obvious that in countries where capitalism is still strong, where it has a huge military and police apparatus, the transition to socialism will unavoidably take place in conditions of an acute class struggle" (p. 73, par. 7).

* * * * *

"As for the forms of transition to socialism, they will, as was pointed out by the 20th CPSU Congress, become increasingly diverse, and it is not essential that the transition to socialism everywhere and in all cases be connected with armed uprisings and civil war" (p. 73, par. 2).

* * * * *

"Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the view that the forms of transition to socialism can be of a peaceful or nonpeaceful nature. Revolution by peaceful means is in keeping with the interest of the working class and the masses. But if the ruling classes counter revolution with force and are unwilling to bow to the will of the people, the proletariat must break their resistance and start a resolute civil war" (p. 73, par. 3).

ON WAR TYPES

Communists always placed great importance upon defining the various types of war. For example, in the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International (1928), they distinguished between imperialist, national liberation, and revolutionary wars and divided those categories further into just and unjust wars. As will be seen further on, the Communists continue to distinguish between just and unjust wars, but the other classification has been modified to some extent.

The Communists now distinguish between world wars, local wars, liberation wars, and popular uprisings. The classification of popular uprisings as war invites close attention. Perhaps it can be anticipated that in contrast to past times when popular uprisings suffered from many military and organizational handicaps, future uprisings may be waged on a larger scale and be run professionally within the framework of coordinated world strategy. In addition, up-to-date arms probably will be used.

Thus, the inclusion of popular uprisings under the category of "war" may be explained by a Kremlin decision henceforth to run such uprisings as major and authentic military undertakings and for this purpose to provide the necessary military, command and logistical assistance to revolutionary organizations.

Khrushchev, of course, shies away from stating explicitly that the Soviets would start a war whenever they feel the opportunities to be propitious for such a venture. But he emphasized that the free world could attack: if such an attack were to occur, the Soviets would not be caught unawares and capitalism would be defeated. There is no need to remind anyone that no aggressor ever would admit to aggression. Practically all aggressors of history fabricated claims that they attacked merely to forestall an attack upon them. I cannot understand that this Khrushchev prose is so often taken at face value.

He spoke as follows:

"In modern conditions the following categories of wars should be distinguished: World wars, local wars, liberation wars, and popular uprisings. This is necessary to work out the correct tactics with regard to these wars" (p. 63, par. 3).

* * * * *

"Now imperialism has created, under peacetime conditions, a gigantic apparatus of war and a widespread system of blocs, and has subjected their economy to the arms race" (p. 52, par. 9).

* * * * *

"* * * while dying and disintegrating, capitalism is still capable of causing great calamities to mankind. The party always maintains the greatest vigilance regarding the danger emanating from imperialism. It nurtures the Soviet people in this spirit and does everything necessary to make it impossible for the enemy ever to catch us unawares" (p. 62, par. 9).

KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 9, 1961

"We know that if the imperialist madmen unleash a world war, capitalism would be wiped out and annihilated by the peoples. But we are resolutely opposed to war * * *" (p. 65, par. 7).

(World Marxist Review version, p. 15, par. 5, second column: "We know that if the imperialist madmen were to begin a world war, the peoples would wipe out capitalism. But we are resolutely opposed to war, because we are concerned for the fate of mankind, its present and its future. We know that the first to suffer in the event of war would be the working people and their vanguard—the working class.")

ALLEGATION THAT LAW IS NOT WAR

The use of Aesopian language is particularly prominent in Khrushchev's arguments about war. For example, the phrase "war among states" which can be found in many Communist documents recurs several times. This type of war, according to Khrushchev, must be prevented. He alleges that for Communist victory "wars among states are not necessary." The obverse of this doctrine is that other types of war, such as civil wars, would be necessary.

If so, the question arises as to how the Communists describe "civil wars." On this point no new definition has been supplied, so far as I can see. But in earlier days, World War I, for example, was described as "international civil war."

Moreover, there is the problem of military intervention: It is customary in civil wars that the belligerents receive outside support. It is my belief that, according to their current interpretation, intervention to help pro-Communist insurgents specifically would be excluded from the category "war among states." By contrast, intervention to support anti-Communist forces would be prohibited, according to the same "dialectic" interpretation of the term "war."

Speaking on this subject, Khrushchev said:

"* * * uprisings must not be identified with wars among states * * *" (p. 65, par. 2).

"Our duty to history is to insure peace and peaceful development of this great offspring of the international working class and to protect the peoples of all countries from another destructive war. The victory of socialism throughout the world, which is inevitable because of the laws of historic development, is now near. For this victory, wars among states are not necessary" (p. 65, par. 8).

ON THE PREVENTION OF GLOBAL WAR

Despite many ambiguities, I think it is self-evident that Khrushchev fears a global thermonuclear war among states. I do not think that Khrushchev fears this war badly enough so that he will never wage it, nor that his successors will be bound by his fears. I believe above all, that he is doing all he can in order to get the Soviet Union into a position where such a war could have waged under optimal conditions for communism. In my judgment, this is one of the main reasons why the Soviets have been pushing the nuclear test ban and are suggesting fraudulent agreements to stop nuclear production. At any rate Khrushchev's objections to global war, taken by itself, as well as to thermonuclear weapons within a nonglobal war, or to global nuclear war between hostile "social systems," would be considerably less acute than those to a global thermonuclear war among states.

Khrushchev's objections to such a war do not imply that he does not want to reap the benefits of such a war which, if concluded successfully, would give victory to the Communist movement. He wants the baby sans labor. He avers that the Communists now have at their disposal new methods by which they will be able to achieve their goal short of thermonuclear holocaust.

These methods include the deterrence of the free world through Soviet thermonuclear long-range power; the mobilization of pacifist forces in the free world; and the utilization of uprisings in lieu of war.

This emphasis on uprisings, to which we have already alluded, is a reversal to Communist 19th century doctrine. Yet there are significant changes. First, as we have deduced before, such uprisings are to be undertaken as proper and major military operations and second, military operations of this type henceforth will be provided with the strategic cover—and possibly support—of nuclear missile forces and other modern weapon systems.

Riots are a preparatory step to uprisings. The Communists possibly are engaged in a worldwide program to train their "troops" in the tactics of riots.

Khrushchev expressed himself this way:

"The prevention of a new war is the question of all questions" (p. 62, par. 6).

"* * * the problem of preventing a global thermonuclear war is the most burning and vital problem of mankind (p. 62, par. 7).

"The conference has discovered and outlined ways of using even more effectively the new opportunities of preventing a world war which emerged as a result of the formation of the Socialist camp, the growth of its might, and the new balance of power" (p. 62, par. 8).

"* * * the present balance of power in the world arena enables the Socialist camp and other peace-loving forces to pursue the completely realistic task of compelling the imperialists, under the threat of the downfall of their system, not to unleash a world war" (p. 56, par. 1).

"If the peoples of all countries are united and mobilized, if they wage a tireless struggle, uniting their efforts both inside each country and on a world scale, wars can be averted" (p. 64, par. 5).

"We are convinced that, as the might of the world Socialist system increases and the level of organization of the working class in capitalist countries improves, increasingly favorable conditions for Socialist revolutions will occur" (p. 73, par. 4).

ON WORLD WAR

Khrushchev leaves no doubt that a future world war would be fought with long-range weapon systems, notably missiles, and with nuclear weapons. He also is fairly certain that war, "a constant companion of capitalism," is threatening again.

World War I was used "classically" by Lenin but presently wars among capitalist states are unlikely. (Khrushchev is remarkably silent on World War II which also was used in a classical style by Stalin. This may indicate that Khrushchev is inclined to consider Lenin's tactics more appropriate in the present period than the tactics Stalin used in 1939 and thereafter, but this is not clear, by any means.)

In future, war between the "imperialists" (read: the United States) and the Soviet Union is most likely—if there is to be a world war. Such a war presumably would be directed "in the first place against the Soviet Union" and though the "unleashing of wars has become a much more complicated business for the imperialists," the danger of war continues to loom. Hence the task is to "create impassable obstacles" against the unleashing of wars.

At this point Khrushchev becomes contradictory. On the one hand, he states confidently that Communists "can forestall the outbreak of a world war" and argues that wars can be prevented "indisputably." On the other hand, he reiterates the Communist axiom that wars will occur necessarily so long as capitalism exists.

The solution to this riddle may be that he is enjoining the world Communist movement in the free world to undermine the military and will power of free governments as best they can. This injunction is being couched in terms of a directive to prevent war. Yet, insofar as the Soviet Union and the military forces of the Communist bloc are concerned, war is being prepared.

Obviously, it would be easier for the Soviet military forces to fight against a free world whose military power had been undermined or even crippled from within.

In addition, Khrushchev points out that while, in Lenin's time, the task was to seize power during the war, now it would seem to be the preferred Communist tactic to exploit a war crisis, and perhaps a situation characterized by nuclear blackmail, and to launch Communist uprisings in the midst of war alerts. This then would be a third modification of the classical Communist doctrine on popular uprisings.

The Communist leader said:

"* * * the unleashing of a world war, the most destructive war in history" (p. 65, par. 4).

(November Declaration, par. 79:)

"War is a constant companion of capitalism. The system of exploitation of man by man and the system of extermination of man by man are two aspects of the capitalist system. Imperialism has already inflicted two devastating world wars on mankind and now threatens to plunge it into an even more terrible catastrophe."

Khrushchev said further:

"* * * World War I * * * was classically used by the Bolshevik Party and Lenin" (p. 63, par. 5).

"* * * imperialists now must keep an eye on the Soviet Union and the whole Socialist camp, and are afraid of starting wars among themselves. They are trying to play down their differences * * *" (p. 63, par. 6).

"In present conditions, the most probable wars are wars among capitalist and imperialist countries, and this too should not be ruled out" (p. 63, par. 7).

World Marxist Review version: "In present conditions, the likelihood is that there will not be wars among capitalist and imperialist countries, although this eventually cannot be ruled out."

"Wars are chiefly prepared by imperialists against Socialist countries, and in the first place against the Soviet Union as the most powerful of the Socialist states" (p. 63, par. 8).

"* * * as yet we are unable to exclude completely the possibility of wars, for the imperialist states exist. However, the unleashing of wars has become a much more complicated business for the imperialists. * * *" (p. 63, par. 9).

"The task is to create impassable obstacles against the unleashing of wars by imperialists. We possess increasing possibilities for placing obstacles in the path of warmongers. Consequently, we can forestall the outbreak of a world war" (p. 63, par. 8).

"* * * the peoples, by mobilization of all their forces for active struggle against the warmongering imperialists, can indisputably prevent war." * * * (p. 63, par. 11).

World Marxist Review version (p. 13): "Prior to the rise of the Socialist world camp, the working class was unable to exert a decisive influence on the decision of the question whether there would or would not be a world war. In those circumstances the finest representatives of the working class advanced the slogan of turning an imperialist war into a civil war, that is, of the working class and all working people using the situation created by the war to take power. * * *

"In our time the conditions are different. * * *

"In the conditions of today the likelihood is that there will not be wars between the capitalist, imperialist countries, although this eventually cannot be ruled out. The imperialists are preparing war chiefly against the Socialist countries, above all against the Soviet Union, the most powerful of the Socialist countries. They would like to sap our might and by so doing restore the one-time rule of monopoly capital."

ON LOCAL WARS

Mr. Khrushchev's position on local wars is another exercise in Aesopian semantics. A local war, according to his expostulations, is a military operation undertaken by free world forces short of global war, most probably for the purpose of putting down Communist guerrillas and insurrectionists. For example, an American military operation in a given country outside the bloc would be considered a local war, but a similar military operation by the Soviet Union or by Communist forces in the same country would not be described as a local war. This Soviet operation would be support to "liberation."

Local wars, in the Khrushchevian sense, may occur. If they do, they could escalate into a major war—obviously, though, such escalation would happen only because of Soviet intervention. It is interesting that by implication, Khrushchev contemplates, with complete serenity, those very types of steps which the Soviet Union could take in order to transform a "small imperialist war * * * into a world thermonuclear rocket war." So, after all, he is not op-

posed to thermonuclear global war if it can be dressed up as an undertaking to suppress a "local war." This type of semantic trickery must be kept in mind constantly.

Though Khrushchev is not as much opposed to nuclear wars as he alleges, nevertheless, he wants to avoid these wars. Hence he desires to deter local wars; i.e., free world military initiatives. He claims that in 1956 the Soviet Union stopped the British-French war in Egypt, even though the Soviets were then less powerful than they are today. (I don't have to point out that this is an inaccurate historical reconstruction.) His point is that local wars, if they occur, must be stopped by the Soviets threatening thermonuclear war. But again he alleges that attempts to wage local wars "are being thwarted" successfully by the Communists, presumably through nuclear blackmail, pacifism, and other methods inhibiting the "imperialists."

The reason he is so interested in thwarting local wars is that a free world intervention would occur only against a Communist attempt at takeover. If a free world intervention occurs, the local undertaking by the Communists may fail. By contrast, if the intervention is deterred, the Communists may attain their local goal. Thus, Khrushchev opposes local war in order to facilitate local Communist conquests.

Under some conditions, of course, a local war could be exploited by the Communists deliberately to bring about war on a larger scale, provided they find the escalation of conflict to be to their interest.

Khrushchev said:

"There have been local wars, and they may occur again in the future, but opportunities for imperialists to unleash these wars, too, are becoming fewer and fewer. A small imperialist war, regardless of which imperialist begins it, may grow into a world thermonuclear rocket war. We must, therefore, combat both world wars and local wars" (p. 64, par. 2).

"Here is an example of how a local war started by the imperialist was stopped as a result of the interference by the Soviet Union and the entire Socialist camp" (p. 64, par. 4).

(World Marxist Review version: "Here is an example of how a local war started by the imperialist was nipped in the bud by the intervention of the Soviet Union and the entire Socialist camp.")

"The Soviet Union and the whole Socialist camp came to the defense of Egypt. * * * The local war, the venture in Egypt, failed miserably" (p. 64, par. 3).

"This was in 1956, when * * *. We were not as mighty then as we are today" (p. 64, par. 6).

"We told them frankly: 'If you start a war, you will lose it; we will not remain neutral'" (p. 64, par. 3).

"* * * their attempts to unleash local wars are being cut short" (p. 55, par. 10).
(World Marxist Review version: "* * * attempts made by the imperialists to start local wars are being thwarted.")

ON SACRED LIBERATION WARS

I am not turning to liberation wars which Khrushchev is discussing, together with uprisings. Khrushchev goes beyond describing liberation wars as "just wars." He goes so far as to describe them as "sacred." He confirms that "we recognize such wars," which means that the Soviet Union is prepared and willing to fight wars of this type.

Under modern conditions practically any war can be described as a liberation war. I call your attention to the fact that under one heading Khrushchev says that the Soviet Union would help all those people who are "striving for their independence." In another passage, he almost deliberately muddles the difference between national liberation wars and uprisings, and joins together the struggle for independence and self-determination with the struggle for social and national development. Hence he has complete freedom to justify any type of war as a liberation war. Khrushchev

specifically argues that uprisings should not be identified either with "wars among states" or with "local wars" but he does not state that they should not be identified with liberation wars either.

I call your attention to this intriguing wording: "Can conditions be created where a people will lose their patience and rise in arms? They can." The implication is that the Communists can and therefore must be the creators of those conditions.

To Khrushchev, it appears self-evident that liberation wars will occur as long as imperialism exists. He stresses that peoples can attain "their freedom and independence *only* by struggle, including 'armed struggle'." He calls for a specific form of escalation; namely, the development of uprisings into guerrilla wars. [Italic supplied.]

Please note that his wording suggests that, like in previous times, "liberation wars" are considered to be a specific form of "revolutionary wars." As before, the Communists consider revolutionary wars as justified and inevitable. These passages should be read very carefully. It is clear that Khrushchev wants to create the impression that the justification and inevitability of war refers only to liberation wars. Actually, he is talking about revolutionary wars. It should not escape our notice that, according to age-old Communist theory, any war can be a revolutionary war, provided it is fought by Communists for the sake of achieving an advance (or the defense) of communism.

On the basis of this doctrine, global thermonuclear war waged by the Soviet Union can be described as a revolutionary war.

If there were a war between the Soviet Union and the United States, this war, whether global and thermonuclear or not, by definition, would be a revolutionary war for the Soviet Union (while an imperialist war for the United States).

I think the exact meaning of these passages is that, according to current Communist doctrine, war remains inevitable and will have to be fought in all forms and intensities if communism cannot be advanced otherwise.

However, the world Communist movement should try to render a global thermonuclear war superfluous. Falling in this ambitious objective, it should weaken the free world to such an extent that the Soviet Union can strike with nuclear weapons without risking unacceptable or irreparable retaliation.

Regarding "sacred" wars, Khrushchev said:

"* * * a liberation war of a people for its independence, is a sacred war. We recognize such wars, we help and will help the peoples striving for their independence" (p. 64, par. 9).

"The Communist fully support such just wars (World Marxist Review version: *and without reservation*) and march in the front rank with the peoples waging liberation struggles" (p. 64, par. 2).

"Can such wars flare up in the future? They can. Can there be such uprisings? There can. But these are wars which are national (WMR version: popular) uprisings. In other words, can conditions be created where a people will lose their patience and rise in arms? They can. What is the attitude of the Marxists toward such uprisings? A most positive one. These uprisings must not be identified with wars among states, with local wars, since in these uprisings the people are fighting for implementation of their right for self-determination, for independent social and national development" (p. 64, par. 3).

(World Marxist Review version: p. 15, par. 7, col. 1: "Is there a likelihood of such wars recurring? Yes, there is. Are uprisings of this kind likely to recur? Yes, they are. But wars of this kind are popular uprisings. Is there the likelihood of conditions in other countries reaching the point where the cup of the popular patience overflows and they take to arms? Yes, there is such a likelihood.")

"* * * national liberation wars * * * began as an uprising by the colonial peoples against their oppressors and changed into guerrilla warfare. Liberation wars will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only admissible (World Marxist Review version: justified) but inevitable, since the colonialists do not grant independence voluntarily. Therefore, the peoples can attain (World Marxist Review version: win) their freedom and independence only by struggle, including armed struggle."

"* * * prevent or resolutely rebuff interference by the imperialists in the people's affairs in any country which has risen to revolt" (p. 68, par. 9).

ON THE PURPOSE OF LIBERATION WARS

One of the most important tasks on which the Communists have been working since about 1919 has been to join the various types of revolutionary struggles into a coordinated worldwide operation. At present, the main job is to coordinate the various national independence movements, whether they be to the left or right of center, and to support them directly through weapons deliveries, economic means, experts, and diplomacy from the Soviet Union and other bloc countries, and indirectly through political warfare within the free world. One major purpose is to facilitate the overt or covert Communist takeover of these local movements.

According to Khrushchev, the collapse of the so-called colonial system is almost as important an advance in the global power conflict as the formation of the "world system of socialism." He still holds to the old Lenin theory that the free world has been drawing enormous strength from their colonies, especially cheap raw materials and "tremendous masses of people" who could be used as "cannon fodder."

Whether the colonies were an element of free world strength or weakness can be debated at length. I will restrict myself to saying merely that the main strengths of the free world always were based on Western Europe and North America and that in the atomic age, this is more true than ever before.

Naturally I do not want to imply that Communist advances in the former colonial areas, which we now call the underdeveloped countries, would not be of strategic advantage to the Soviet bloc and of strategic disadvantage to the free world. But the notion that the free world can be effectively outflanked through a Communist advance in the underdeveloped areas is not valid if it is interpreted to mean that the United States can be defeated in Africa, for example. Too many sideshows and struggles in and for secondary theaters always have been ruinous of effective strategy. I hesitate to believe that the Kremlin is not aware of the principle of concentration of force as a major element in strategic success.

Consequently, I lean to the interpretation that much of the argument about the so-called colonial revolutions is essentially in the nature of a diversionary and deceptive maneuver, and serves to hide the fact that the Soviet Union considers its own military power and technological proficiency as the main road to strategic success.

In any event, Khrushchev talks about "fronts of active struggle," namely, Asia and Africa. To those "one more front of active struggle," namely, Latin America, has been added "in recent years." Note this language: If there are "fronts of active struggle," there also must be "fronts of passive struggle," that is, fronts where the Communists are not yet ready to fight openly but merely are preparing themselves for initiating the active struggle some time in the future. I hope this point will be considered carefully by the many proponents of the notion that the struggle for the underdeveloped areas is the main "front," and will remain the decisive front even in the distant future.

With respect to neutralism, specifically pro-Western neutralism, Khrushchev expresses confidence that gradually the new countries can be pointed toward the Soviet bloc.

So far as I can see, Khrushchev does not mention the possibility of uprisings in advanced countries. It is true, as we shall see, that the possibilities of using parliaments as an instrument of revolution are considered sympathetically by modern Communists. However, in view of an almost unbroken chain of 40 years of electoral defeats in advanced free countries, I cannot believe that Khrushchev seriously expects the Communists to take power "peacefully" in America or Western Europe, least of all through the legislatures.

This can be interpreted very easily, I think, by stating that in the presently active fronts; namely, the underdeveloped countries, the power struggle must be waged by guerilla operations and uprisings, and possibly by "parliamentary" means. As soon as the presently passive fronts will become activated, other means of struggle will have to be used. These "other means" would not exclude guerrilla and insurrectional operations but, by necessity, would include more risky and more decisive military means.

To put it more bluntly, I don't believe that the Communists have any doubt about their ability to conquer the United States and Western Europe at a price less than global thermonuclear war. They are opposed to this war at this moment—"seichas," as Khrushchev reiterates it in his native Russian. For

the time being, they are keeping the front in the underdeveloped countries active, in order to gain time and to prepare themselves militarily in optimal fashion for the ultimate showdown.

This showdown is inevitable so long as the Communists do not give up their ambition to take over the whole world. I am inclined to accept the view that Khrushchev, like other Communists leaders, dreads this ominous implication of their doctrine. Hence I am prepared to accept the notion that the present strategy of "gaining time" is designed, at least in part, to postpone an irrevocable and possibly deadly decision.

But in considering such hesitations, we should be under no illusion that the Communists are not sufficiently hardboiled to make a war decision, even though such a decision appears to be "unthinkable" to many free world leaders. It is unthinkable that the Communists will call off the Communist world revolution.

Here are Khrushchev's statements on the subject:

"Lenin saw this task in awakening the revolutionary activity, independent action, and organization of the working masses irrespective of the level at which they are in applying Communist teaching to the specific conditions in their countries, merging in the common struggle with proletarians of other countries" (p. 70, par. 1).

"Lenin said: 'It is quite clear that in the future decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe at first aimed at national liberation will turn against capitalism and imperialism and may play a much greater revolutionary part than we expect'" (Collected Works, Russ. ed. vol. XXXII, p. 458) (p. 54, par. 5).

"With the collapse of the colonial system, imperialism has become considerably weaker. Vast territories, tremendous masses of people, have already ceased or are ceasing to serve as its reserve, a source of cheap raw material and cannon fodder" (p. 69, par. 10).

"* * * the crumbling of the system of colonial slavery under the pressure of the national liberation movement is the second phenomenon of historic importance after the formation of the world system of socialism" (p. 69, par. 3).

"The national liberation movement deals more and more blows against imperialism, helps consolidation of peace, contributes to speeding mankind's development along the path of social progress. Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now the most important centers of revolutionary struggle against imperialism" (p. 69, par. 11).

"The forces of the national liberation movement are greatly increasing owing to the fact that one more front of active struggle against American imperialism has been formed in recent years. Latin America has become this front" (p. 69, par. 7).

"Bourgeois and revisionist politicians allege that the development of the national liberation movement is independent of the working class struggle for socialism, independent of the Socialist states' support, that it is the colonizers who grant freedom to the peoples of former colonial countries. Such inventions are launched to isolate the young independent states from the Socialist camp, to prove that on the international stage they should, allegedly, play the part of some kind of third force and not oppose imperialism" (p. 70, par. 5).

"History has proved that without the establishment of socialism, if only in a part of the world, there could have been no question of the abolition of colonialism. The imperialist powers, primarily the United States, are exerting every effort to attach to their own system the countries which have freed themselves from the yoke of colonialism, and thus to strengthen the position of world capitalism by providing it—as the bourgeois ideologists say—with new blood, to rejuvenate and consolidate it" (p. 70, par. 6).

"The correct application of Marxist-Leninist theory in countries which have freed themselves consists indeed in seeking forms for uniting all the *sound forces* of the national liberation movement with the *sound forces* of the special features of

the economic, political, and cultural life of the peoples, in insuring the leading role of the working class in the national front, and in the struggle for resolute extermination of the roots of imperialism and the remnants of feudalism, for clearing the roots of imperialism and the remnants of feudalism, and for clearing the way for an eventual movement toward socialism" (p. 71, par. 3).

* * * "It does not follow * * * that the Socialist help does not influence the prospects of the further development of countries which have won their freedom." (p. 71, par. 8).

ON COLONIALISM

May I call your attention to a passage in Mr. Khrushchev's speech where he takes pride in having proposed a U.N. General Assembly declaration concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples? I believe this is a case where, to some extent, we have allowed the Soviets to use the United Nations as a "transmission belt" of Communist policy.

The Soviet Union is the largest remaining colonial empire. There is a very massive documentation proving that such old nations as the Ukrainians, the Armenians, and the Uzbeks, for example, are oppressed jointly by Russian imperialism and communism. Contrary to the Soviet constitution, these people are not allowed to exercise their rights of self-determination. They are in worse political shape than many peoples under earlier Western "colonialism." Surely this is also evident in the satellite countries which officially are not part of the Soviet Union but clearly are a part of the Communist empire and in many ways are Russian colonies. The term "satellite" means "colony," nothing else.

A country like Cuba, where Fidel Castro is refusing to hold elections, is in no position to exercise its rights of self-determination.

Naturally, the arguments about oppression also refer to the Great Russians themselves who are suffering under the Communist heel, but the non-Russian nations of the Communist empire are suffering both from political dictatorship and terrorism, and from national oppression.

It is incomprehensible to me why the free world does not make a systematic effort to uphold the principle of self-determination globally, and more specifically why we do not even attempt to apply it to the one area where it is more surely needed; namely, to the Communist colonial empire.

Mr. Khrushchev said:

"The Soviet Union submitted for consideration by the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly a declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. As a result of acute political struggle around this proposal, which scathed not only in the United Nations but outside it, the General Assembly adopted the declaration on granting independence to colonial countries and peoples.

"The main conclusion of the Soviet declaration, the necessity of a speedy and final liquidation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, was on the whole reflected in the decision passed by the United Nations. This was a great victory for the progressive forces and for all Socialist states which firmly and consistently defend the cause of the freedom and independent national development of peoples" (p. 71, pars. 10, 11).

ON PEACE POLICY

I pointed out before that the Communist policy aimed at preventing a world war is designed to facilitate Communist expansion. The Communists do not think that war can be prevented by some sort of agreement with the free world. They state specifically that peace "can be assured *only* by active purposeful struggle" (italics supplied).

The peace the Communists are talking about is not to be confused with "peace" as it is defined in the American political dictionary. They want to prevent free world intervention or democratic defense against Communist attacks, or, to put it in another fashion, they aim for the paralyzation of the free world.

The term "active struggle for peace," or variations thereof, is the Communist version of what we call "cold war." It appears from this context that the Communists are waging their version of cold war for the chief purpose of paralyzing the free world. In this, emulating the primary Hitlerian tactics, they systematically exploit human weaknesses and fears.

Significantly, Khrushchev avers that the Communist struggle for "peace has imposed dynamic force on the foreign policy of the Socialist countries." This goes beyond the notion that the peace slogan can be used to mobilize the

masses on the side of communism. In my interpretation, Mr. Khrushchev's wording means that the purpose of Communist foreign policy, in its broadest meaning, is to paralyze the will of the free world and in particular of the West.

Quoting Khrushchev's words:

"* * * the most burning problem of our times—prevention of a world war * * * We Communists * * * indicate the only correct way for preserving and strengthening peace" (p. 53, par. 2).

"The possibility of preventing war is not something like a gift. Peace cannot be begged for; it can only be assured by active purposeful struggle" (p. 66, par. 1).

"The entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union is directed toward the strengthening of peace. The growing might of our State has been used by us and will in the future be used not to threaten anyone, not to fan the fear of war, but to pursue steadfastly a policy of struggle against the danger of war, for the prevention of a world war" (p. 66, par. 2).

"The policy of actively struggling for peace has imparted dynamic force to the foreign policy acts of the Socialist countries" (p. 66, par. 6).

ON THE NOVEMBER DECLARATION ON PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

"Peaceful coexistence" must not be confused with peace policy. This particular tactic, which has been given its Aesopian name to deceive the free world, is a "form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism." It is not the whole class struggle but merely one of its manifestations. Perhaps it could be said that "peaceful coexistence" is the international manifestation of the class struggle between socialism and capitalism, as distinguished from the national manifestations of this selfsame, overriding, and ubiquitous conflict.

The purpose of the particular type of class struggle, which is called "peaceful coexistence," is to stop the cold war; i.e., to induce the free world to discontinue all its programs designed to uphold its interests and to safeguard its security against the Communist onslaught. Specifically, peaceful coexistence tactics are designed to bring about the disbanding of freeworld alliances and the dismantling of military bases.

However, the international form of the class struggle also is used to develop "the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence." This quote is taken from the declaration of November 1960. It means that the international and the national forms of class struggle are "dialectically" related.

The various statements leave no doubt that, more specifically, "peaceful coexistence" is a form of struggle and a method of "mobilizing the masses." It involves, and this is very important, "launching vigorous actions against the enemies of peace." The launching of vigorous actions against enemies hardly can be categorized as an exercise in the arts of peace, as the West understands this term.

Otherwise, the purpose of the peaceful coexistence type of class struggle is to provide support to Soviet strategies and policies, to strengthen socialism, to enhance the Communist influence throughout the free world, to support national liberation movements and to weaken, undermine, and ultimately eliminate all forces which are unwilling to capitulate to the Communists.

"By upholding the principle of peaceful coexistence, Communists fight for the complete cessation of the cold war, disbandment of military blocs, and dismantling of military bases, for general and complete disarmament under international control, the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, respect for the equality of states and their territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, noninterference in each others' internal affairs, extensive development of trade, cultural and scientific ties between nations" (November Declaration, par. 121).

"The policy of peaceful coexistence meets the basic interests of all peoples, of all who want no new cruel wars and seek durable peace. This policy strengthens the positions of socialism, enhances the prestige and international influence of

the Communist parties in the capitalist countries. Peace is a loyal ally of socialism, for time is working for socialism against capitalism" (November Declaration, par. 12!).

"In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence" (November Declaration, par. 124).

Some quotations from Khrushchev follow:

"All peoples in the world gain from the liquidation of military alignments. This would be a most important concrete contribution to the consolidation of peace, improvement of the international atmosphere, and a major success of the policy of peaceful coexistence" (p. 66, par. 11).

"Peaceful coexistence helps to develop the forces of progress, the forces struggling for Socialism, and in capitalist countries it facilitates the activities of communist parties and other progressive organizations of the working class. It facilitates the struggle the people wage against aggressive military blocs, against foreign military bases. It helps the national liberation movement to gain successes" (p. 66, par. 7).

"The consistent implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence strengthens the position of the world Socialist system, promotes the growth of its economic might, its international prestige and influence among the people's masses, and creates for it favorable foreign-political possibilities in peaceful competition with capitalism" (p. 66, par. 8).

"Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas. But ideological and political disputes between states must not be settled through war" (November Declaration, par. 126).

"... the policy of peaceful coexistence, as regards its social content, is a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena" (p. 66, par. 8).

"The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle, as the revisionists claim. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between Socialism and capitalism" (New York Times).

ON DISARMAMENT

Disarmament policies must not be confused with "peaceful coexistence." In part, disarmament policy is a subsidiary tactic of the international class struggle. In part, it is a tactic which the Communists are employing on its own merit.

I already mentioned that disarmament slogans are used to elicit mass support, to gain sympathizers for communism, to strengthen the Communist movement, and to drive home the idea, clearly expressed during the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in 1928, that a lasting peace can be achieved only after communism has won all over the world.

The Communists have not changed this concept. Their 40- or 50-year-old position on disarmament as being an entirely unattainable goal prior to full-fledged Communist victory, is upheld strongly. This is evidenced by the fact that Khrushchev pointedly refers back to the proposals on full or partial disarmament which were submitted by Lenin in the early twenties. These proposals were made, not to achieve disarmament—this was deemed impractical and undesirable—but to "unmask" the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie.

According to Khrushchev, the Communist "struggle for disarmament is not a tactical move. We sincerely want disarmament." The meaning of this is that the struggle for disarmament is a part of the class struggle on the positions of Marxism-Leninism.

This is a beautiful example of a careful use by Khrushchev of the Aesopian language. Obviously, the Communist struggle for disarmament is quite sincere because this expression "struggle for disarmament" is nothing but a synonym for "struggle for the worldwide victory of communism." The reference to original Marxism-Leninism is designed to drive this point home and to show that the traditional position remains unchanged. Consequently, it is indeed true that the disarmament struggle is more than merely a tactical move.

Nevertheless, there is another side to this coin: the struggle for disarmament also is an "active struggle against imperialism, for restricting its military potentialities." This is a new version of what used to be called disarmament policy. Disarmament as "an active struggle against imperialism" must not be confused with disarmament as a sincere wish and expectation concerning the results of Communist victory.

The active struggle for disarmament, as Mr. Khrushchev explains it with almost disarming frankness, serves to restrict and sap the military power of the free world. Note specifically that he did not say that this active struggle also would restrict the military power of the Soviet bloc. I am sure no one will be particularly surprised about this "omission." Lenin's idea of disarmament policy was to disarm the bourgeoisie and arm the proletariat. This remains the true objective of the Communist stratagem. Mr. Khrushchev still adheres to this notion of strategic legerdemain. He just about tells us that what he is after is nothing more and nothing less than the unilateral disarmament of the free world.

I call your attention to his statement that once nuclear weapons are prohibited and destroyed, peace will be insured and a situation will be created where the "peoples" will encounter "the most favorable prospects for organizing their lives in accordance with their aspirations and interests." To put it more succinctly: Mr. Khrushchev believes that the elimination of nuclear weapons from free world arsenals would provide the Communists with the "most favorable prospects" of carrying through the Communist plan of world revolution.

It is my considered opinion that he is absolutely justified in this assumption. Unfortunately, this simple truth seems to be almost incomprehensible to many free-world statesmen.

Khrushchev's principal points:

"The struggle for disarmament * * * is an effective struggle against imperialism" (p. 67, par. 6).

* * *
 "The struggle for disarmament is an active struggle against imperialism, for restricting its military potentialities. Peoples must do everything to achieve the prohibition and destruction of atomic weapons and all other mass destruction weapons. Peace will then be insured and there will open before peoples the most favorable prospects for organizing their lives in accordance with their aspirations and interests." [Italics supplied.] (P. 68, par. 1.)

* * *
 "Vladimir Ilch Lenin pointed out the necessity for establishing contacts with those circles of the bourgeoisie which gravitate toward pacifism, even if it should be of the poorest quality. He said that in the struggle for the preservation of peace we must also use prudent representatives of the bourgeoisie" (p. 68, par. 3).

* * *
 "The slogan of the struggle for peace appears as a satellite (WMR version: companion) of the slogan of the struggle for communism. As correctly stated in the statement, the movement of peace partisans is the broadest movement of modern times, embracing people of different political and religious views, belonging to different classes of society, but united by the noble endeavor to prevent new wars and to insure lasting peace" (p. 67, par. 9).

* * *
 "The question of the struggle for communism is a class struggle, but in the struggle for peace not only the forces of the working class, peasantry, and petty bourgeoisie can be united, but even the part of the bourgeoisie which sees the real danger of thermonuclear war.

"Consequently the slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism. These two slogans harmonize with each other. * * * (p. 67, par. 8).

"* * * the first Soviet proposals on full or partial disarmament—if the capitalists will not agree on full disarmament—were submitted at the Genoa Conference" (p. 67, par. 5).

"Our struggle for disarmament is not a tactical move. We sincerely want disarmament. Here we stand fully on the positions of Marxism-Leninism" (p. 67, par. 5).

ON REVISIONISM

Communist strategy under Khrushchev has become highly sophisticated. True to the eternal advice given by Machiavelli to all would-be conquerors, he tries to combine the strength of the lion with the wiles of the fox. Military power, specifically long range nuclear power, and large-scale strategic deception are the two pillars of Communist strategy.

The intense employment of deception methods, however, entails the risk that many Communists and camp followers may misinterpret the precise meaning of the operation. There is the danger that expressions like "peaceful coexistence" may be misread as an intent to achieve the attenuation of the national and international class struggle, or even a lasting accommodation between hostile systems.

In order to prevent such misinterpretations, the Communists are waging a determined struggle against "revisionism in all its forms" and even "wage" an "implacable war on revisionism which tries to wipe out the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism." This struggle remains "an important task of the Communist Parties."

Khrushchev reiterates that Communists must be and must remain genuine revolutionaries. True Communists and what he calls "the elite" of the international Communist movement (thus using a term which was significant in the intellectual history of fascism) should be waging a "heroic struggle against capitalism." To turn this around, Communists who are not revolutionaries and who are not waging this heroic struggle, wherever they are, are not true Communists and do not belong to the Communist elite. The Communists who are read out of the elite include those who think that a particular Communist Party can go its separate way and that "capitalism" is perhaps more successful than the leaders in the Kremlin want to believe.

To put it in American terms, all of those within the Communist movement who believe that communism will win in an evolutionary fashion, are not true Communists. Those who want to sit out the collapse of capitalism are not true Communists. Revolutions and heroic struggles remain the way of the Communist movement, and those who avoid "heroic struggle," do not belong.

Mr. Khrushchev was particularly critical of the Communist Parties of the United States and Denmark. The Communist Parties of Western Europe were given a highly qualified vote of confidence. It is clear that he is not overly impressed by the accomplishments of the Communist Parties in the main industrialized countries of the free world. This may be an additional reason why the "active fronts" presently are located in the underdeveloped countries.

We must remember that if the effectiveness of the European and United States Communist Parties does not improve, much of the Khrushchevian strategy of forestalling an effective free world strategy against communism and of preventing thermonuclear war would collapse. It is therefore not surprising that Khrushchev is putting increasing emphasis on the cooperation between Russian and bloc Communists with pacifist groups throughout the free world.

The Soviet Premier said, on this subject:

"The struggle with revisionism in all its forms still remains today an important task of the communist parties. * * * we must * * * wage implacable war on revisionism which tries to wipe out the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, whitewash modern capitalism, undermine the solidarity of the communist movement, and encourage communist parties to go their separate national ways * * *" (p. 75, par. 1).

"In the Communist Party of such a country as the United States the revisionist group of Gates was active. In the Danish Communist Party undermining activity was conducted by the Larsen group. The revisionists were a serious danger to some other fraternal parties as well" (p. 74, par. 7).

perienced bourgeoisie having at its disposal immense material resources and a powerful military, police, and ideological machine. But we have profound confidence in the working class of the west European countries * * * (p. 74, par. 4).

* * *
 "Communists are revolutionaries, and it would be a bad thing if they did not take advantage of new opportunities that arose and found new methods and forms providing the best way to achievement of the ends in view" (p. 71, par. 1).

* * *
 "Participating in the conference were prominent leaders of Marxist-Leninist parties of Socialist countries, representatives of communist parties which are waging, under difficult conditions, a heroic struggle against capitalism, the fighting leaders of the national liberation movement—in other words, the elite of the international Communist movement" (p. 52, par. 3).

ON USE OF PARLIAMENTS

The Communists do not overlook a single bet. Regardless of current difficulties, they are anxious to develop tactics which will prove ever more effective in the advanced countries. In particular, Khrushchev thinks that parliamentary institutions may be exploited to advance the "transition to socialism" and thus to accelerate the course of the world revolution. I believe that this parliamentary tactic, which was not invented by Khrushchev but already was prescribed by Lenin, is most easily applicable in countries where parliamentary institutions and traditions are of recent vintage; that is, largely in the underdeveloped areas.

However, even in developed countries, under certain circumstances, utilization of parliaments can be quite effective as was proved by the events in Czechoslovakia in 1948. It is unnecessary to spell out the specific conditions which facilitated the Communist abuse of parliamentary institutions in this particular case.

In most of the other European satellites, parliaments in one way or the other were used to install Communists or Communist-controlled regimes. But the fundamental purpose of using the parliaments was to conceal the fact that communism was imposed on Eastern Europe by the direct and indirect application of military force. It is true that in 1948, the Red Army no longer was stationed in Czechoslovakia, but it is also true that Communist military power was present in many concealed ways. After the Communists conquered Czechoslovakia by military means in 1945, Communist agents were installed throughout the entire state and they never were expelled after the Red Army withdrew.

It may be doubtful whether Khrushchev really expects Communist parties to win major electoral successes anywhere in Western Europe. But since these windfalls can happen, he feels compelled to prepare the tactics which would be proper for such an occasion. Otherwise, I believe that Khrushchev, in extolling the role of parliament in the transition to socialism (not communism), is talking about a subsidiary method to be employed if and when military conquest has occurred.

Khrushchev is careful to point out that the winning of a majority in parliament by itself is not enough but must be supplemented by revolutionary mass actions. Subsequently, once a Communist regime or a Communist-dominated coalition government has been installed, the machinery of the pre-Communist state must be "smashed," just as was outlined by Lenin in "State and Revolution," written in 1917.

In his January speech, he said:

"Transition to socialism in countries with developed parliamentary traditions can also be carried out by making use of parliament and in other countries of institutions in keeping with their national traditions. Here it is not a case of making use of bourgeois parliaments but of the parliamentary form, in order to make it serve the people and give it new content" (p. 73, par. 5).

* * *
 "the unification and rallying of the revolutionary forces of the working class and all working people, and the *launching* (World Marxist Review version) of mass revolutionary actions are an *absolute* (World Marxist Review version) condition to gain a *stable* (World Marxist Review version) majority in parliament."

"To gain a majority in parliament, to make it a body of popular power with the existence of a powerful revolutionary movement in the country, means the *smashing* (World Marxist Review version) of the military bureaucratic machine of the bourgeoisie and creation of a new proletarian state system in parliamentary form" (p. 73, par. 7).

AN EXAMPLE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Since Mr. Khrushchev was quite vague on the tactics of abusing parliamentary institutions for the purposes of a Communist revolution, I thought it worthwhile to include quotes from a Communist manual on this very subject. This manual was written by a Communist member of the Czechoslovak National Assembly, Jan Kozak. This manual recently has been made available in English. The Communists were very reluctant to let this particular manual or textbook come to the attention of the free world, and it was obtained more or less by accident by a group of alert Englishmen. May I take the opportunity to compliment our English friends on this accomplishment? Since Kozak's manual has not yet been widely circulated in the United States, I would like to introduce substantial portions of his text into the record.

Kozak starts with an anti-Marxist quote by the former President of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Eduard Benes, to the effect that "the philosophy of power is barbaric, inhuman, and absurd philosophy." (Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, and Hitler consider violence to be the locomotive of history.) He then proceeds to explain that the utilization of parliaments may be practical in a "number of countries" and that the parliament can be transformed into an "instrument for the development of the Socialist revolution." Parliaments can be used to legislate revolutionary laws including such measures as purges, expropriations, and nationalizations and to conclude alliances with the Soviet Union. Furthermore, parliament can protect revolutionary pressures from below and add to them pressures from above. It also can facilitate the systematic infiltration of the entire state apparatus by Communists. Subsequently, according to Kozak, parliaments can be used for the consolidation of revolutionary gains.

KOZAK ON PARLIAMENT

"The philosophy of power is barbaric, inhuman and absurd philosophy." Dr. Eduard Benes (p. 7, Motto).

"In a number of countries which are particularly weakened by the conflicts within the capitalist order, the opportunity has arisen for the workers' class to place itself firmly at the head of great popular movements for national independence, democracy, peace, and socialism, to defeat the reactionary antipeople forces striving for the maintenance, and aggravation of national oppression and exploitation, to win a decisive majority in Parliament and to change it from an organ of the bourgeois democracy into an organ of power for the democracy of working people, into a direct instrument of power for the peaceful development of the socialist revolution.

"Also, our experience provides notable and practical proof that it is possible to transform parliament from an instrument of the bourgeoisie into an instrument of the revolutionary democratic will of the people and into an instrument for the development of the socialist revolution" (p. 8f, par. 5).

"Of the political points in this programme these were the most important: the breaking up of the basic members of the old oppressive bourgeois, state apparatus and assumption of power by the national committee, the formation of a new people's security system and army, the prohibition of the revival of the political parties which had represented the treacherous upper bourgeoisie, a systematic purge of the entire political, economic and cultural life of the country, the settlement of the relations between the Czech and Slovak nations on the principle of equality, the expulsion of the German minority, etc.

"Of the economic measures the following were the most important: The transfer of all enemy property, of that of the treacherous upper bourgeoisie and of the other traitors, under the national administration of the new people's authorities, the transfer of the land belonging to these enemies and traitors into the ownership of landless persons, tenants and working smallholders, the principal task of the new state was to ensure the alliance with the Soviet Union, safeguarding national liberty and independence as a state and

further undisturbed, peaceful development for the nations of Czechoslovakia" (p. 10, pars. 1, 2, 3).

"Of the eight political parties which were part of the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks at the time of the elections the Communist Party emerged as by far the strongest. It gained over 40 percent of the votes in the Czech lands and, with the Communist Party of Slovakia, 38 percent of the votes cast in the state as a whole" (p. 10, par. 4).

"The working class, whose struggle had made it possible that this institution could be reestablished, strove for parliament, as one of the most prominent political traditions and form of the past, to change its character (lit.: content; Tr.), to change from the instrument of the working class into one of the levers actuating the further development and consolidation of the revolution, into a direct instrument for the socialist building of the country" (p. 11, par. 1).

"This struggle took place during the period 1946-48. In the course of these years the working class, led by the Communists, made effective use of all its old forms of fighting, employed by the revolutionary workers' parties in parliament, adjusted however to the new conditions, and found new ones. Helped by parliament, which was used by the working class for deepening the revolution and for the gradual, peaceful, and bloodless change of the national and democratic revolution into a socialist one as 'pressure from above' and by its effect on the growth of the 'pressure from below' the bourgeoisie was pushed step by step from its share in power. This gradual and bloodless driving of the bourgeoisie from power and the quite legitimate constitutional expansion of the power of the working class and of the working people was completed in February 1948 by the parliamentary settlement of the government crisis engineered by the bourgeoisie" (p. 11, par. 2).

"Our working people, led by the Communists, provided practical proof during the years 1945-48 that it was possible to transform parliament from an organ of the bourgeoisie into an instrument developing democratic measures of consequence, leading to the gradual change of the social structure, and into a direct instrument for the victory of the socialist revolution.

"This fact, coupled with similar experiences gained by the other Communist and workers' parties, led to the possibility being envisaged of the transition of some countries from capitalism to socialism by revolutionary use of parliament" (p. 11, pars. 4, 5).

"The purpose to which this new power, the nucleus of which would be formed by the working class, should be put thereafter would be using parliament for the consolidation and deepening of the real democratic rights and to a more or less speedy unfolding of the socialist revolution. (About our tasks during the years 1945-48.) The use of parliament itself for the transfer of all power into the hands of the working class, the speed of progress and the order of its revolutionary tasks would be, however, the same as the methods of the struggle, variegated, and would always correspond with the specific class and historical conditions" (p. 12, par. 1).

Kozak spells out what he means by "pressure from above." This pressure is designed to suppress the power of all enemies of communism and to organize the forces of the revolution. It can serve to popularize revolutionary slogans and demands, to hunt down enemies, and to utilize whatever power positions the Communists have attained.

KOZAK ON PRESSURE FROM ABOVE

"The Combination of 'Pressure From Above' and that 'From Below'—One of the Elementary Conditions for the Revolutionary Use of Parliament" (p. 12, par. 4).

"Pressure from 'above' is, therefore, the pressure of a revolutionary government, parliament and the other organs of power in the state apparatus or its part and it has, in substance a dual effect—the direct suppression by power of the counter-revolution and its machinations and, at the same time, exerting pressure on the citizens inciting and organizing them for the struggle for a further development of the revolution" (p. 13, par. 5).

"The first direction given to the pressure 'from above,' which our working class applied from its position of power in the organs and newly forming links of the apparatus of the peoples' democratic state, was a systematic fight against enemies, traitors, and collaborators. Gradually, as the national and democratic revolution changed into a socialist one the pressure 'from above' was applied in an ever-increasing measure for the direct suppression and destruction of the counter-revolutionary forces. All the signal

role played in the development and extension of that pressure by the Ministry of the Interior, for instance, which was led by the Communists and the units of State Security directed by them" (p. 14, par. 3).

"But also other organs of the state and of the state apparatus controlled by the Communists served for the direct suppression of bourgeois sabotage and obstructionism. So, for instance, the Ministry of Agriculture quickly completed by means of so-called 'roving commissions' [lit.: flying commissions--Tr.] the confiscation of the land of enemies and traitors, in the autumn of 1946 sabotaged by the bourgeoisie. The national committees organized in autumn 1947 the 'Special Food Commissions' which uncovered the hidden stores of landowners and kulaks and contributed greatly in this way to their isolation. In December 1947 organs of the Ministry of Internal Trade, controlled by the Communists, uncovered an extensive black market in the textile trade. * * *" (p. 14, par. 4).

"The second prong of the pressure 'from above' successfully employed by our working class was the use made of the organs holding powers (the government, parliament, national committees) for bringing about a wide popularization of revolutionary demands and slogans" (p. 15, par. 1).

"Examples of the far-reaching results in closing the ranks of the working masses round the slogans of the Party were, e.g., the proposal of the Communists in the government recommending the introduction of the Millionaires' Levy, the draft proposals of the Agricultural Laws elaborated by the Communist-controlled Ministry of Agriculture and submitted to the working peasants for comment. * * *" (p. 15, par. 1).

"The third measure. A particularly important and exceptionally effective way of the struggle 'from above' lay in the utilization of economic political power positions, especially the nationalization of the banks, of banking, of key and big industries" (p. 15, par. 3).

"The fourth direction given to the pressure 'from above' existed in the utilization of the organs holding power for the direct uncovering of the antipeople policy of the bourgeoisie, for the isolation of the reactionary bourgeois leadership of the other parties of the National Front" (p. 16, par. 3).

With respect to pressure from below, Kozak goes through a whole list of methods and tactics, such as protest meetings, demonstrations, and strikes; his list is by no means complete.

The purpose of the pressure from below is to compensate for the numerical weakness of the Communists (who are unable to win a majority ever), to disintegrate the political opposition, and to drive forward the pressure tactics toward a culmination point where they will develop into uprisings, which methods are seen to be an effective substitute for war.

However, Kozak stresses that pressure from above and below must be combined in order to achieve a "real possibility of the revolutionary utilization of parliament on the road to socialism."

Kozak asks the question whether the "coordination of actions by the broad popular masses and the revolutionary forces in parliament * * * can * * * really render impossible or reduce to a minimum armed violence on the part of the bourgeoisie?" He fails to answer his own question and prefers, in an ambiguous way, to discuss various tactical problems instead.

The upshot of this discussion, so far as I understand it, is a paraphrase of Lenin: "A delivery may be difficult or easy. Naturally we are all for an easy and painless delivery. Conditions for such a delivery are now favorable. But if necessary, we are ready to undergo a difficult and painful delivery to see the child born." This quote sums up neatly Communist strategy in this "era" of history.

The meaning is that there won't be a "difficult and painful" war provided the free world capitulates. But if the free world resists, then the Communists are ready to bring about worldwide communism through "a difficult and painful delivery," regardless of whether this act of midwifery will necessitate the use of liberation wars, nuclear blackmail, or total nuclear war.

Note that Kozak, though an advocate of "peaceful" revolution, insists on the arming of the Communists, reasserts the "right" of the "working class" to "take to arms in every case when forced to do so by the resistance of the bourgeoisie," and supports the CPSU line to the effect that, in "a number of capitalist countries a violent overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship and * * * a * * * vehement acceleration of the class struggle are inevitable." In Communist logic, a vehement armed struggle is peace.

KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 4, 1956

KOZAK ON PRESSURE FROM BELOW

"III. Questions of Utilizing Pressure 'From Below.'

"To bring about a parliament which would cease to be a 'soft-soap factory' and would become a revolutionary assembly of working people requires, however, a force constituting, maintaining it and actively assisting its revolutionary activity."

"This pressure takes effect mainly in three directions:

"(a) It systematically supports the revolutionaries in the organs of power, enhances their strength and makes up for numerical weakness;

"(b) It has a direct effect on limiting the influence and positions of waverers and enemies standing in the path of further progress of revolution;

"(c) It awakens the forces of the people dormant for many years, its energy and self-confidence; it breaks through the onerous circle of intimidation and spiritual terror of the old institutions, the Church, etc."

"The pressure 'from below,' the revolutionary emergence of the popular masses is, therefore, essential for the success of every revolution" (p. 17, par. 5).

"The principle and the necessity of using pressure from below by the popular masses, forming one of the fundamental possibilities of making revolutionary use of Parliament, as mentioned at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, ties in fully with the old practice of the revolutionary workers' classes in Parliament also in the new conditions" (p. 18, par. 7).

*"On the one side all the old proven forms of the struggle of the popular masses were employed, the forms which were in keeping with the revolutionary initiative and determination of the workers and matched the degree of resistance shown by the bourgeoisie: calling of protest meetings, passing of resolutions, sending of delegations, organized mass demonstrations, and eventually also using strikes including general strikes * * *" (p. 20, par. 2).*

"On the other side the Communists, aided by the network of national mass organisations (and by the pressure 'from above' exerted by the organs holding powers, especially the national committees and the government), developed new forms of pressure 'from below' meeting the situation when the workers' class was proceeding with the assumption of power. These forms must be particularly noted. They are the organisation of a broad building movement on the basis of voluntary brigades (coal, harvest, machine, etc.) and the advancement of competition in production within the factory and on a statewide scale" (p. 20, par. 4).

"This third most valuable experience gained by our workers' class is the creative application of the principal condition for pressure 'from below,' much emphasized by Lenin, that is to say arming the proletariat" (p. 20, par. 5).

"The workers' class armed itself in the course of the national and democratic revolution. Even after the victory of that revolution it retained its arms; however, one part of it from the ranks of the partisans, barricade-fighters, and from the units of the CS corps formed in the Soviet Union, became the nucleus of a new armed state apparatus, especially the security apparatus under the control of the Ministry of the Interior which was in the hands of the Communists."

"The second part permanently secured the safety of the works, the so-called Factory Guards" (p. 21, pars. 2, 3).

*"The pressure of the popular masses 'from below' (in the totality of all its forms and concrete actions) made it impossible for the representatives of the other parties of the National Front, controlled by the bourgeoisie, which had numerical superiority in the decisive organs endowed with power, to isolate the Communists and to stop the revolution. Thus it [the pressure * * *; Tr.] made up for the numerical weakness of the revolutionary representatives of the workers' class in these organs and enhanced their strength, it contributed in a decisive manner to the acceptance of further revolutionary measures weakening the bourgeoisie and fortifying the power of the workers' class. This experience, that pressure 'from below' is absolutely essential for the undisturbed unfolding of the socialist revolution, is also reflected, in full measure, in the theory about the possibility of the revolutionary utilisation of parliament in connection with the road to socialism" (p. 21, par. 5).*

"Disintegration of political opponents: At the end of 1947 and the beginning of 1948 an actual disintegration of the national socialist, the people's, and the bourgeois parties took place. Honest members of these parties were parting with their bourgeois leadership and were coming over to the ranks of the CPSU."

and the Slovak CP (already in November 1947 when the Communists gained from the beginning of the year 237,384 new members the CPKS was stronger than all other political parties taken together), or created opposition groups within their own parties. The isolation of the bourgeoisie within the parties of the National Front was proceeding not only from the outside through the turning away of the broad masses from parties ruled by the bourgeoisie but also from within through the growth of democratic and socialist forces in these parties; through the growth of progressive opposition seeking the maintenance and strengthening of people's democratic freedoms and rights and therefore endeavouring to cooperate with the Communists" (p. 26, par. 4).

"While prior to the elections in 1946 the bourgeoisie had a relatively strong mass basis, a short time of under 2 years of people's democratic government was sufficient for the disintegration of the political army upon which it could formerly count" (p. 27, par. 2).

"In this situation the bourgeoisie, frightened by this peaceful progress of the revolution which kept removing and destroying its economic and political positions one after another and which threatened their complete annihilation within a short time, decided to violate the lawful ways and to achieve its counter-revolutionary aims through a coup. It was signalled by a government crisis provoked by the resignation of 12 ministers. But by this the bourgeoisie only offered another new and open evidence of its spirit of disruption; it achieved its own isolation and complete defeat. After five days of government crisis the people settled its accounts with bourgeois reaction, legally and constitutionally (under consistent use of all forms of pressure from 'above' and from 'below').

"The representatives of the bourgeoisie and their agents were replaced in the government, absolutely legally and in accordance with the constitution valid since pre-Munich days (1920), by new representatives faithful to the people, selected from the ranks of the reconstituted National Front and recognizing the leading role of the Communists in the state; the government was nominated by the President of the Republic and was unanimously approved by parliament" (p. 27, par. 2).

"The real possibility of the revolutionary utilization of Parliament for the road to socialism lies, therefore, in the combined mass strength of the revolutionary acting people supporting parliament as a revolutionarily active assembly which fights for the systematic fulfillment of the demands of the working people. This coordination of actions by the broad popular masses and the revolutionary forces in parliament, in the government and in the local organs of power, mutually germinates their strength, drives the revolution ahead, and infuses it with attacking and penetrating power.

"Can this force really render impossible or reduce to a minimum armed violence on the part of the bourgeoisie, however?" (p. 22, par. 2).

"No, the bourgeoisie has never yielded its power by a simple 'act of Parliament.' But it may be deprived of its power at an opportune moment without an armed uprising and civil war—by the force of consistently acting revolutionary masses led by the revolutionary workers' party, supporting their representatives in the Parliament and transforming the Parliament into an active revolutionary assembly.

"In the fight for the direct national, democratic, peaceful, economic, and social demands of the people, by a combined pressure from 'above' and from 'below,' the position of the bourgeoisie in the organs of power and in the state apparatus may be weakened step by step, and so may its economic positions, and thus the working class leading the popular masses may be given step by step conditions more favourable for its fight for socialism. (Naturally, these demands will always be founded upon the concrete situation prevailing in the country concerned and will greatly differ. For example, defence of national interests by cancellation of all agreements and treaties with the United States of America damaging to the interests of the nation; prohibition of all war propaganda, punishment of warmongers, and active support of the policy of collective security; abolition of all forms of racial, religious, and national discrimination; fight against the monopolies, and their nationalization; carrying out of a land reform, introduction of a general system of social security; abolition of every kind of economic, social, and legal inequality of women, separation of Church and state; etc.)" (p. 22, pars. 4, 5).

"Progress toward socialism may take, under these circumstances, a democratic and constitutional course, through the formation of an active revolutionary assembly relying upon the revolutionary mass movement of the working

class and its allies, will turn into an instrument of the working class on its way to power, into an instrument of the transformation of the whole state and its machinery. Under these circumstances all the changes which in their entirety represent a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into a socialist one will proceed absolutely legally. Parliament may pass in a democratic and legal way and in the name of the nation a new constitution codifying and making possible a socialist transformation of the country. (Within less than three months following the crushing of the attempt of the bourgeoisie at a coup the Parliament of the Czechoslovak Republic approved a new constitution which safeguarded all the progress so far made * * *) (p. 29, par. 4.)

"Thus, progress toward socialism, with the help of Parliament and without a bloody civil war, is a real possibility. However, this possibility must not raise false illusions among the working class which must not be in the least morally disarmed through doubts as to its right to take to arms in every case when forced to do so by the resistance of the bourgeoisie. Therefore the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party proclaimed with absolute frankness: 'There can be no doubt that for a number of capitalist countries a violent overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship and, with it, a connected vehement acceleration of the class struggle are inevitable' " (p. 30, par. 2).

"The task of the representatives of the working class in the bourgeois parliament * * * has always been to use bourgeois parliament as a platform for revolutionary agitation, propaganda, and organization, as an effective form to unchain revolutionary activity of the broad popular masses side by side with the working class.

"Linking and systematic combination of parliamentary and nonparliamentary actions has always been the fundamental principle of revolutionary tactics in making use of Parliament" (p. 31, par. 4).

"Thus it uses Lenin's paraphrase: 'A delivery may be difficult or easy. Naturally, we are all for an easy and painless delivery. Conditions for such a delivery are now favourable. But if necessary we are ready to undergo a difficult and painful delivery to see the child born' " (p. 30, par. 3).

In using parliamentary methods, the Communists must combat the danger of "revisionism" and "reformism." However, Kozak's arguments are by no means defensive. According to him, parliamentary methods may serve to split Socialist parties and to create united fronts between Communists and left-socialists.

He also points out that if peaceful transitions to socialism can be effected, some of the fears which people have about the human costs of a Communist revolution may be dispelled. The idea that a so-called peaceful parliamentary transition to socialism (with armed "pressure from below") would not cost the lives of those innumerable citizens of whom the Communists do not approve, is just silly. The Communist seizure of power in Russia by itself was not a particularly bloody affair but after communism had been installed, some 20 to 30 million Soviet citizens lost their lives due to terror campaigns, forced labor, concentration camps, artificially created famines, the collectivization of agriculture, genocide, and other policies characteristic of communism. In addition, many Soviet citizens, about another 20 to 25 million, lost their lives in the course of World War II which, if the Soviet policy really had been peaceful, could have been prevented, but which the Kremlin made every effort to provoke.

I would judge the fact that the Soviet Union almost was destroyed in 1941-42 is a potent enough reason why the modern-day Communists have become a little skeptical about their traditional "cult of violence." They could not care less about the lives of human beings, even the lives of "proletarians." However, the Czech Communists apparently are more critical of this "cult" than the Russian, let alone the Chinese Communists.

Kozak argues that the Czechoslovak example shows that "an apparently slower progress of socialist revolution (gradual) transition of national and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution) was actually the faster way." This statement is debatable. It overlooks the prior conquest of Czechoslovakia by the Red army and it also disregards the probability that the parliamentary methods proposed by Khrushchev and Kozak can be applied effectively only in very exceptional cases. For example, the Italian Communists did not succeed in "mastering" this particular tactic.

Kozak was given the task of explaining one particular Communist method of struggle, and he did so. But the Communists, as was stated before, do not marry themselves to a master weapon, a master tactic, or a master strategy. Their fundamental principle is to use any and all means, depending on risk and cost, on opportunity and necessity—and on the chance of achieving surprise.

KOZAK ON REVISIONISM

"The reformist parliament (an instrument of the bourgeoisie for strengthening and maintaining capitalist power) is an organ for cooperation between the workers' class and the bourgeoisie. Partial reforms achieved in Parliament (in agreement with the capitalists) serve the reformists, as evidence that peaceful coexistence of bourgeoisie and the workers' class is possible, that class struggle is dying down, that revolution is superfluous and political domination of the workers' class unnecessary. Instead of the necessity of a proletarian democracy they sustain the illusion of a parliamentary pure democracy.

"Because in the reformist conception Parliament is an organ of cooperation of the working class with the bourgeoisie the reformist tactic takes the weight of political work exclusively to Parliament (i.e., organ of bourgeois power), rejects and refuses the use of the pressure of broad popular masses, isolates Parliament from the revolutionary actions of the working people. The reformists have already taken care by their own deeds to offer not one but scores of examples of the absolute impossibility and absurdity of their 'parliamentary way to socialism.' In many countries the reformists won the majority, often absolute majority. Their governments were in existence and have been in existence for extended periods of time" (p. 32, par. 3).

"This tactic which the Communists employed during the whole period 1945-48, i.e., during the period of transition from national and democratic revolution to socialist revolution, led to a strengthening and greater decisiveness on the left wing of the Social Democratic party and to its successive shift to the positions of true revolutionary Marxism and thus to its gradual ideological harmony with the Communists. It prepared conditions for the left wing of the Social Democratic party to expel right-wing representatives from the party of the moment when the right, reformist, wing prepared for an open crossing to the side of the bourgeoisie (in the February crisis in 1948), to cleanse the party and to increase substantially the party's cooperation with the Communists.

"Our experience with the creation of an action unity of the working class, one of the fundamental conditions of a peaceful transition to socialism, shows that the centre of its true beginning must be pressure from below, systematic uncovering of the reformist theory and of cooperation with the bourgeoisie, common fight of the broad masses of all socialist parties or parties and organizations approving the revolutionary demands of the working people. In other words direct actions from below based on our own experience of fighting and winning" (p. 40, pars. 1, 2).

"In 1919, in the midst of a grave civil war in Russia, and in the days of the foundation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, V. I. Lenin proclaimed:

*"In a state in which the bourgeoisie do not offer such furious resistance the situation for Soviet power will be easier; it will be able to work there without violence, without the bloody way forced upon us by Messrs. Kerensky and his imperialists. * * * Other countries arrive at the same goal. Soviet power, by another, more humane way. * * * The example given by Russia alone was not fully understandable to the workers everywhere in the world. They knew that there were Soviets in Russia, they all were for the Soviets but they were frightened by the horrors of the bloody fight. The example of Hungary will be decisive for the proletarian masses, for the European proletariat and for the working peasants." (V. I. Lenin's Works, vol. 29 Czech edition 1955, pp. 264, 265)" (p. 41, pars. 5, 6).*

"A 'cult of violence' cannot be followed by the working class also because a violent armed fight is not at all advantageous for it from the point of view of its aim—the achievement of a complete socialist revolution. This aim combines two inseparable tasks—to oust the power of the bourgeoisie and to organize a new higher method of social productions, to organize and build socialism. The latter task is more serious and more difficult for it is the best source of strength required for the definite victory over the bourgeoisie, a source of firmness and steadfastness of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"It is just this more difficult and serious, more decisive, task that the working class can fulfill much faster with the help of peace production forces, without a civil war—which is unthinkable, without disorganization of the country, destruction of production forces, without the sacrifice of the best cadres of the working class which, instead of following the slogan 'All for the fastest socialism' must turn to the slogan 'All for the victory on the civil war front' (p. 42, pars. 1, 2).

"The Czechoslovak example is evidence that an apparently slower progress of socialist revolution (by gradual transition of national and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution) was actually the faster way because the two-in-one task of the socialist revolution began to be fulfilled simultaneously" (p. 42, par. 6).

DR. POSSONY'S SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I now want to summarize my interpretation of Khrushchev's speech:

(1) This speech, together with the declaration of the Communist Parties of November 1960, has disclosed Communist strategy as it will be employed for the next 5 years or so.

(2) The traditional goal of communism, the conquest of the entire world, is not only reaffirmed but is held far more strongly and hopefully than in the past. It is "unthinkable" that the Communists will abandon their goal of world domination regardless of the price they have to pay. They are willing to pay any price to attain their objective.

(3) The Communists probably are honestly convinced that they are invincible (a) because of the alleged predetermination of history, (b) because of their combined military-political strength, (c) because of their anticipated military superiority, and (d) because of the anticipated demoralization of the free world.

(4) Communist strategy has become more sophisticated than it was under Stalin.

(5) The Communists believe that the final decision in the world struggle, and specifically the victory of world communism, will be attained in the present era of history. In their conception, this era seems to extend to 1975, approximately.

(6) Armed struggle is inevitable. Such specific forms of armed struggle, as liberation wars, uprisings, and "pressure from below" also are inevitable.

(7) A global thermonuclear war is not entirely inevitable. If the free world, and especially the strongest democratic countries like the United States capitulate, then such a war may be avoided. However, while preferable, such a development is unlikely.

(8) The Communist Parties in the free world and their sympathizers must do everything in their power to facilitate nuclear blackmail by the Soviet Union and to prevent military resistance by the free world.

(9) The Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc must not leave any stone unturned to increase their military power in order to fight the probable (albeit not inevitable) world war and to win a global thermonuclear conflict.

(10) For the time being, such conflict must be avoided. The turning point in history will come when the Soviet Union overtakes the United States, some time between 1965 and 1970. Khrushchev talks as though he conceives this competition in terms of an "economic" production race. It is more likely that he is thinking about a race in military technology. Consequently, the great turning point in history will come when the Soviet Union, irrespective of per capita production in industrial goods, achieves technologically superior armaments and attains a military force which, qualitatively and quantitatively, will be superior to the military forces of the United States. If necessary, this force will be employed in the second phase of the current era.

(11) In the first phase, the armed struggle will mostly take the form of liberation wars and uprisings, plus deterrence by nuclear blackmail, on the part of the Soviets, of any military initiatives undertaken by the free world.

(12) Also, in this first phase the struggle must be intensified on the "active fronts in the underdeveloped areas." In particular, it must be pushed in Latin America.

(13) In this phase, strong efforts will be made to improve the effectiveness of uprisings. Henceforth uprisings will be planned as major military undertakings. The insurrectionists will be properly trained and be armed with the most modern equipment. They will be provided with strategic support and power by Soviet nuclear long-range forces, under a coordinated strategy. International crises, such as threats of war and war alerts, may be exploited to launch insurrections.

(14) The achievement of a military, political, and psychological paralysis of the free world is a paramount objective of Soviet strategy.

(15) This objective can be attained by such means as peace propaganda, Pavlovian conditioning, infiltration, threats, and diplomatic negotiations.

(16) Propaganda on disarmament, specifically nuclear disarmament and dis-

armament negotiations are an integral part of the Soviet strategy aimed at paralyzing the free world and strengthening the power of communism.

(17) Soviet strategy is based, on the one hand, on achieving optimal military power and building and strengthening Communist political armies throughout the free world. On the other hand, Soviet strategy utilizes massive deception to bring about, through (a) the unilateral military weakening of the free world, (b) the moral paralysis of free world governments, and (c) the demoralization of public opinion, the capitulation of the United States.

(18) Failing in this strategy, the Soviet intends to destroy the United States by nuclear weapons.

I would like to conclude by voicing my conviction that however sophisticated this current Soviet strategy may be, it is not sophisticated enough to accomplish Communist victory. The hubris of Khrushchev is reminiscent of Hitler and foreshadows his failure. I am fortified in this belief by my realization that the course of history, contrary to Mr. Khrushchev's assumption, is not foreordained. The cause of freedom in history often was considered lost but usually good sense prevailed after democratic hesitations, and one after the other, the main threats to freedom were defeated.

Still, I am concerned that the Kremlin may have become overconfident, apparently is overrating Soviet power, and is inclined to underrate Western power and resolution. There is no question but that free world policies are partially responsible for this dangerous frame of mind. Cockiness and cocksureness have been more frequent causes of war than a rational evaluation of risks, chances, and purposes.

The errors of free world policies will not culminate in the destruction of freedom and of the democratic system of government. But if we condition the Soviet leaders to expect final victory, even by "easy delivery," many millions of citizens all over the free world will pay with their limbs and lives.

To convince the Kremlin that we are not about to commit suicide, nor are going to tolerate our destruction, superior strength, sustained firmness, greater willingness to assume risks, and at long last greater comprehension of the real nature of the Communist threat, are mandatory. True to its traditions, the United States will prove worthy of its responsibilities.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

"The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every Cabinet of Europe, have taught the working class the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations."

"The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."

Source: Address, "Preamble, and Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association," founded in London, Sept. 28, 1864.

APPENDIX II

"From one extreme revolutionary organization came salutations to Lincoln in a fraternal tone. This was the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association * * *. Their leading philosopher and tactician, corresponding secretary for Germany, Karl Marx, author of "Das Kapital," drafted a letter to the American people, addressed to Abraham Lincoln, the President of the United States. 'Sir: We congratulate the American people upon your reelection by a large majority. If resistance to the Slave Power was the watchword of your first election, the triumphal war cry of your reelection is Death to Slavery. From the commencement of the Titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt distinctively that the Star-spangled Banner carried the destiny of their class.' A territorial question had been the immediate cause of the war, and was not the war 'to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tract should be wedded to the labor of the immigrant or be prostituted by the tramp of the slave driver?' An oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders had dared for the first time in the annals of the world to inscribe 'Slavery' on a banner of armed revolt. This in the very places 'where hardly a century ago the idea of one great Democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the first impulse given to the European Revolution.'

"The workingmen of Europe feel sure that, as the American War of Independence initiated a new era or ascendancy for the middle class, so the American Antislavery War will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest sign of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of the enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.

"This first letter from organized workingmen of Europe to American kin" was signed by "George Oiger, president of the council, corresponding secretaries from France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, and fifty-one others representing practically all the lands and corners of continental Europe and the British Isles."

Source: Carl Sandburg, "Abraham Lincoln: The War Years," vol. 3, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1939, p. 579f

"Mr. Lincoln and the International Working Men's Association.

"To the EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"Sir: Some few weeks since a congratulatory address was sent from the Central Council of the above Association to Mr. Lincoln. The address was transmitted through the U.S. Legation, and the following reply has been received. Its publication will oblige.

"Respectfully yours,

"W. R. CREMER."

"LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
"London, January 31.

"Mr. W. R. CREMER,
"Honorary General Secretary of the International Working Men's Association,
18, Greek-st., W.

"SIR: I am directed to inform you that the address of the Central Council of your Association, which was duly transmitted through the Legation to the President of the United States, has been received by him. So far as the sentiments expressed by it are personal, they are accepted by him with a sincere and anxious desire that he may be able to prove himself not unworthy of the confidence which has been recently extended to him by his fellow-citizens, and by so many of the friends of humanity and progress throughout the world. The

Government of the United States has a clear consciousness that its policy neither is, nor could be, reactionary, but at the same time it adheres to the course which it adopted at the beginning, of abstaining everywhere from propagandism and unlawful intervention. It strives to do equal and exact justice to all States and to all men and it relies upon the beneficial results of that effort for support at home and for respect and good will throughout the world. Nations do not exist for themselves alone, but to promote the welfare and happiness of mankind by benevolent intercourse and example. It is in this relation that the United States regard their cause in the present conflict with slavery-maintaining insurgents as the cause of human nature, and they derive new encouragement to persevere from the testimony of the working men of Europe that the national attitude is favoured with their enlightened approval and earnest sympathies.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant.

"CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS."

Source : London Times, Feb. 8, 1865, p. 12, col. 4.

APPENDIX III

KHRUSHCHEV REPORT ON MOSCOW CONFERENCE

(Moscow, Soviet Home Service, Jan. 19, 1961, 0800 GMT—L)

Text of Nikita Khrushchev's report, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," at the meeting of party organizations of the Higher Party School, the Academy of Social Sciences, and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism attached to the Central Committee of the CPSU on January 6, as published in *Kommunist*, No. 1, January 1961)

(Text) Comrades: The conference of representatives of 81 Marxist-Leninist parties held in Moscow in November 1960 will enter the history of the world Communist and Workers movement as one of its most vivid pages. This conference profoundly analyzed the present-day international situation and worked out positions common for our movement pertaining to the most important questions. As a result of this conference, held in an atmosphere of fraternal unity, the many-million-strong family of Communists of all countries rallied even closer on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and its forces in the heroic struggle for the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism increased.

Participating in the work of the conference, the most representative in the whole history of the Communist and Workers movement, were veterans of our movement hardened in class struggles who in long years of severe struggle had not faltered under the torture of Fascist henchmen and other enemies of the working class. Participating in the conference were prominent leaders of Marxist-Leninist Parties of Socialist countries, representatives of Communist Parties which are waging under difficult conditions a heroic struggle against capitalism, the fighting leaders of the national liberation movement—in other words, the elite of the international Communist movement.

Now, when in all countries of the world Communists are vividly discussing and unanimously approving the statement of the conference and the appeal to the peoples of the world, it becomes particularly evident that the participants in the conference did not in vain spend much time and effort in their common cause. The working people of mankind are convinced that the Marxist-Leninist Parties have justified the hopes of the peoples.

More than 1 billion people of the countries of the Socialist camp watched the work of the conference with rapt attention. They are confident that as a result of the conference the Socialist camp will become even stronger and that the ranks of the international Communist movement will be rallied even more closely.

The working class, the workers of the capitalist countries, awaited the answers to the questions on how best to carry on the struggle for their revolutionary aims, for social progress, for democratic rights and freedoms, and how to give a more successful rebuttal to imperialist reaction.

The fighters for national independence awaited an answer to the questions on how one can rapidly put an end forever to the shameful system of colonialism and insure the development of the countries that have become liberated on the path of national independence, peace, and social progress.

All peace-loving mankind awaited the answer to the most burning question of the present day—how to prevent a world thermonuclear war and attain lasting peace on earth and friendship among all the peoples, and how to insure peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Hundreds of millions of people in all the countries of the world felt a satisfaction on learning the results of the work of the conference.

As a result of the conference, the ideological treasure house of international communism has become greatly enriched. The statement unanimously adopted at the conference is a militant Marxist-Leninist document of tremendous international importance. It confirms allegiance of the Communist parties to the declaration of 1957. At the same time it provides a profound analysis of new

phenomena in the world arena and contains important theoretical and political deductions for the activity of all the Marxist-Leninist parties. The statement will serve as a true compass in the further struggle for the great aims that confront Communists, working classes, and progressive people of all countries.

The declaration gives the Marxist-Leninist definition of the current era and shows the fresh prospects opening before the international Communist, workers, and liberation movement. The documents of the conference point the way for development of the world Socialist system and for further unification of the socialist camp. They determine the major problems of the struggle by the working class in capitalist countries, the struggle for liquidation of the disgraceful colonial system and unification of all forces acting against the threat of a new war.

The appeal to the peoples of the world contains a fiery call to unite in struggle for solution of the most burning problem of our times—prevention of a world war. The appeal again demonstrates that it is precisely we Communists who are the most consistent defenders of the interests of the masses and indicate the only correct way of preserving and strengthening peace.

The work of the conference was imbued with a spirit of proletarian internationalism, party democracy, and an aspiration for even greater consolidation of the unity of the Communist ranks. The delegations of all the parties presented their views, exchanged experiences, and contributed to the assessment and elaboration of the basic problems of the present day.

A strengthening of the unity of the ranks of the world Communist movement and an even greater consolidation of the world Communist front on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism are the principal outcome of the conference. This is a new ideological and political victory for the Communists, a victory of major historic significance. At the same time, it is another defeat for the enemies of communism and progress. The imperialists and their lackeys were bitterly disappointed when they studied the documents of the conference. We have every reason to state firmly that the unity of the world Communist movement, which the imperialist reactionaries fear like the very devil, has now gained more strength. This is a great success for our common cause.

Our epoch is the epoch of the triumph of Marxism-Leninism:

The analysis of the world situation at the beginning of the sixties can only evoke in every fighter in the great Communist movement feelings of profound satisfaction and legitimate pride. Indeed, comrades, life has greatly surpassed even the boldest and most optimistic predictions and expectations. Once it was customary to say that history was working for socialism; at the same time, one remembered that mankind would dump capitalism and that socialism would be victorious. Today, it is possible to assert that socialism is working for history, for the basic content of the contemporary historical process constitutes the establishment and consolidation of socialism on an international scale.

In 1913, 4 years before the October revolution, our immortal leader and teacher, Vladimir Ilich Lenin, wrote that since the time of the Communist Manifesto world history had been distinctly divided into three major periods: (1) From the 1848 revolution to the Paris Commune in 1871, (2) from the Paris Commune to the Russian revolution in 1905, and (3) since the Russian revolution. He concluded the description of these periods this way: Since the emergence of Marxism each of the three great epochs in world history has been supplying it with new confirmations and new triumphs; but Marxism, as the teaching of the proletariat, will be supplied with even greater triumphs by the present historical epoch. These are prophetic words. They became reality with striking force and accuracy. The historical epoch brilliantly foreseen by Vladimir Ilich Lenin has become a qualitative, basic, new era in world history. Not a single preceding era can be compared to it.

These were the eras when the working class was gaining strength, when its heroic struggle, though shaking the foundations of capitalism, was as yet unable to solve the major problem of the transfer of power into the hands of the workers.

The new area differs from all the preceding ones in the universal historic triumph of socialism initiated in October 1917. Since then Marxist-Leninist teaching has been achieving one triumphal victory after another, and now its great strength and its transforming role are felt not only within individual countries and continents but in social development in all parts of the world.

There are a number of reasons which make the march of socialism invincible. In the first place, Marxism-Leninism today dominates the minds of literally

hundreds of millions of people and thereby constitutes, if one is to apply Marx's words, a mighty material force. Furthermore, Marxism-Leninism now appears before mankind not only as a theory but as a living reality. The Socialist society which is being created in the boundless expanses of Europe and Asia today represents this teaching.

Now a force does not exist in the world, nor can one exist, that can hold back the increasing tendency by which the masses see with their own eyes and, so to speak, feel with their own hands, what socialism is like—no, not in books and manifestoes, but in life, in practice. There is now no force in the world that can stem the movement toward socialism by the peoples in all the new countries.

Another circumstance is of prime importance. If yesterday hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America were suppressed by the yoke of the imperialist civilizers, today the picture is radically changing. The revolutionary emergence of more and more peoples into the world arena creates exceptionally favorable conditions for an unprecedented broadening of the sphere of influence of Marxism-Leninism.

The time is not far away when Marxism-Leninism will possess the minds of the majority of the world's population. What has been going on in the world in the 48 years since the triumph of the October revolution completely confirms the scientific accuracy and vitality of the Leninist theory of the world Socialist revolution.

Under current conditions it is useful to recall, in Lenin's terms, the actual process of the world Socialist revolution, the forces participating in it. The Socialist revolution, Lenin indicated, will not be solely and largely a struggle by the revolutionary proletarians in each country against its own bourgeoisie. No, it will be a struggle by all the colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism.

Stressing that this struggle is aimed primarily at national liberation, Lenin said: It is quite clear that in the future decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe at first aimed at national liberation will turn against capitalism and imperialism and may play a much greater revolutionary part than we expect.

Now that the world Socialist system has already come into existence, in the time of the greatest upsurge of anti-imperialist national liberation revolutions, it is essential to determine the future course, the prospects of world events. This is impossible, however, without a deep understanding of the nature, substance, and character of the decisive tasks of our era. The question of the character of the era is by no means an abstract or a narrow theoretical question. The general strategic line and tactics of world communism, of each Communist Party, are closely related to it.

Ideologists of imperialism, including their accomplices in the camp of reformism and revisionism, are relying particularly on the distortion of the character of the present era. Such falsification pursues quite a definite aim: to disorientate the broad masses of the people, to lead them away from the revolutionary path, to bind them to the chariot of imperialism, to present things as if capitalism were not in agony, but were performing a sort of calculated evolutionary transformation toward socialism. This is precisely the notorious theory of the so-called transformation of capitalism.

The falsifiers maintain that literally all classes of society are interested in such a transformation and allege that, this being so, peace and harmony prevail in the world of capitalism. Such is the picture of the modern era painted by bourgeois ideologists, rightwing social democrats, and the revisionist renegades of communism. It is not fortuitous that the ideologists of capitalism are trying to substitute for the concept of capitalism and imperialism such artificial concepts as "people's capitalism" or "welfare state."

We must, of course, unmask these ideological diversions and oppose them by our scientific Marxist-Leninist assessment of the era. We must do that to determine correctly the correlation of forces, to exploit new possibilities which the present era opens up for the further advancement of our great cause.

What requirements should a Marxist-Leninist appraisal of our epoch meet? It should provide a clear idea of which class stands in the center of the era and what the essence, direction, and tasks of social development are. It should cover the whole revolutionary process from the formation of socialism to the full victory of communism. It should indicate the forces which side with the working class, standing in the center of our era, and the movements which contribute to the general anti-imperialist stream.

Socialist revolution has achieved victory in a large number of countries, socialism has become a powerful world system, the colonial system of imperialism verges on complete disintegration, and imperialism is in a state of decline and crisis. The definition of our epoch must reflect these decisive events.

The statement of the conference provides the following definition of our era: Our era, whose essence is the transition from capitalism to socialism begun by the great October Socialist revolution, is an era of the struggle of two diametrically opposed social systems, an era of Socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions; an era of the collapse of capitalism and of liquidation of the colonial system; an era of the change to the road of socialism by more and more nations; and of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale.

This definition of the nature of the current era can be regarded as an example of the creative, truly scientific solution of a big, weighty problem. The strength of this definition is that it correctly characterizes the main achievement of the world liberation movement and opens before the Communist and workers movement clear prospects for the worldwide victory.

Defining the essence and nature of the entire current era, it is highly important that we understand the chief peculiarities and distinctive characteristics of its present stage. If one approaches an evaluation of the post-October period from the point of view of its principal motive forces, this period is clearly divided into two stages:

The first began with the victory of the October revolution. This was the period of the assertion and development of, as Lenin put it, the national dictatorship of the proletariat; i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat within the national boundaries of Russia alone. Although the Soviet Union, from the very first days of its existence, exercised an exceptional influence on international life, imperialism, nevertheless, greatly determined the course and nature of international relations. But even then imperialism proved itself unable to smash the Soviet Union, to prevent its becoming the mighty industrial power which became the stronghold of the cause of progress and civilization, the center of attraction of all forces opposing imperialist oppression and Fascist enslavement.

The second stage of development of the current era is connected with the formation of the world Socialist system. This is a revolutionary process with universal historic importance.

The October revolution broke one link in the chain of imperialism. Then a frontal assault on the chain of imperialism was carried out. Previously one had spoken of a breach in the chain of imperialism through one or a number of links, but now, as a matter of fact, there no longer exists an all-enveloping chain of imperialism. The dictatorship of the working class has stepped out of the boundaries of one country, has become an international force.

Imperialism has lost not only those countries in which socialism was victorious; it is rapidly losing almost all its colonies. It is quite understandable that as a result of such blows and losses the general crisis of capitalism has greatly increased, and the balance of forces in the world arena undergone radical changes in favor of socialism.

The principal distinguishing feature of our time is the fact that the world socialist system is becoming a decisive factor in the development of human society. This has been directly reflected also in the sphere of international relations. Under present conditions, prerequisites have been created for socialism to increasingly determine the nature, methods, and ways of international relations. This does not mean that imperialism represents an infinitesimal quantity which can be disregarded. Not at all. Imperialism still possesses great strength. It possesses a strong military machine. Now imperialism has created, under peacetime conditions, a gigantic apparatus of war and a widespread system of blocs, and has subjected their economy to the arms race. American imperialists lay claim to the whole world living under their heel and threaten humanity with a rocket and nuclear war.

Contemporary imperialism is being characterized to an ever-increasing degree by decay and parasitism. In their evaluation of the prospects of international development, Marxist-Leninists do not permit and cannot permit any illusions concerning imperialism. There is countless evidence that imperialists are pursuing a policy of base provocations and aggressions. This is nothing new. What is new is that any intrigues by the imperialists not only are completely exposed but are also resolutely rebuffed, and their attempts to unleash local wars are being cut short.

For the first time in history, the present balance of power in the world arena enables the Socialist camp and other peace-loving forces to pursue the completely realistic task of compelling the imperialists, under the threat of the downfall of their system, not to unleash a world war.

In connection with the possibility of averting a world war, I should like to dwell on the question concerning the prospects for a further development of the general crisis of capitalism. It is generally known that both World War I and World War II exerted enormous influence on the emergence and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Does it follow from this that a world war is a necessary condition for a further intensification of the general crisis of capitalism? Such a conclusion would be profoundly incorrect since it distorts the Marxist-Leninist theory of the Socialist revolution and conflicts with the real reasons for revolution. A proletarian revolution does not result from military cataclysms; it is first of all a consequence of the development of the class struggle and of the internal contradictions of capitalism.

It is perfectly obvious that the establishment of the world system of socialism, the quick progress of the disintegration of the colonial system, the unprecedented upsurge of the struggle of the working class for its rights and interest—that all this undermines the support for capitalism, intensifies its general crisis. The losses of capitalism as a result of these blows are irreparable. This refers both to the entire system of capitalism and to its main power, the United States.

The mightiest power of capitalism has found itself most affected by the general crisis. In the postwar years the blows of economic shocks have fallen with particular frequency. In the postwar period, the United States has experienced three critical production slumps: 1948-49 1953-54, and particularly 1957-58. During the past year, according to estimates of the American press, U.S. industrial production increased by only 2 percent. For 1961, American economists predict not an increase but a decline of about 3.7 percent in production, and maybe even more. In the U.S.S.R. production increased about 10 percent in 1960.

It is precisely the monopoly capital of the United States that is revealing its incapability of using the production forces on hand. The richest country of the capitalist world is the country of the largest chronic unemployment. According to clearly optimistic official statistics, the number of unemployed in the United States rose from 2.6 million people in 1956 to 3.8 million in 1959, and to more than 4 million by the end of 1960. Moreover, there is a multimillion army of semiunemployed in the United States.

A constant feature in the United States is the growing below-capacity operation of industry. Some 37 percent of the productive capacity of the steel-smelting industry of the United States was idle in 1959, although the output of steel, following a steep reduction in the critical year of 1958, increased somewhat. At the end of 1960 less than half of the productive capacity of the steel-smelting industry was used.

In spite of an immense increase in military appropriations, the production growth rate in that country has been falling off in postwar years and is now just managing to keep ahead of the population increase. During 1956-59, in per capita terms, the output of industrial products in the United States remained at the same level.

Although the United States remains the principal economic, financial, and military force of modern imperialism, its share in the economy and politics of the capitalist world is declining. The U.S. share of industrial output of capitalist countries has fallen from 54 percent in 1950 to 47-48 percent in 1959. While in 1950 the U.S. share in the capitalist countries' steel production amounted to 57.4 percent, in 1959 it fell to 40.4 percent. The U.S. share in the exports of capitalist countries sank from more than 30 percent in 1940, to 21 percent in 1953, and to 17.4 percent in 1959.

Nevertheless, American monopolists have been and remain the principal usurers and exploiters of the peoples. One is fully justified in concluding that both in the economic field as well as in the field of international politics the main power of capitalism has entered a phase of growing difficulties and crises—the phase of its decline.

As regards the economy of the other capitalist countries, it is also characterized by increasing instability.

Today the capitalist world is not divided into two imperialist camps, as it was on the eve of both world wars. Nevertheless, it is far from united and is divided by a cruel internal struggle. Even the window of the so-called Atlantic

solidarity hides an ugly picture of internal discords and conflicts; the opposition to U.S. leadership and diktat is increasing.

The revival of German militarism and revanchism in the center of Europe restores a most complicated range of Anglo-German, Franco-German, and other imperialist contradictions. If we compare the present position of capitalism with its position after World War II, it becomes clear that a great deepening in the general crisis of capitalism has taken place.

Having profoundly analyzed the whole international situation, the conference reached a conclusion which is of great theoretical and political significance. This conclusion states:

The development of the common crisis of capitalism has reached a new stage. The peculiarity of this stage is that it emerged not in connection with the world war, but in conditions of competition and struggle between the two systems; in the ever-increasing change in the correlation of forces to the advantage of socialism; in the acute aggravation of all the contributions of imperialism; under conditions when the successful struggle of the peace-loving forces for establishment and stabilization of world coexistence has prevented the imperialists from undermining world peace with their aggressive actions; and under conditions of an increasing struggle by the masses for democracy, national liberation, and socialism.

This bespeaks the further development and deepening of the common crisis of capitalism. Our militant comrades from the Communist parties in the capitalist countries take this into consideration in defining their further tactical line in the struggle for the cause of the working class. And it can be said with confidence that the near future will be marked with new successes by the united forces of world socialism, the working class, and the national liberation movement.

Extensive building of communism in the U.S.S.R. and prospects for development of the world socialist system:

Comrades, the world Socialist is the greatest moving force in modern times. The international working class and its Communist vanguard regard it as their duty to strengthen in every way the might and cohesion of the Socialist camp—the stronghold of peace, freedom, and independence. It is well known that the conference devoted a great deal of attention to the further development of the world Socialist system. The statement set forth important theoretical and political tenets of this development. I would like to dwell now on some of them.

As pointed out in the statement, the primary task of Socialist countries is to exploit possibilities inherent in socialism to outstrip, as soon as possible, the world capitalist system in absolute volume of industrial and agricultural production, and then to overtake the most developed capitalist countries in per capita production and living standards.

The period since the 1957 conference of representatives of Communist and Workers Parties is characteristic of the vigorous growth of the economic might and international influence of the world Socialist system.

Since then the volume of industrial production in the Socialist countries rose 37.1 percent and the industrial output in the capitalist countries increased 7.4 percent. During the same time industrial production in the U.S.S.R. rose by 23 percent and in the United States by only 4.6 percent. The average annual rate of increase in all the Socialist countries amounted to 17 percent, and in the capitalist countries to 3.6 percent. The average annual rate of increase in the U.S.S.R. in that period amounted to 10.9 percent and in the United States to 2.3 percent.

Socialism has wrought such profound changes in all spheres of life in the people's democracies that today we can assert with legitimate pride that by now not only in the U.S.S.R. but in all countries of the Socialist camp the social-economic possibilities for the restoration of capitalism have been liquidated.

The world Socialist system has entered a new stage of development. The CPSU Central Committee deemed it its duty to inform the world Communist forum about the work of our party and to acquaint it with our immediate prospects. Our party is concentrating its efforts on solution of tasks in the extensive construction of a Communist society. Chief among these tasks are creation of the material-technical base of communism, development on this foundation of Communist social relations, and molding the man of the future Communist society.

The most important stage in the creation of the material-technical base of communism in our country is the 7-year plan. In the first 2 years of the 7-year plan industrial output, according to the target figures, had to increase 17 percent. In fact, however, it increased almost 25 percent. In the present rates are pre-

served, industrial output will not increase 80 percent in 7 years as envisaged in the plan, but will almost double. This will mean that industrial production in an amount of about 90 billion new rubles will be produced in excess of plan.

To explain more clearly what this figure means, let me remind you that Vladimir Ilich Lenin reported with pride to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International that our country in 1922 for the first time had been able to invest 20 million rubles in heavy industry. You see how modest the figures of 1922 were and what possibilities we have today.

In connection with this I want to say a few words about metallurgy. The 7-year plan has been drawn up in such a way that we must produce 86 to 91 million tons of steel in 1965. Last year, we produced 65 million tons, and a 6-million-ton increase in the production of steel has been planned for 1961. This means that we will have to produce 71 million tons.

If in subsequent years of the 7-year plan we insure the same increase as in 1961, then, by the end of 1965, 95 million tons of steel could be produced. But if future steel production increases at the same speed as in the first 3 years of the 7-year plan, production in 1965 could amount to 100 to 102 million tons.

But at the moment we will not carry out a policy of developing ferrous metallurgy to the absolute limit. We will switch over part of the capital investment into agriculture and into light industry. It is impossible to build communism by offering only machines and ferrous and nonferrous metals. People should be able to eat properly and dress well, to have adequate housing conditions, and other material and cultural advantages. This is not a revision of our general line but a sensible utilization of our material possibilities.

When we were encircled by enemies and our industry was weaker than that of capitalist countries, we economized in everything and, as Lenin said, even in schools. Now the situation is different; we have a powerful industry, and our armed forces have the most modern arms. Why should we deny ourselves things which people can enjoy without jeopardizing the further development of our Socialist state?

At the moment, the Central Committee of the CPSU and Soviet Government are working on a general plan for the development of the economy of the Soviet Union for the years 1960 to 1980. Truly breathtaking prospects are opening up in the creation of the material and technical base of communism and in raising the well-being of the people on the foundation of bringing to life the great predictions of our immortal leader and teacher, V. I. Lenin.

Raising the culture of the popular masses is one of the greatest achievements of socialism. In 1959 there were 2.2 million students in the U.S.S.R. The number of workers engaged in intellectual labor now exceeds 20 million. The number of persons with secondary and higher educational training has grown considerably among people engaged in physical labor. Before the revolution none of the workers and peasants had secondary training, let alone higher education. Now, according to the latest census, of the citizens of the Soviet Union engaged in physical labor 32 percent have secondary or higher education, (39?) percent among workers, and 21 percent among kolkhoz workers.

All this shows convincingly that we have already scored very perceptible achievements in gradually eliminating substantial differences between physical and intellectual labor.

The results of the very great cultural revolution which has taken place in our country have found vivid reflection in the achievements of Soviet science. The whole world admires these achievements—three Soviet artificial earth satellites, an artificial sun satellite, our luniks and spaceships. In all this can be seen successes and advantages of the Socialist system, the Socialist genius of the people building communism.

The first stage of all-out construction of communism encompassed by the 7-year plan is at the same time the decisive stage in the completion of the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R. Whereas in 1950 the Soviet Union produced less than 30 percent of the industrial output of the United States, it now produces roughly 60 percent. As shown by calculations of economists, by 1965 the U.S.S.R. will outstrip the United States in volume of production, and will outstrip the United States in per capita production by approximately 1970. Alongside the Soviet people, the peoples of other Socialist countries are also selflessly working to solve the basic economic task of socialism.

The time is approaching when, in its share in world production, socialism will take first place. Capitalism will have been dealt a defeat in the decisive sphere of human activity—the sphere of material production.

Already as a result of fulfillment and overfulfillment of the 7-year plan, and of the high rate of development of the economies of the people's democracies, the countries of the world Socialist system will be producing more than half of the world's entire industrial production.

The victory of the U.S.S.R. in economic competition with the United States, the victory of the whole Socialist system over the Capitalist system, will be the biggest turning point in history, will exert a still more powerful, revolutionizing influence on the workers movement all over the world. Then, even to the greatest skeptics, it will become clear that it is only socialism that provides everything necessary for the happy life of man, and they will make their choice in favor of socialism.

To win time in the economic contest with capitalism is now the main thing. The quicker we increase economic construction, the stronger we are economically and politically, the greater will be the influence of the Socialist camp on historical development, on the destiny of the world.

In the statement of the conference the need is emphasized for steady improvement of political and economic work, for constant perfection of the methods of leadership of the national economy, for scientifically backed Socialist management. Our practice also confirms that a correct solution of these problems is quite important. We devote special attention to the problems of leadership being solved with regard to objective conditions, with neither a quickening nor a slowing of the rate of development being allowed.

In our country wide measures are being taken to place natural resources in the service of the construction of communism. Some 41 million hectares of virgin and waste lands have been reclaimed—an area in which several West European states could be placed.

The cascade of gigantic hydroelectric power stations has created an almost fully regulated flow of the great Russian river Volga. The chain of still bigger hydroelectric power stations, notably the Bratsk GES, of over 4 million kilowatts capacity, forms the Angara cascade. Still more majestic stations of up to 5-million-kilowatt capacity will place the mighty Siberian Yenisey at the service of Communist construction.

In the center of the European U.S.S.R., excavation of one of the world's richest iron ore basins, the Kursk magnetic anomaly, has begun. Oil rigs are striding ever further to the east. In prerevolutionary Russia three-fourths of the oil was produced in the Baku area. Under Soviet rule the output of oil in Baku has more than doubled. Nevertheless in 1959 the share of Baku oil related to the whole output of oil in the U.S.S.R. comprised less than 15 percent.

The inexhaustible mineral wealth of Siberia, supplying our country with millions of tons of ferrous, nonferrous, and rare metals, various mineral raw materials and industrial diamonds, is being discovered; millions of hectares of former drought land are being irrigated, and problems of diverting some larger northern rivers are being studied.

These are only individual examples of what fruitful results are obtained when scientifically based methods of management make it possible to make full use of the creative possibilities of socialism.

One of the most important integral parts in the work of the CPSU in the leadership of Communist construction is working out theoretical problems raised by life. The practice of Communist construction raises many such questions, which have no ready answers. We advance along unexplored paths in building communism. Mankind still does not possess the complete theoretical background and the experience of organizing all aspects of society's life under communism.

Of course, Marxists are familiar with general laws and principles defining the way of life under communism, but at present knowledge alone of the general laws is insufficient.

Communism has gone over from theory to direct practice. The party correctly solves new tasks of Communist construction because it regards Marxism-Leninism not as frozen theory but as a creative teaching which is developing without interruption.

In solving the practical tasks of Communist construction, our party is constantly engaged in the further development of Marxist-Leninist theory. The great Lenin teaches that revolutionary Marxist theory is inseparable from revolutionary practice, that the theory and practice cooperate and supplement one another, and that theory illuminates the path of practice.

Allow me to mention a number of theoretical problems dealt with by our party in recent years. These are the questions of the two stages of communism, of

the transition from its first stage to the second, higher stage. They are also the questions of the development of the production forces and production relations during the transition from socialism to communism, of the development of the Socialist state system into Communist self-government, of Communist education of the workers, etc. I would like to dwell on some of these questions.

With the advance toward communism the direction of Socialist economy grows more complicated. The relationship between the branches of this economy and the economic areas of the country are assuming an increasingly tighter character. In this connection our party devotes much attention to the working out of problems of the management of national economy and of the improvement of planning. In 1957 reorganization of the management of industry and building was carried out, branch ministries were liquidated, and sovnarkhozes were set up in economic administrative areas. The essence of this measure was to be found in the transfer of the actual direction of economic development to local areas, with the retention of centralized planning. Consequently the principle of democratic centralism was further developed; this conforms to the Leninist tenet which holds that with the advance to communism and the rise in cultural standards of the people the management of production will be organized on a democratic basis to an increasing extent.

Further our party revealed the ways of the development of the kolkhoz and cooperative ownership on a nationwide level, fusing them into one single Communist ownership. The CPSU has worked out and has put into life a whole system of economic, political, and organizational measures aimed at the strengthening and all-round development of the kolkhoz system and kolkhoz and cooperative ownership, that is, the reorganization of the MTS, the sale of machines to kolkhozes, the changes in the system of procurement of farm produce and of price policy, the help with cadres for the countryside, etc.

Our party devotes much attention to the correct application of the Socialist principle of distribution and to the transition in the future to the Communist principle of distribution. It has shown the economic failure and the harmfulness of all manifestations of leveling and weakening of the principle of material incentive. As is well known, in the past we had cases of deviation from the principle of material incentive, particularly in agriculture, which caused serious damage to agricultural production and to the kolkhoz system. Contempt for the material requirements of the working people and the concentration of emphasis on enthusiasm and awareness, on social and moral forms of incentive and reward, hampered development of production and the raising of the living standards of the working people.

This had negative internal and even international consequences, for it lowered the prestige of the kolkhoz system and gave food to the enemies of communism. We eliminated the shortcomings that were allowed to develop, and are bringing about consistent adherence to the principle "from everyone according to his abilities, to everyone according to his work." This principle is a general obligation to work. Its implementation is of enormous importance for raising labor productivity, increasing workers' skill, and for raising people with the Communist attitude that work is the most vital necessity. At the same time, our party is concerned with combining both material and moral stimuli for work. As we progress toward communism the moral factor will constantly rise. It is of great importance already.

The emergence and development of Communist labor teams, shops, and enterprises is an outstanding phenomenon of Soviet reality. A transition to the Communist principle, "distribution according to need," will be implemented only when productive forces and labor productivity will have attained a level insuring the creation of an abundance of material goods and when work will have become most vital to members of the society.

Now the main portion of national funds earmarked for consumption is distributed according to the amount of work. At the same time, a considerable portion of the needs of working people is satisfied free of charge. Allocations for social and cultural undertakings, for popular education and medical services, which are enjoyed free by all the citizens, now amount to almost 25 billion rubles annually. Increasing public funds for personal consumption is regarded by us as a Communist way of raising the living standards of working people.

The party pays much attention to the critical questions concerning the Socialist state. In our country, where exploiting classes ceased to exist a long time ago, a gradual dying off of the organs of state administration is taking place. First of all, those who exercise the functions of compulsion.

Our party is holding to a strict course in the further development of democracy, in the handing over of individual functions of state organs to public organizations, in the development of public foundations in every sphere of political and cultural life, in the attraction of the broadest masses of working people in the administration of economy, in the safeguarding of public order, in the struggle against violators of the law, and so forth. This course not only does not weaken but, on the contrary, strengthens Socialist society and corresponds to the prospects of the transformation of the Socialist state into a Communist public self-government.

These and other questions concerning the theory and practice of building communism will be reflected in the new program of the CPSU. This program is being worked out at present. It will be discussed by the party and will be adopted at the forthcoming 22d congress of the Party.

The statement expresses the common concern of Marxist-Leninist Parties for successful progress in every Socialist country so that the tasks of Socialist building may be solved correctly, in the interests of each country and the Socialist camp as a whole.

In this connection, the great significance of the collective experience of the Socialist countries, accumulated on the basis of Socialist building in different countries, has been noted. Our party attentively studies the experience of the fraternal parties of Socialist countries, which add much that is of value to the Marxist-Leninist theory of building the new society. Now collective experience in the building of socialism has been accumulated. This experience is a valuable property of the whole international Communist movement. The study and correct use by all the fraternal parties of collective experience are a most important condition for the development of each Socialist country.

In the part of the earth occupied by the world Socialist system, the prototype of a new society for all mankind is being created. This places a particular responsibility on the Communist Parties of all the Socialist countries. Given correct political and economic leadership, taking into account both the general laws of the building of socialism, the specific conditions of individual countries, and the special features and requirements of each stage of development, we can make even more active use of the advantages of socialism and we can attain fresh success.

The countries of the world Socialist system are coming closer and closer together, strengthening their cooperation in all spheres of activity. This is a natural process. There are not and cannot be any insoluble contradictions between the Socialist countries. The more highly developed and economically powerful countries give unselfish, brotherly help to the economically undeveloped. About 500 industrial enterprises and installations have been built in the fraternal Socialist countries with the help of the Soviet Union; loans and credits advanced by us to these countries total 7.8 billion new rubles.

At the same time, we consider it our duty to point out that the fraternal countries of socialism, in their turn, cooperate with the Soviet Union in the development of our economy. The world Socialist system at the present time is an association (sovkupnost) of the national economies of sovereign, independent countries.

The growing strength of the links between the national economies of the Socialist countries is a natural law of the development of the world Socialist system. It can be said with justification that it is the line of strengthening the world Socialist economic system which the further development of the Socialist countries will follow, as shown by the statement that the Marxist-Leninist Parties which are at the helm of leadership in these countries are unanimous in their desire to actively further this process. They are jointly working for a proper solution of problems of specialization and cooperation of production, international division of labor. Thus they contribute to a fuller utilization of the advantages offered by socialism.

Coordination of national economic plans has become the basic form of combining the productive efforts of Socialist countries at the present stage. It is in the interest of all countries to perfect this work, particularly in connection with the task of working out the long-term plan for the expansion of the national economies of Socialist countries. The consolidation of the common economic base of the world Socialist system, the creation of a material base for a more or less simultaneous transition of the peoples of the Socialist system to communism will be achieved more rapidly to the degree that the internal resources of each country are fully mobilized within this system, to the degree that the advantages of the Socialist international division of labor are used more

adequately. It is on this basis that the balancing of the levels of economic expansion is taking place.

By solving the task of gradually overcoming the differences which have arisen in the course of history in the levels of economic development, we are showing to the peoples of the whole world the Communist way toward liquidation of economic and cultural backwardness to which they have been doomed by imperialism.

The effectiveness of this was first demonstrated by the example of certain central Asian and Caucasian peoples, backward in the past, who when greatly assisted by the more advanced Socialist nations, notably by the Russian nation, quickly overcame their backwardness and have now taken their place in the ranks of the industrially developed regions of the country. This process is now taking place within the whole Socialist system.

The common duty is to continue in every way to strengthen the solidarity, unity, collaboration, and mutual aid of Socialist countries. The statement of the conference says Communist and Workers Parties are tirelessly rearing workers in the spirit of Socialist internationalism, in the intolerance of all manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, in the solidarity and unity of Communist and Workers Parties. In their fidelity to the Marxist-Leninist teaching the peoples of the Socialist countries have the main source of the strength and invincibility of each Socialist country and of the Socialist camp as a whole.

The Communist and Workers Parties have defined the correct principles, those in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and of interrelationship of Socialist countries and nations. Of course, in so new and major a matter individual shortcomings and some rough edges are unavoidable. The Socialist commonwealth, however, is characterized not by these shortcomings of a private nature, but by the essentially internationalist nature of socialism, the internationalist policy of the fraternal parties and countries, and the world historic successes achieved because of it.

Regarding the shortcomings, we must remove them, being guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism, international solidarity, and fraternal friendship, keeping as the main aim the solidarity of the Socialist camp. The Soviet Union has always sacredly fulfilled and is fulfilling its international duty, placing the unity of countries of the Socialist camp, of the international Communist movement, above all else. Our Communist Party will continue to adhere to this, its immutable policy. The further solidarity of Socialist countries on principles of Marxism-Leninism will create still greater possibilities for solving the most important problems of the present time in a new manner, in the interests of peace, democracy, and socialism.

The prevention of a new war is the question of all questions:

Comrades, questions of war and peace were at the center of attention at the conference. The participants were fully aware that the problem of preventing a global thermonuclear war is the most burning and vital problem for mankind. V. I. Lenin pointed out that since World War I the question of war and peace has become the cardinal question in the entire policy of all countries on earth, a question of life and death for tens of millions of people. These words of Lenin resound with increased force in our days, when an application of the new means of mass destruction threatens unprecedented devastation and the death of hundreds of millions of people.

There is now no more urgent task than the prevention of such a catastrophe. The conference has discovered and outlined ways of using even more effectively the new opportunities of preventing a world war which emerged as a result of the formation of the Socialist camp, the growth of its might, and the new balance of power. The peoples believe that Communists will use the entire might of the Socialist system and the increased strength of the international working class to deliver mankind from the horrors of war. Marx, Engels, and Lenin considered that the historic mission of the working class and its Communist vanguard consisted not only in abolishing the oppression of exploitation, poverty, and lack of rights, but in ridding mankind of bloody wars.

V. I. Lenin nurtured our party in a spirit of implacable struggle against imperialism, for stable peace and friendship among all peoples. These principles have always been and continue to be the essence of our foreign policy. Our party remembers Lenin's words to the effect that while dying and disintegrating, capitalism is still capable of causing great calamities to mankind. The party always maintains the greatest vigilance regarding the danger emanating from imperialism. It nurtures the Soviet people in this spirit and does everything necessary to make it impossible for the enemy ever to catch us unawares.

We warn of a threat of war in order to raise the vigilance and energy of the peoples and to mobilize them for the struggle to prevent world war. The attitude of the CPSU toward problems of war and peace are generally known. It has been more than once expounded in decisions of congresses and in other documents of our party.

Wars have followed the division of the society into classes, i.e., the basis for the beginning of all wars will be finally eliminated only when the division of the society into hostile antagonistic classes is abolished. The victory of the working class throughout the world and the victory of socialism will bring about the removal of all social and national causes of the outbreak of wars, and mankind will be able to rid itself forever of that dreadful plight.

In modern conditions the following categories of wars should be distinguished: World wars, local wars, liberation wars, and popular uprisings. This is necessary to work out the correct tactics with regard to these wars.

Let us begin with the question of world wars. Communists are the most determined opponents of world wars, just as they are generally opponents of wars among states. These wars are needed only by imperialists to seize the territories of others, and to enslave and plunder other peoples. Before the formation of the world Socialist camp the working class had no opportunity to make a determining impact on the solution of the question of whether there should or should not be world wars. In these conditions the best representatives of the working class raised the slogan of turning imperialist wars into civil wars, or to exploit the situation that had arisen to seize power.

This kind of situation arose during the World War I and was classically used by the Bolshevik Party and Lenin. In our times different conditions have developed. The world Socialist camp is making an ever-growing impact, through its economic might and its armed forces, on the solution of problems of war and peace.

Of course, there also are among the imperialist countries acute contradictions and antagonisms, as well as the desire to profit at the expense of others who are weaker; yet imperialists now must keep an eye on the Soviet Union and the whole Socialist camp, and are afraid of starting wars among themselves. They are trying to play down their differences; they have set up military blocs in which they have involved many capitalist countries. Although these blocs are being torn by internal struggle, their members—as they themselves say—are united in their hatred of communism and, of course, by the nature and aspirations of imperialism.

In present conditions, the most probable wars are wars among capitalist and imperialist countries, and this too should not be ruled out.

Wars are chiefly prepared by imperialists against Socialist countries, and in the first place against the Soviet Union as the most powerful of the Socialist states. Imperialists would wish to undermine our might and thus reestablish the former domination of monopolistic capital. The task is to create impassable obstacles against the unleashing of wars by imperialists. We possess increasing possibilities for placing obstacles in the path of the warmongers. Consequently, we can forestall the outbreak of a world war.

Of course, as yet we are unable to completely exclude the possibility of wars, for the imperialist states exist. However, the unleashing of wars has become a much more complicated business for the imperialists than it was before the emergence of the mighty Socialist camp. Imperialists can unleash a war, but they must think hard about the consequences.

I already said that even if the crazy Hitler had realized what a devastating rout was in store for his bloody gamble and had seen that he would have to commit suicide, he would have thought twice before starting a war against the Soviet Union. Then there were but two Socialist countries, the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic, and yet we routed the aggressors, having also exploited the contradictions between imperialistic states.

The picture now is quite different: the Socialist countries, which represent a mighty force, now oppose the imperialist camp. It would be a mistake to minimize the strength of the Socialist camp and its influence on the course of world events and thus on the solution of the question of whether wars will take place. In conditions where a mighty Socialist camp exists, possessing powerful armed forces, the peoples, by mobilization of all their forces for active struggle against the warmongering imperialists, can indisputably prevent war and thus insure peaceful coexistence.

A word or two about local wars. A lot is being said nowadays in the imperialist camp about local wars, and they are even making small-caliber atomic weapons for use in such wars; a special theory of local wars has been concocted. Is this fortuitous? Of course not. Certain imperialist circles, fearing that world war might end in the complete collapse of capitalism, are putting their money on unleashing local wars.

There have been local wars and they may occur again in the future, but opportunities for imperialists to unleash these wars too are becoming fewer and fewer. A small imperialist war, regardless of which imperialist begins it, may grow into a world thermonuclear rocket war. We must therefore combat both world wars and local wars.

As an example of a local war unleashed by the imperialists, we may take the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt. They wanted to strangle Egypt and thus intimidate the Arab countries struggling for independence, and also to frighten the other peoples of Asia and Africa. British statesmen, including Eden, spoke quite openly of their desire to deal summarily with Egypt when we were in London. We told them frankly: If you start a war, you will lose it; we will not remain neutral. When that war started, the United Nations formally condemned it, but this did not worry the aggressors and they went on with their dirty deed and even thought they had almost achieved their ends. The Soviet Union and the whole Socialist camp came to the defense of Egypt. The Soviet Government's stark warning to Eden and Guy Mollet stopped the war. The local war, the venture in Egypt, failed miserably.

This was in 1956, when the balance of power between the countries of socialism and the countries of imperialism was not the same as it is today. We were not as mighty then as we are today. In addition, the rulers of Britain, France, and Israel reckoned on being able to utilize the difficulties which had arisen in Hungary and Poland. Spokesmen of imperialist states were whispering into our ears: You have your difficulties in Hungary, we have ours in Egypt; therefore do not interfere in our affairs. Yet we gave a due reply to these whisperers. We did not shut our eyes to their bandit deeds. We interfered and stopped their aggression. Here is an example of how a local war started by the imperialist was stopped as a result of the interference by the Soviet Union and the entire Socialist camp.

I have already said that local wars are also not excluded in the future. Therefore, our task is to be always on guard, mobilizing both the forces of the Socialist camp and the peoples of the world, all the peace-loving forces, for prevention of aggressive wars. If the peoples of all countries are united and mobilized, if they wage a tireless struggle, uniting their efforts both inside each country and on a world scale, wars can be averted.

Now a word about national liberation wars. The armed struggle by the Vietnamese people or the war of the Algerian people, which is already in its 7th year, serve as the latest examples of such wars. These wars began as an uprising by the colonial peoples against their oppressors and changed into guerrilla warfare. Liberation wars will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only admissible but inevitable, since the colonialists do not grant independence voluntarily. Therefore, the peoples can attain their freedom and independence only by struggle, including armed struggle.

How is it that the U.S. imperialists, while desirous of helping the French colonialists in every way, decided against direct intervention in the war in Vietnam? They did not intervene because they knew that if they did help France with armed forces, Vietnam would get relevant aid from China, the Soviet Union, and other Socialist countries, which could lead to a world war. The outcome of the war is known. North Vietnam was victorious.

At present, a similar war is taking place in Algeria. What kind of war is it? It is the uprising of the Arab people in Algeria against French colonizers. It is being conducted in the form of a partisan war. The imperialists in the United States and Britain render assistance to their French allies with arms. Moreover, they have allowed France, a participant in NATO, to transfer its troops from Europe for the struggle against the Algerian people.

The Algerian people, too, receive assistance from neighboring and other countries that sympathize with their peace-loving aspirations. But it is a liberation war of a people for its independence, it is a sacred war. We recognize such wars, we help and will help the peoples striving for their independence.

Or let us take Cuba's example. A war took place there too. But it also started as an uprising against the internal tyrannical regime supported by U.S. imperialism. Batista was a protege of the United States. The latter rendered active assistance to him. However, the United States did not interfere in that war directly with its Armed Forces. The Cuban people, under the leadership of Fidel Castro, have won.

Can such wars flare up in the future? They can. Can there be such uprisings? There can. But these are wars which are national uprisings. In other words, can conditions be created where a people will lose their patience and rise in arms? They can. What is the attitude of the Marxists toward such uprisings? A most positive one. These uprisings must not be identified with wars among states, with local wars, since in these uprisings the people are fighting for implementation of their right for self-determination, for independent social and national development. These are uprisings against rotten reactionary regimes, against the colonizers. The Communists fully support such just wars and march in the front rank with the peoples waging liberation struggles.

Comrades, mankind has come close to the historic point where it can solve all problems which were beyond the strength of former generations. This also concerns the most vital issue, the prevention of a world war. The working class, which already leads a large part of the world—and the time will come when it will lead the whole world—cannot allow the forces doomed to ruin to drag hundreds of millions of people to the grave with them.

A world war in present conditions would be a rocket and nuclear war, the most destructive war in history. Among hydrogen bombs already tested are those in which the power of one bomb exceeds by several times the force of all explosions used during the World War II—and even during all of mankind's existence. According to scientific calculations, the explosion of a single hydrogen bomb in an industrial area can destroy up to 1.5 million people, and cause death from radiation to another 400,000.

Even a medium-sized hydrogen bomb is sufficient to wipe a large town off the face of the earth. British scientists have concluded that four megaton bombs, one each for London, Birmingham, Lancashire, and Yorkshire would destroy at least 20 million people. According to data submitted to the Senate by American experts, losses after 24 hours of nuclear war are expected to total 50 to 75 million people.

Pauling, a well-known American scientist, states: The areas likely to suffer strong nuclear blows are inhabited by about 1 billion people. In 60 days from the moment of atomic attack, 500 to 750 million people could perish. Nuclear war would also bring innumerable hardships to the peoples of those countries not directly subjected to bombing; in particular, many millions would perish as a result of the lethal consequences of radiation.

We know that if the imperialist madmen unleash a world war capitalism would be wiped out and annihilated by the peoples. But we are resolutely opposed to war, first of all because we are concerned for the destiny of mankind, its present and its future. We know that in the event of war it is the working people and their vanguard, the working class, that would suffer most. We remember how Vladimir Ilich Lenin formulated the question of the destiny of the working class. As early as in the first few years after the revolution, when the world's first state of workers and peasants was in a state of siege. Ilich taught that if we save the working man, the main producing force of mankind, we will save everything, but we will perish if we fail to save him.

Now there is more than one worker-peasant state in the world, there is an entire system of Socialist states. Our duty to history is to insure peace and peaceful development of this great offspring of the international working class and to protect the peoples of all countries from another destructive war. The victory of socialism throughout the world, which is inevitable because of the laws of historic development, is now near. For this victory, wars among states are not necessary.

A sober appraisal of the inevitable consequences of nuclear war is the indispensable condition for a persistent pursuance of a policy of preventing war, and of mobilizing the masses for the solution of this task.

After all, the very appreciation of the threat of devastating war strengthens the will of the masses to struggle against war. Therefore it is essential to warn the masses of the most dangerous consequences of a new world war and, thereby, to rouse the sacred wrath of the peoples against those who are preparing this

The possibility of preventing war is not something like a gift. Peace cannot be begged for; it can only be assured by active purposeful struggle. That is why we have waged and will wage such a struggle.

The entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union is directed toward the strengthening of peace. The growing might of our state has been used by us and will in the future be used not to threaten anyone, not to fan the fear of war, but to steadfastly pursue a policy of struggle against the danger of war, for the prevention of a world war. We have been and are prompted by the desire to maintain and strengthen friendly relations with all peoples in the interests of peace, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Comrades, life itself bears out the correctness of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence of states with diverse social systems, consistently pursued by the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries. Our party considers the policy of peaceful coexistence, which has been handed down to us by Lenin, to be the general line of our foreign policy. Peaceful coexistence is the high road of international relations between Socialist and capitalist countries. The consistent implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence strengthens the position of the world Socialist system, promotes the growth of its economic might, its international prestige and influence among the people's masses, and creates for it favorable foreign-political possibilities in peaceful competition with capitalism.

Because the countries of the Socialist camp are putting into effect a correct policy, a policy of active struggle against the imperialist warmongers, the prestige of the Soviet Union and of all Socialist countries has risen to an unprecedented height. It is, after all, a fact that countries of socialism now have very good international positions.

The prestige of fraternal parties in the capitalist states, operating in particularly difficult conditions, is also growing from day to day. The world today acknowledges that the active, effective, influential foreign policy of the Soviet Union, of all Socialist countries, draws to the side of peace and socialism more and more millions of people.

The policy of active struggle for peace has imparted dynamic force to the foreign policy acts of the Socialist countries. In recent years, the initiative in the international arena has been in the hands of the Soviet Union, the Socialist countries, while the imperialist states and their governments defend themselves with their backs to the wall, their prestige and foreign political stock have never been so low.

Peaceful coexistence helps to develop the forces of progress, the forces struggling for socialism, and in capitalist countries it facilitates the activities of Communist Parties and other progressive organizations of the working class. It facilitates the struggle the people wage against aggressive military blocs, against foreign military bases. It helps the national liberation movement to gain successes.

Thus, the policy of peaceful coexistence, as regards its social content, is a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena.

The struggle against imperialism can be successful only if its aggressive acts are resolutely rebuffed. Verbal exhortations will not contain the imperialist adventurers. There is only one way of bringing imperialism to heel, the unflagging consolidation of the economic, political, and military might of the Socialist states, an all-out unification and consolidation of the world revolutionary movement and the mobilization of the broad popular masses for the struggle to prevent the danger of war.

The CPSU and Soviet Government will continue with determination to do everything to enhance the military might of our country, since the imperialists continue the arms race. In rebuffing the aggressive actions of imperialism, our party and government display firmness and presence of mind. We always seek to direct the development of events in a way which insures that, while defending the interests of the Socialist camp, we do not provide the imperialist provocateurs with a chance to unleash a new world war.

We set ourselves the task of exposing the aggressive essence of all military-political alignments of the imperialists like NATO, SEATO, and CENTO, of seeking their isolation and ultimate liquidation. We have repeatedly stated that in those circumstances we are willing to terminate the Warsaw Treaty. All peoples in the world gain from the liquidation of military alignments. This is the only way to the maintenance of peace.

KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 6, 1961

67

improvement of the international atmosphere, and a major success of the policy of peaceful coexistence. In spite of all their efforts the imperialists lately have not succeeded in involving a single new state in their military alignments. It is significant that all new independent states have declared their intention to pursue a policy of nonparticipation in military blocs.

The struggle against the revival of German militarism is of particular importance for the consolidation of peace in Europe, and not only in Europe.

The Soviet Union is waging this struggle together with the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Socialist countries in various directions. The most important of these is the struggle for a peace treaty.

The program of peaceful German settlement submitted by Socialist states and the solution on this basis of the question of West Berlin have to a great extent assisted in exposing the aggressive circles of the United States, the German Federal Republic, and other NATO participants as opponents of a relaxation of tension.

The international positions of the GDR—the outpost of socialism in Western Europe—have become stronger. The positions of the United States, Great Britain, and France have turned out to be particularly vulnerable in West Berlin. These powers are still trying to cling to the old statutes. They cannot fail to understand that sooner or later an end will come to the occupational regime in this city. It is essential to continue, step by step, to bring the aggressive imperialist circles to their senses, to compel them to take the actual position into account. If they are stubborn, we will adopt decisive measures. We will conclude a peace treaty with the GDR because we are fully determined to insure the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany at last, to do away with the occupational regime in West Berlin, and, thus, to eradicate this splinter from the heart of Europe.

Comrades, if the problem of all problems of our time is that of averting a new war, the most radical way of solving it is disarmament. The conference of representatives of Marxist-Leninist parties has declared that the implementation of the program of general and complete disarmament, put forward by the Soviet Union, could be of historic significance for the destiny of mankind. Our struggle for disarmament is not a tactical move. We sincerely want disarmament. Here we stand fully on the positions of Marxism-Leninism. At the end of last century, Engels indicated that disarmament was possible and qualified it as a "guarantee of peace." In our time the slogan of disarmament was first put forward as a practical task by Vladimir Ilich Lenin and the first Soviet proposals on full or partial disarmament—if the capitalists will not agree on full disarmament—were submitted at the Genoa conference.

The struggle for disarmament is the most important factor for averting war. It is an effective struggle against imperialism. In such a struggle the Socialist camp has the majority of mankind on its side. The ideals of peace and progress are our vital ideals. After all, the constituent manifesto of the "First International," written by Marx, contained an appeal that the simple laws of morality and justice, which ought to guide private individuals, should become the highest laws in relations between nations.

When we raise the slogan of the struggle for peace without weapons and without war, we naturally take into account that under modern conditions, while two different world social systems exist, there still are in the imperialist camp some forces, and quite considerable ones at that, which not only do not support this slogan but fight against it.

The question of the struggle for communism is a class struggle, but in the struggle for peace not only the forces of the working class, peasantry, and petty bourgeoisie can be united, but even the part of the bourgeoisie which sees the real danger of thermonuclear war.

Consequently the slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism. Those two slogans harmonize with each other because in the eyes of the broad masses of people communism acts as a force capable of saving mankind from the horrors of modern destructive rocket-nuclear war, and imperialism is being associated in the minds of the masses with war more and more, as a system which engenders wars. Therefore, the slogan of the struggle for peace appears as a satellite of the slogan of the struggle for communism. As correctly stated in the statement, the movement of peace partisans is the broadest movement of modern times, embracing people of different political and religious views, belonging to different classes of society, but united by the noble endeavor to prevent new wars and to insure lasting peace.

Among the people who fight for peace, there are representatives of various social strata, various political opinions, and religious outlooks. The struggle for disarmament is an active struggle against imperialism, for restricting its military potentialities. Peoples must do everything to achieve the prohibition and destruction of atomic weapons and all other mass destruction weapons. Peace will then be insured and there will open before peoples the most favorable prospects for organizing their lives in accordance with their aspirations and interests.

The primary condition of progress in disarmament is the mobilization of the broadest masses of people and their increasing pressure on imperialist governments. In the capitalist camp, policy regarding Socialist countries follows two trends: a militant-aggressive trend, and a moderate-sober trend.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin pointed out the necessity for establishing contacts with those circles of the bourgeoisie which gravitate toward pacifism, even if it should be of the poorest quality. He said that in the struggle for the preservation of peace we must also use prudent representatives of the bourgeoisie.

The correctness of these words is confirmed by the events of our times, too. Among the ruling classes of the imperialist camp a fear for the future of capitalism prevails.

The most reactionary circles are showing increasing nervousness and a tendency toward adventurism and aggression, which they hope will help improve the shaken state of their affairs. At the same time, among the ruling circles in those countries there are also forces which understand the danger of a new war to capitalism itself. Hence there are two tendencies: one as aiming at war, and the second at accepting the idea of peaceful coexistence in some form.

The Socialist states in their policy take these two tendencies into consideration. They strive for negotiations and agreements with the capitalist countries on the basis of constructive proposals. They endeavor to develop personal contacts among statesmen of Socialist and capitalist states. It is also essential in the future to make use of every opportunity to expose the supporters of the cold war, the supporters of the arms race, to show to the popular masses that the Socialist countries are sincerely waging the struggle to insure universal peace.

The awareness is becoming stronger among all peoples that it is the Communists who are for the building of relations among states on the basis of peaceful coexistence, that it is they who are the most ardent and consistent fighters for peace. We can be proud of the fact that the peoples' notion of peace and communism are all the more being identified as a single unit.

The Communists feel that if all progressive and peace-loving forces of our times, countries belonging to the Socialist system, the international working class, the national liberation movement, young national states and all countries opposing war, all peace partisans, will wage a resolute struggle against the danger of war, they can tie the hands of warmongers and prevent a new world war catastrophe. It is essential day by day to enlist in the struggle for peace new strata of the population, eliminating a passive attitude which unfortunately is to be found among some social strata in bourgeois states. The struggle against the danger of a new world war must be developed without waiting for the full fall of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the statement stresses.

One of the decisive sources of the moral strength of communism, of its great influence on the masses, is that it comes forth as a standard bearer in the struggle for peace. It is the banner of peace that enables us to rally the broadest popular masses around us. If we carry high the banner of peace, we shall score even greater successes.

The Communists regard it their sacred duty to make full use of all possibilities created for the peoples by the present era to curb the bellicose forces of imperialism, to prevent a new war.

The present international Communist and workers movement has attained such might and organization that it poses for itself the practical task of delivering mankind from the calamities of a new war. The statement of the conference says: The Communists see their historical mission not only in abolition of exploitation and poverty all over the world and in excluding forever the possibility of any war in the life of human society, but in delivering mankind in the current era from the nightmare of a new world war. The Communist Parties in all countries will devote all their strength and energy to the realization of this great historic mission.

Liquidation of colonialism and ways for the further development of countries which have liberated themselves:

Comrades, the peoples which achieved national independence have become a new and powerful force in the struggle for peace and social progress. The national liberation movement deals more and more blows against imperialism, helps consolidation of peace, contributes to speeding mankind's development along the path of social progress. Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now the most important centers of revolutionary struggle against imperialism. In the postwar period about 40 countries won national independence. Almost 1.5 billion people have wrenched themselves out of colonial slavery.

The conference has correctly pointed out that the crumbling of the system of colonial slavery under the pressure of the national liberation movement is the second phenomenon of historic importance after the formation of the world system of socialism.

New remarkable pages are opening in the history of mankind. It is easy to imagine what majestic deeds these peoples will perform after they completely evict the imperialists from their countries, when they feel that they are masters of their own fate.

This vastly multiplies the progressive forces of mankind. For example, take Asia, this ancient cradle of civilization. What inexhaustible strength lies hidden in the peoples of this continent! And will the Arab people with their heroic traditions, and all the peoples of the Middle East, which have already freed or are freeing themselves from political and economic dependence on imperialism, play any lesser role in the solution of tasks now facing mankind?

A remarkable phenomenon of our time is the awakening of the peoples of Africa. Dozens of states in north and central Africa have already achieved independence. The south of Africa is seething and there is no doubt that the fascist prisons in the Union of South Africa will collapse, that Rhodesia, Uganda, and other parts of Africa will become free.

The forces of the national liberation movement are greatly increasing owing to the fact that one more front of active struggle against American imperialism has been formed in recent years. Latin America has become this front. Until recently that vast continent was identified by one concept: America. This concept greatly expressed its substance: Latin America was bound hand and foot by Yankee imperialism.

By their struggle, the Latin American peoples are showing that the American continent is not an appendage of the United States. Latin America is reminiscent of an active volcano: the lava of the liberation struggle has swept away dictatorial regimes in a number of Latin American countries.

The whole world has heard the thunder of the heroic Cuban revolution. The Cuban revolution is not only repelling the onslaught of the imperialists; it is going deeper and broader, marking a new, higher stage of the national liberation struggle, with people coming to power, with the people themselves becoming masters of their own wealth, solidarity with revolutionary Cuba is the duty not only of the people of Latin America; it is also the duty of the Socialist countries, of the entire international Communist movement, the proletariat of all areas of the world.

The national liberation movement is an anti-imperialist movement. With the collapse of the colonial system, imperialism has become considerably weaker. Vast territories, tremendous masses of people, have already ceased or are ceasing to serve as its reserve, a source of cheap raw material and cannon fodder. Asian, African, and Latin American countries, with the support of the Socialist states and all international progressive forces, are more and more often defeating the imperialist powers and coalitions.

We gladly welcomed in Moscow the participants of the conference from the fraternal Communist Parties of countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, stalwart fighters for the independent and free development of peoples. Now Communist Parties are functioning in nearly 50 countries of these continents. This has broadened the sphere of influence of the Communist movement, given it a truly worldwide character.

V. I. Lenin, speaking in 1919 at the Second All-Russian Congress of the Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, said: If Russian Bolsheviks succeeded in making a breach in the old imperialism, to take upon themselves the extraordinarily difficult but extraordinarily noble task of creating new revolutionary ways, then you—representatives of the working masses of the East—are faced with still a greater and newer task.

Lenin saw this task in awakening the revolutionary activity, independent action, and organization of the working masses irrespective of the level at which they are in applying Communist teaching to the specific conditions in their countries, merging in the common struggle with proletarians of other countries. When Lenin put forward this task, it had not yet been executed in practice anywhere, and the way it could be executed in concrete form could not be learned from any book. Now the Communist Parties of the countries struggling for national independence, or those that have already attained it, exist under immeasurably more favorable conditions, for there is the gigantic experience of the application of the theory of Marxism-Leninism in the conditions of countries and areas which had been doomed by capitalism to backwardness for ages to come. This experience, amassed by the world Communist movement is a rich treasure house for all Communists. The correct application of this experience, the correct determination of which policy should be pursued, naturally can be done only by the actual party functioning in the given country.

These parties have concentrated their attention on what is most important: how to approach their own peoples correctly, to convince the broadest masses that their best future is indissolubly connected with the struggle against imperialism and reactionary internal forces, and also how to strengthen international solidarity between Socialist states and the Communist advance guard of the world toilers. The renovation of the world on the principles of freedom, democracy, and socialism in which we are participating is a great historic process in which various revolutionary and democratic movements unite and work in concert under the determining influence of Socialist revolutions.

The successes of the national liberation movement are to a great extent conditioned by the victories of socialism and, in their turn, strengthen the international positions of socialism in the struggle against imperialism. The policy of the Communist Parties and Socialist states aimed at strengthening the close union with the peoples struggling for their independence or those who have already achieved it, is based on this truly Leninist understanding of these historical processes.

Bourgeois and revisionist politicians allege that the development of the national liberation movement is independent of the working class struggle for socialism, independent of the Socialist states' support, that it is the colonizers who grant freedom to the peoples of former colonial countries. Such inventions are launched to isolate the young independent states from the Socialist camp, to prove that on the international stage they should, allegedly, play the part of some kind of third force and not oppose imperialism.

Is it necessary to mention that such reasoning is downright charlatanism? It is a historical fact that before the victory of the great October Socialist revolution nations were not able to break the shackles of colonialism. History has proved that without the establishment of socialism, if only in a part of the world, there could have been no question of the abolition of colonialism. The imperialist powers, primarily the United States, are exerting every effort to attach to their own system the countries which have freed themselves from the yoke of colonialism, and thus to strengthen the position of world capitalism by providing it—as the bourgeois ideologists say—with new blood, to rejuvenate and consolidate it.

If one faces facts, it cannot be ignored that the imperialists possess strong economic inducements for influencing the liberated countries. They are still able to enmesh certain politically independent countries in the net of economic dependence. Now, when the establishment of overt colonial regimes is impossible, the imperialists resort to camouflage forms of enslaving and looting the liberated countries.

At the same time the colonial powers maintain internal reactionary forces everywhere in the liberated countries. They attempt to implant puppet dictatorial regimes and draw these countries into aggressive blocs. Although the sharpest divergencies are observed among the imperialist states, they often act jointly against the national liberation movement. But if all the factors influencing the fate of the peoples who have thrown off colonialism are taken into consideration, the conclusion is that the trends of social progress opposed to imperialism will eventually prevail. However, these questions are settled in the acute struggle within each country.

The conference statement contains important clauses concerning basic questions of development of the national liberation struggle, whose tasks the Communist Parties are striving to carry out. Their position in regard to various

Expressing the unity of views of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the statement directs maximum utilization of the revolutionary capabilities of the various classes and social strata, drawing into the struggle against imperialism all, even inconsistent, wavering, unsteady allies. Communists are revolutionaries, and it would be a bad thing if they did not take advantage of new opportunities that arose and found new methods and forms providing the best way to achievement of the ends in view.

Particular note should be taken of the idea in the statement concerning formation of national democracies. The statement describes the basic features of this state and the tasks it is called on to carry out.

It is important to stress that with the immense variety of conditions in countries whose peoples have risen to independent, historic creative work, various forms of settling problems of social progress cannot fail to arise. The correct application of Marxist-Leninist theory in countries which have freed themselves consists indeed in seeking forms for uniting the whole national (word indistinct) while taking account of the special features of the economic, political, and cultural life of the peoples, in insuring the leading role of the working class in the national front, and in the struggle for resolute extermination of the roots of imperialism and the remnants of feudalism, for clearing the roots of imperialism and the remnants of feudalism, for clearing the way for an eventual movement toward socialism.

At present, when imperialist reaction is trying to foist a policy of anti-communism on the young, independent states, a truthful explanation of Communist views and aims becomes particularly significant. Communists generally support democratic measures taken by national governments. At the same time, Communists explain to the masses that these measures are not Socialist ones.

To no one are the hopes of the peoples bursting the fetters of colonialism as dear and as comprehensible as to the working people of the Socialist countries, to the Communists of the whole world. Our very world outlook and the interests of working mankind, for which we fight, urge us to do everything we can so that the peoples follow the right road to progress and the efflorescence of their material and spiritual forces. By our policy we must strengthen the confidence of the peoples in the Socialist countries.

The assistance of the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist states to countries which have won their independence pursues a single goal: To contribute to the strengthening of the position of those countries in the struggle against imperialism, to the development of their national economies, and to the improvement of the living conditions of their peoples. Engels, noting the immense interest of the working class and of the leading countries in making colonial countries independent at the earliest possible date, wrote that only one thing was beyond all doubt: The victorious proletariat cannot enforce happiness upon other people without undermining its own victory.

The international duty of the victorious working class is to help the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries to completely break the fetters of colonial enslavement and to give them all-round support in their struggle against imperialism and for self-determination and independent development.

It does not follow from this, however, that the Socialist help does not influence the prospects of the further development of countries which have won their freedom.

The Soviet Union has been and remains a sincere friend of colonial peoples and has always stood guard over their interests and aspirations to independence. We will continue to strengthen and develop economic and cultural cooperation with countries which have entered the party of independent existence.

The Soviet Union submitted for consideration by the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly a declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. As a result of acute political struggle around this proposal, which seethed not only in the United Nations but outside it, the General Assembly adopted the declaration on granting independence to colonial countries and peoples.

The main conclusion of the Soviet declaration, the necessity of a speedy and final liquidation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, was on the whole reflected in the decision passed by the United Nations. This was a great victory for the progressive forces and for all Socialist states which firmly and consistently defend the cause of the freedom and independent national development of peoples.

It is necessary to stress that in the solution of this problem at the U.N.

tries, countries which take the stand for the liquidation of colonial system. Even some of the countries which belong to aggressive blocs, for instance, Norway and Denmark, voted for the liquidation of the colonial system. The colonizers were left among a miserable handful of nine countries which abstained from voting. This is highly characteristic, as it shows to the whole world who stands for the liquidation of the colonial system and what the so-called free countries uphold.

Is it not significant that among those who abstained were representatives of such countries as the United States, Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and others? Despite being doomed to fail, colonialism still has quite a considerable strength of resistance and will cause much harm to many peoples. Around it there gathers all that is obsolete and reactionary. Colonialism is the direct or indirect cause of many conflicts threatening mankind with a new war.

Colonialism, which more than once has led to bloodshed, still is fraught with the danger of war. Now and again it manifests itself in the outbreaks of vicious madness, which is eloquently proved by the bloody events in Algeria, the Congo, and Laos. It still grips in its tenacious claws tens of millions of people. Not all the peoples who won state independence enjoy its benefits, since in the economies of their countries foreign monopolies continue their domination.

To demolish these last remnants of the colonial system of imperialism to protect the peoples that are gaining independence from encroachment by colonial powers, and to help these peoples in the implementation of their liberation ideals—therein the peoples of the Socialist countries and Communists and progressive people of the world see their duty.

Some ideological questions of the Communist movement:

When summing up the results of the world-historic victories of the Communist movement, we give thanks first of all to our great teachers Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Vladimir Illich Lenin. Their teaching has made the international Communist movement a spontaneous movement and has insured its victories. In working out our strategy and tactics for the future, we again rely for advice on Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The guarantee of all our future victories lies in faithfulness to Marxism-Leninism.

The path of the Communist movement has been difficult and thorny. No other party has had to go through so many trials and so many sacrifices. Numerous reactionaries have been trying to destroy communism, yet communism has emerged from all these trials ever stronger and has become a mighty force today. You have all seen beautiful giant trees deeply rooted in the soil. Such trees fear no storms or hurricanes. A storm may pass and break brittle trees, while the giant tree remains standing unshakable. Its crown becomes even thicker and rises higher toward the sun. The same occurs in the Communist movement. Imperialist reaction has sent one storm after another upon it, but the Communist movement remains steadfast; it is growing and is becoming stronger.

Forty-one years ago, here in Moscow, the First Congress of the Comintern took place. Communist parties and leftwing Socialist organizations from 30 countries were represented at the congress. If one were to discount the Communist parties of the republics which now form a part of the U.S.S.R., only five Communist parties existed in all of Europe at that time. In Asia, Africa, Australia, and Oceania there were no Communist parties. On the American Continent there was only the Communist party of Argentina. Now there are Communist and workers parties in 87 countries. They unite in their ranks more than 36 million people. The ideas of communism have captured the minds of millions of people in every corner of the world. This is good, very good.

Comrades, we are witnesses to the birth of a succession of new Communist parties. After the Moscow conference in 1937, 12 parties have been formed and have established international ties.

If Marx, Engels, and Lenin could have been present at the November conference of the representatives of Communist and workers parties, how happy they would have been to see such a mighty army of Communists from the whole world. The growth of the ranks of Communist parties reflects the striving of the popular masses toward communism. It is one of the remarkable phenomena of today.

The Communist system for which Marxists-Leninists struggled has been prepared by the entire process of social development, and the transition to it is a

ripe task. Marxists-Leninists cannot fail to be concerned with, and are in fact concerned with, interpreting the ways of transition to the new society, and here not a few complex problems arise. Fraternal parties have highly rated the contribution made at the 20th CPSU Congress to the elaboration of urgent problems. The conference of Communist and workers parties in 1957 and the November forum of the world Communist movement in 1960 devoted serious attention to the elaboration of these problems and have advanced the theory and practice of the Communist movement. Recognition of the necessity of a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into a Socialist society is an axiom for us Soviet Communists, sons of the October Revolution. The path to socialism lies through proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As for the forms of transition to socialism, they will, as was pointed out by the 20th CPSU Congress, become increasingly diverse, and it is not essential that the transition to socialism everywhere and in all cases be connected with armed uprisings and civil war.

Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the view that the forms of transition to socialism can be of a peaceful or nonpeaceful nature. Revolution by peaceful means is in keeping with the interests of the working class and the masses. But if the ruling classes counter revolution with force and are unwilling to bow to the will of the people, the proletariat must break their resistance and start a resolute civil war.

We are convinced that as the might of the world Socialist system increases and the level of organization of the working class in capitalist countries improves, increasingly favorable conditions for Socialist revolutions will occur.

Transition to socialism in countries with developed parliamentary traditions can also be carried out by making use of parliament and in other countries of institutions in keeping with their national traditions. Here it is not a case of making use of bourgeois parliaments but of the parliamentary form, in order to make it serve the people and give it new content.

Thus, it is not a case of some kind of electoral combinations, of battle merely for the ballot box—that is what the reformists do. Such are alien to Communists. For us the unification and rallying of the revolutionary forces of the working class and all working people and the deployment of mass revolutionary actions are an essential condition to gain a firm majority in parliament.

To gain a majority in parliament, to make of it a body of popular power with the existence of a powerful revolutionary movement in the country, means the overthrow of the military bureaucratic machine of the bourgeoisie and creation of a new proletarian state system in parliamentary form. It is obvious that in countries where capitalism is still strong, where it has a huge military and police apparatus, the transition to socialism will unavoidably take place in conditions of an acute class struggle. The decisive condition for all forms of transition to socialism is political leadership of the working class headed by the Communist vanguard.

These conclusions reached by the 20th CPSU Congress are based on the theory of Marxism-Leninism, on the practice of fraternal Communist parties, on the experience of the international Communist movement, and correctly take into consideration the change in international conditions. They direct Communist parties toward cohesion of the working class and the majority of people to master all forms of struggle—peaceful and nonpeaceful, parliamentary and nonparliamentary. Lenin taught the Communists to be ready, depending on the situation, to make use of one form or another of struggle and to educate the working masses in the spirit of readiness for resolute revolutionary actions.

Of course, to define what forms and methods of struggle will be selected by the working class in one country or another under concrete historical circumstances is the task of the proletariat itself in each country, and of its Communist vanguard.

It must be emphasized here that under present conditions the following tenet in the statement of the conference is of special significance: The Communist parties, being guided by Marxist-Leninist teaching, have always opposed the export of revolution; at the same time they resolutely struggle against the imperialist export of counterrevolution; they regard it as their international duty to call upon people in all countries to rally and mobilize all their internal forces, to work actively, and, basing themselves on the might of the world Socialist system, prevent or resolutely rebuff interference by the imperialists in the people's affairs in any country which has risen to revolt.

It is a very complicated thing to lead the masses to Socialist revolution. It is known from our party's experience that the Bolsheviks, struggling for power, devoted their principal attention to working among the masses, to establishment and consolidation of the union of the working class with the peasantry, to training the political army of the Socialist revolution. Leninists worked wherever there were masses—among the workers, peasants, women, young people, in the army. Each party can see better which slogan at any moment corresponds best with the task of winning the masses, leading them forward, stimulating cohesion of the political army of the Socialist revolution.

The conference emphasized the important part played by work among young people. Bourgeois propaganda is spreading inventions about modern youth, calling it the lost generation and presenting it as aloof from politics. However, recent revolutionary actions in a number of countries show that youth is a great revolutionary force. No other political party can attract young people in the same way as the Communists, the most revolutionary party. And young people like bold revolutionary actions.

The working class is the leading revolutionary force of our time. In the world army of labor, the working class of developed capitalist countries occupies an important part. These countries number 160 million workers and employees, which is equal to no less than three-fifths of the total of workers and employees in the entire non-Socialist world.

The working class of the developed capitalist countries presents an immense revolutionary force, not only because of its numerical strength, but primarily because it is organized. It has mass trade unions and its own mass parties. We understand full well that Communists in Western Europe and the United States encounter great and specific difficulties. They have to deal with an experienced bourgeoisie having at its disposal immense material resources and a powerful military, police, and ideological machine. But we have profound confidence in the working class of the West European countries, the heirs of the revolutionary traditions of the Paris Communards and of the British Chartists, the leader and organizer of anti-Fascist resistance. The working class, which in many countries has experienced mass Communist parties possessing tested Marxist-Leninist cadres, will make its contribution to the cause of the revolutionary transformation of society.

Comrades, the greater the successes of the Socialist system, the greater the growth of the international army of Communists, the more the bourgeoisie rages. It adopts Fascist methods of administration and regimes of tyranny. It mobilizes all its means of propaganda in an attempt to whitewash the capitalist order and to defame socialism and our Communist ideas.

Bourgeois propaganda is assuming an increasingly cunning nature. Its main weapon in the struggle against the Socialist camp and the Communist Parties is anticommunism. We must resolutely unmask this antiscientific and purely false ideology. The cause of socialism cannot progress successfully without a determined struggle against opportunism in the workers and Communist movement, without a struggle against revisionism, dogmatism, and sectarianism.

You all know well that 3 years ago the Communist movement was subjected to wild attacks by revisionists and that in some countries it concerned the life and death of the revolutionary parties of the working class. In the Communist Party of such a country as the United States the revisionist group of Gates was active. In the Danish Communist Party undermining activity was conducted by the Larsen group. The revisionists were a serious danger to some other fraternal parties as well.

It can be noted with a feeling of profound satisfaction that revisionist pollution was unmasked and thrown out of the party. From the struggle with the revisionists the Communist Parties emerged stronger and more mature, wiser in experience. The Communist Parties unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of contemporary revisionism. The struggle against revisionism, against all sorts of deviations from Leninism, retains its urgency. It is a struggle to strengthen the Socialist camp and consistently implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin, with his usual perspicacity, stated that the struggle with the evil of nationalism, with the most deep-rooted national petty bourgeois prejudices, moves more and more urgently into the foreground as a task of turning the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national one—one existing in a single country and incapable of determining world policy—into an international one—a dictatorship of the proletariat in at least several leading countries and

KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 5, 1956

The struggle with revisionism in all its forms still remains today an important task of the Communist Parties. As long as the bourgeois order exists, there will be a nutritive medium for the ideology of revisionism too. Therefore, we must always keep our powder dry and wage implacable war on revisionism which tries to wipe out the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, whitewash modern capitalism, undermine the solidarity of the Communist movement, and encourage Communist Parties to go their separate national ways (razvesti kommunisticheskiye partii po natsionalnym kvartiram).

The Communist movement has another danger: Dogmatism and sectarianism. At the present time, when a rallying of all forces for the struggle against imperialism, for the prevention of war, and for the overthrow of the monopolies is required, dogmatism and sectarianism can do great harm to our cause. Leninism is uncompromising toward dogmatism. Lenin wrote: It is essential to learn the indisputable truth that a Marxist must take account of life, of the exact facts of reality, and not go on clinging to yesterday's theory, which, like all theory, at best outlines fundamentals, generalities, and only approximates a total comprehension of the complexities of life.

Dogmatism nourishes sectarian stodginess which hinders the rallying of the working class and all progressive forces around the Communist Parties. Dogmatism and sectarianism are in irreconcilable contradiction to the creative development of revolutionary theory and its creative application in practice. They lead to the isolation of Communists from the broad strata of the workers; they condemn them to passive temporizing or leftist adventurist activities in the revolutionary struggle; they prevent full use of all opportunities in the interests of the victory of the working class and all democratic forces.

The statement stresses that the Communist Parties will continue to wage a resolute struggle on two fronts: against revisionism, which remains the main danger, and against dogmatism and sectarianism. Unless a consistent struggle is waged against them, dogmatism and sectarianism may even become the main danger at one stage or another of the development of individual parties. The Communist and Workers Parties consider it their international duty to hold high the banner of creative Marxism-Leninism as a decisive condition for all our further victories.

For the further consolidation of the Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism:

Comrades, the struggle between the Communist and all the popular forces on one side, and the forces of imperialism on the other, is entering a new stage. In these conditions the solidarity of the ranks of the Socialist camp and the entire international Communist movement acquires foremost importance. Our solidarity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism is the main condition for victory of the working class over imperialism. We keep sacred the bequest of the great Lenin—to march forward firmly holding hands. The unity of our ranks increases the strength of communism tenfold. Solidarity, solidarity, and again solidarity—such is the law of the international Communist movement.

It follows from the essence of Leninism itself that every Marxist-Leninist party must prevent, both within its own ranks and in the international Communist movement, any action which could undermine its unity and solidarity. The common aim of the struggle of all Communists of the world demands, as before, a unity of will and action of the Communist Parties of all countries. The conference made a major contribution to the further consolidation of the international Communist movement by declaring, in complete accord with Leninist teaching, that the Communist Parties will in every way strengthen the unity of their ranks and the unity of the whole international Communist movement.

The interests of the struggle for the cause of the working class demand an increasing cohesion of the ranks of every Communist Party and of the great army of Communists of the world. The declaration says that unity of will and action and a concern for the constant strengthening of the unity of the international Communist movement constitute the supreme international duty of every Marxist-Leninist party.

A resolute defense of the unity of the international Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and a prevention of any action capable of undermining this unity constitute a necessary condition for a victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy, and peace, and for a successful solution of the tasks of the Socialist revolution, the building of socialism and communism. A violation of these principles would lead to a weakening of the international Communist movement.

It should be noted that the delegation of the CPSU at the conference set out its viewpoint concerning the wording that the Soviet Union is at the head of the Socialist camp and that the CPSU is at the head of the Communist movement. Our delegation declared that in this wording we see first of all high praise of the services of our party, which was created by Lenin, and an expression of cordial thanks to all fraternal parties.

Our party, nurtured by Lenin, has always regarded it as its foremost duty to fulfill international obligations to the international working class. The delegation assured the participants of the conference that the party in the future too would bear high the banner of proletarian internationalism and would spare no effort to fulfill its international obligations. At the same time the CPSU delegation proposed that the wording should not be included in the declaration or other documents of the Communist movement.

Regarding the principles of mutual relations between the fraternal parties, the CPSU expressed its position most definitely at the 21st party congress.

From the tribune of the congress we declared before the whole world that in the Communist movement, just as in the Socialist camp, there has existed and exists complete equality of rights and solidarity of all Communist and Workers Parties and Socialist countries. The CPSU in reality does not exercise leadership over other parties. In the Communist movement there are no parties that are superior or subordinate. All Communist Parties are equal and independent. All carry responsibility for the destiny of the Communist movement, for its victories and failures. Each Communist and Workers Party is responsible to the working class, the working people of its own country, to the entire international workers and Communist movement.

The role of the Soviet Union does not lie in the fact that it leads other Socialist countries but in the fact that it was the first to blaze the trail to socialism, is the most powerful country in the world Socialist system, has amassed a great deal of positive experience in the struggle for the building of socialism, and was the first to enter the period of comprehensive construction of communism. It is stressed in the statement that the universally acknowledged vanguard of the world Communist movement has been and still remains the CPSU, as the most experienced and hardened unit of the international Communist movement.

At the moment, when there exists a large group of Socialist countries, each of which is faced with its own tasks, when there are 87 Communist and workers parties functioning, each of which moreover is also faced with its own tasks, it is not possible for leadership over Socialist countries and Communist Parties to be exercised from any center at all. This is neither possible nor necessary.

There have grown up in the Communist Parties hardened Marxist-Leninist cadres capable of leading their own parties, their countries. However, in practice, as is well known, the CPSU does not give directives to any other parties. The fact that we are called the leader gives no advantages either to our party or to other parties. On the contrary, it only creates difficulties.

As is evident from the text of the statement, the fraternal parties have agreed with the conclusions of our delegation. The question may arise: Will our international solidarity not be weakened by the fact that this provision is not written down in the statement? No, it will not be weakened. At the present time there is no statute which could regulate relations between parties. Instead, we have a common Marxist-Leninist ideology, and loyalty to it is the main condition of our solidarity and unity. It is necessary to be consistently guided by the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin: to resolutely practice the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Then the cause of international solidarity of the Communist movement will continually strengthen.

Our party as an internationalist party is following with great attention the struggle of its class brothers in all countries. We are well aware of the difficulties that Communists struggling under capitalism must overcome. From the rostrum of the conference the CPSU delegation expressed the boundless solidarity of our party with fighters for the cause of communism in capitalist countries, especially with our comrades languishing in prison torture chambers in Spain and Portugal, Greece and West Germany, the UAR, Iraq, and Iran, the United States and Paraguay, and all other prisoners of capitalism. We are confident that our words of greetings will give heart to the self-sacrificing fighters for the people's happiness.

Comrades, representatives of Communists in all countries attended the meeting at a remarkable time, when the world Communist movement is in a great upsurge. Outstanding successes have been scored by Communist Parties in

the capitalist countries. Communism in those countries where the working class has been victorious is scoring ever new successes. These countries not only withstood the pressure of class enemies both inside and outside the countries but, implementing the principles of Marxism-Leninism on Socialist construction, have attained a high upsurge in the development of economy, culture, science, and technology, in raising the people's living standards.

The peoples in those countries demonstrate monolithic unity around Communist and Workers Parties. While in the past the slogan of the struggle for socialism and Communist transformation was the slogan of Communist Parties, now the struggle for socialism and communism has become a nationwide cause in those countries, a nationwide struggle for the triumph of a new Communist world. Thus life itself confirms the validity of our revolutionary theory, the validity and vitality of Marxism-Leninism.

Very rewarding for us Communists is the fact that the great force of communism is seen not only by the peoples in the Socialist countries but by people who do not recognize the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. They are compelled to recognize the great results of the development of our countries attained on the basis of Marxist-Leninist teaching. This, comrades, is of great significance.

Marxist-Leninist theory is the guiding light for our actions. The Communists, as the leading detachment of the working class, have always regarded it as a scientific program in their struggle for victory, wholeheartedly believe in this teaching, and consistently and firmly struggle for its implementation. Today, guided by this teaching, the Socialist countries score great successes in economic competition with the capitalist states, and the masses see that socialism and communism are the greatest force of our times; they see that the future belongs to communism.

Of course, in building socialism and communism, new forms and methods yielding good results in the achievements of the great socialist aims are emerging. Since different conditions exist in various Socialist countries, it is natural that every Communist Party applies Marxist-Leninist theory in accordance with conditions in its country. Therefore we must understand such strivings by the fraternal parties, who know better the conditions and peculiarities in their countries. We are proceeding from the statement by the great Lenin that all nations will come to socialism. This is unavoidable. But all will not come in the same way. Each of them will bring its own traits into one or another form of democracy, into one or another variety of dictatorship of the proletariat, into one or another rate of Socialist transformations in various aspects of social life. But, of course, there is no need to exaggerate the significance of these peculiarities, to overstress them, failing to see the main part of Communist construction indicated by the teaching of Marx and Lenin.

We have always been firmly defending and will defend purity of the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism and the basic principles of its implementation. Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties exchanged their opinions on the present international situation, discussed the urgent problems of the communist and workers movement, or, as comrades figuratively stated at the conference, synchronized their watches. Indeed, the Socialist countries and the Communist Parties must synchronize their watches. When someone's clock is fast or slow, it is regulated so that it shows the correct time. Similarly, it is necessary to check the time of the Communist movement, so that our powerful army keeps in step and makes confident strides toward communism. If it is possible to use such a figure of speech, Marxism-Leninism and the jointly worked out documents of international Communist conferences serve us as chimes, striking the hour. After all, the Communist and Workers Parties attending the conference unanimously worked out their decisions. Every party will adhere to these decisions in a strict and sacred manner, throughout its activities.

Comrades, the importance of the conference lies in the fact that as its result the participants of the conference have felt even better, stronger, and more confident. There has opened before them to an even wider extent the grandiose epic of the struggle of all Communist and Workers Parties. This contributes to the rallying together of the international Communist movement. Every fraternal party emphasized in the international forum its confidence in the victory of our common cause. This is of immense importance for the consolidation of the whole international Communist movement. The unity of the ranks of every Communist Party and the unity of all Communist Parties constitute the united international Communist movement directed at the achievement of our

common goal—the triumph of communism throughout the world. The main thing that is now demanded of all Communist and Workers Parties is all-round and persistent efforts to strengthen the unity and cohesion of their ranks.

The unity of the ranks of the Communist movement in modern conditions assumes particularly great importance. It is required by the worldwide historic tasks which the Communist movement is now called upon to tackle. On behalf of the CPSU, our delegation assured the participants of the conference that we, on our part, would do everything to strengthen still more the close fraternal bonds with all Communist Parties. Our party will do everything so the Socialist camp and the world Communist front becomes even stronger. The CPSU is filled with unswerving determination to strengthen the unity and friendship with all fraternal parties of Socialist countries and with the Marxist-Leninist parties of all the world.

In this connection, I would like to refer to our invariable endeavor to strengthen the bonds of fraternal friendship with the Chinese Communist Party, with the great Chinese people. In our relations with the Chinese Communist Party our party is always guided by the fact that the friendship of the two great peoples, the cohesion of our two parties—the largest in the international Communist movement—is of exceptional importance in the struggle for the triumph of our common cause. Our party has always made, and will continue to make, every effort to strengthen this great friendship. With People's China, with the Chinese Communists, just as with the Communists of all countries, we share one goal, the safeguarding of peace and the building of communism; we share common interests, the happiness and well-being of the working people; and we share the common basis of firm principles, Marxism-Leninism.

The CPSU and Soviet people will do everything to insure that the unity of our parties and our peoples will increasingly strengthen so as not only to disappoint the enemies but to shake them even more with our unity and to attain our great goal—the triumph of communism.

Comrades, we live at a splendid time: communism has become the invincible force of our century. The further successes of communism depend to an enormous degree on our will, our unity, our foresight and resolve. Through their struggle and their labor, Communists, the working class, will attain the great goals of communism on earth. Men of the future, Communists of the next generations will envy us. In their thoughts they will always revert to our days when the lines from the party anthem "We shall build our own new world and those who were nothing will become everything!" resounded with particular force.

The CPSU has been, is, and shall be true to the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, to proletarian internationalism, and friendship among peoples. It will always struggle for universal peace, for the victory of communism as we were taught by great Lenin.

APPENDIX IV

COMMUNIST PSYCHOLOGICAL OFFENSIVE: DISTORTIONS IN
THE TRANSLATION OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

By Natalie Grant, Research Institute on the Sino-Soviet Bloc
(Peter S. H. Tang, director)

There is no political group in the world which understands the value of words as thoroughly as do the communists. Every term and definition are carefully weighed in communist texts. Stalin's formula that "language, as a tool of communication, is at the same time a tool of struggle,"* seems to have left a profound imprint on the Soviet mind.

When they first appeared, the works of Stalin on Philology were greeted with ridicule outside the Iron Curtain. Research workers in non-communist countries seriously underestimated the significance of these texts. Today, few, if any, experts on Soviet affairs attribute the importance which it deserves to "Marxism and the Questions of Philology" (Moscow, 1950). Yet the opinions expressed by Stalin were of interest. According to his theories, the expansion of communism will bring along a gradual, but steady, evolution of speech. A communist inspired mode of expression will gain recognition and be adopted universally.

Elaborating on the theme, Stalin declared that communism introduces distinctive terminology into all fields of human endeavor: political, economic, social, and cultural. Since every "base has its own corresponding superstructure", and language, as a part of culture, belongs to the superstructure, a change in the base, i.e., infiltration of communism into the non-communist world, must be accompanied by changes in the style of speech. Such theories continue to be current in the Soviet Union.**

* MARKSIZM I VOPROSY YAZIKOZNANIYA, by I.V. STALIN, 1950, Gospolitizdat, p 23.

**See in this connection, VOPROSY STROITELSTVA KOMMUNIZMA V SSSR, p. 333 (Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959) and OSNOVY MARKSISTSKOI FILOSOFII, p.185 (Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959).

The penetration of societies not directly subject to communist influence by communist forms of speech should therefore be of interest to the research worker. Words introduced into circulation become as symptomatic as ideas. One is often struck by the infiltration into English usage of communist manufactured terms and distorted communist interpretation of terms already in use, ("kulak", "sputnik", "apparat", etc.; "contradiction"). Formulas launched by communism, which, if carefully studied, prove almost nonsensical, have gained a firm foothold in current speech ("peaceful coexistence").

Soviet ambition to introduce communist language forms into non-communist societies is greatly advanced by communist political "translations". Under this title may be considered political material of communist origin, translated under communist sponsorship for the benefit of readers outside the Soviet Union. Translations of this nature deserve particular attention. They have been found to contain inaccuracies. The Text follows the outline of the original, but the specific phraseology used, if examined in relationship to the communist propaganda line in the country for which the translation is intended, seems to be slanted to coincide with this line. In fact at times, however incredible this may appear, communist translators seem to show less interest in textual accuracy than in presenting the original in a form designed to appeal to the non-communist reader.

To verify this impression and to evaluate the degree of accuracy of communist translations, an attempt was made to compare the English and Russian texts of an identical document. Two documents were selected for this purpose.

One of the documents examined was the "Statement" issued by the Conference of Representatives of the Communist and Labor Parties, and published in Russian, in the Moscow KOMMUNIST (November, 1960), and in English, in the London WORLD MARXIST REVIEW (December, 1960). The "Statement" is a document of great political importance. In the words of communist sources,

it acts as a "general ideological platform and a program of struggle of all communist parties." (Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Plenary Session, January 18, 1961).

The second document examined is the report made by Nikita Khrushchev before three primary Party organizations on January 6, 1961. It appeared in Russian in the Moscow KOMMUNIST (January, 1961), and in English, in the London WORLD MARXIST REVIEW (January, 1961).

The documents were selected for analysis because both serve internal Party consumption and, at the same time, are intended for circulation outside the Iron Curtain. They are further linked by chronological unity, having appeared within two months of one another.

2.

One cannot assert that the "Statement" was first elaborated in Russian. Even if written originally in another language, it may be regarded as reflecting the communist method of translation: it was issued by communist sources in two versions and possibly more, and a Russian and English text of communist origin are available. Khrushchev's report may be assumed to have been Russian in the original, and the English text supplied by communist sources may be considered a translation.

Allowances must be made for customary errors of translation, arising as a result of possible haste or tension. Some pages of the "Statement," as well as Khrushchev's report may have been translated by persons to whom English is alien. Evidence thereof may be found in the use of certain verb tenses, and some of the inaccuracies of translation may be attributed thereto. No doubt exists, however, that both documents were handled by experienced and skilled translators.

The originals in each instance are presented as identical with the translation. One is therefore intrigued by the recurrence of errors inexplicable on the part of translators entrusted with documents of importance. There are thus surprising omissions in the text of Khrushchev's report. These inaccuracies follow a pattern illustrated below.

TABLE I

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 12 "...In our country measures are being put into effect on a gigantic scale, to place the natural resources of the country at the service of the construction of communism. Forty-one million...."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 10: "...Measures are being taken on a vast scale in the USSR to make the utmost use of the natural resources. Forty-one million.. .."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961 p. 12: "...Still more grandiose stations with a power up to 5,000,000 kw. will place the giant Siberian river, the Enisei, at the service of Communist construction. One of the richest...."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW January, 1961, p. 10: "...Still more powerful stations of up to 5,000, 000, kw. will harness the great Siberian river the Yenisei. One of the richest...."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961 p. 13: "...Our party devotes great attention to the correct application of the socialist principle of distribution, as well as to transition, in perspective, to the communist principle of distribution. It has demonstrated...."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW January, 1961, p. 11: "...Our party is devoting close attention to the correct application of the socialist principle of distribution. It has demonstrated...."

KOMMUNIST, January, 1961 p. 14: "...This line of policy, far from weakening social- ist society, strengthens it, and is in accord with the prospects for the out- growth of the socialist state into a communist pub- lic self-administration..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW January, 1961, p.11" "...This line, far from weakening socialist socie- ty, is strengthening it and is in keeping with the perspective of public self-administration..."
--	--

One notes that in each of the above excerpts from Khrushchev's report of January 6, 1961, references to communism, as an objective of the Soviet system, which are present in the Russian text, have been omitted in the English translation.

Omissions, noticeable at a glance, are scarce in the translated material. Far more common are differences of meaning caused by the reshuffling of words in a sentence. Reconstruction of phrases is favored as a method in both translations, and is used when indispensable for stylistic reasons, as well as when a direct translation would be more effective.

TABLE II

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, p. 28: "...The leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia ... thereby created the danger that the revolutionary gains achiev- ed by the heroic struggle of the Yugoslav people would be lost..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, p. 22: "...The leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia ... thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle..."

KOMMUNIST, January, 1961,
p. 30:

"...Transition to socialism in countries with developed parliamentary tradition can be effected also by utilizing the parliament...it is a matter of utilizing not the bourgeois parliament, but the parliamentary form with the objective of placing it at the service of the people and introducing therein a new content..."

KOMMUNIST, January, 1961
p. 17:

"...The most likely under present conditions are wars not between the capitalist and imperialist countries, although this too should not be excluded..."

KOMMUNIST, January, 1961
p. 34 :

"...At the same time, the CPSU delegation proposed not to include the formulation in question in the Statement..."

KOMMUNIST, January, 1961
p. 29 :

"...The peoples of the socialist countries, the communists and progressive people of the whole world see it as

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW,
January, 1961, p. 23:

"... The transition to socialism in countries with developed parliamentary tradition may be effected by utilizing Parliament...it is a question of using the parliamentary form and not the bourgeois parliament as such in order to place it at the service of the people, and to fill it with a new meaning..."

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW,
January, 1961, p. 13:

"...In the conditions of today the likelihood is that there will not be wars between the capitalist, imperialist countries although this eventuality cannot be ruled out..."

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW,
January, 1961, p. 26 :

" Nevertheless, the CPSU delegation proposed that the formulation be not included in the Statement..."

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW,
January, 1961, p. 22 :

"...The peoples of the socialist countries, the communists and progressives all over the world see it as their

their duty to destroy the last remnants of the colonial system of imperialism, to defend the peoples in process of liberation from the attacks of the colonial powers, and help these peoples in putting their liberation ideals into effect..."

duty to abolish the last remnants of the colonial system of imperialism, to support the peoples now liberating themselves from the colonial powers and to help them to realize their ideals of liberation..."

The reshuffling of the sentence and use of synonyms have brought a slight change of meaning into each of the above excerpts. The Russian text of the first excerpt indicates that a loss will be incurred by an unidentified entity as a result of the action of the League of Communists; the English text states specifically that the losers will be the Yugoslav people. The English text in the second excerpt, by omitting one word, "also," introduces legality into "transition to socialism" which, as one may judge from the Russian text, can also be accomplished by other, unspecified, means. The English text of the third excerpt lays more emphasis on the impossibility of wars than does Khrushchev's Russian original. Through the use of "nevertheless" instead of "at the same time," the action of the CPSU delegation, in the fourth excerpt, acquires an entirely new significance. Finally, in the last excerpt, the translator changes the tone of the Russian text; the forceful "destroy" is replaced by the more lawful "abolish" and the defense of peoples from the "attacks of the colonial powers" is altered into support of peoples "now liberating themselves from the colonial powers."

Changes of meaning also result from the replacement of one grammatical case by another, a common practice in the translations examined. The method is acceptable in many instances. In others, it can

produce a subtle difference in meaning.* So can the introduction of subordinate clauses and the irresponsible use of synonyms and metonyms.

TABLE III

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961 p. 3: "... communists of all countries..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 3: "... communists in all countries..."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 3: "...the flower of the in- ternational communist world was at this Con- ference..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 3: "... it was a gathering of the flower of the world Communist movement..."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 3: "...This Conference sub- jected the present inter- national situation to a profound analysis and elaborated on questions	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 3: "...The meeting made a profound analysis of the present international situation and arrived at a common standpoint on

* It will be recalled that this method was used by the communist translators who handled President Kennedy's inaugural address. They translated into Russian the sentence "fellow-citizens of the world" as "fellow-citizens in the world." This distorted the meaning completely. The President appealed to all mankind. The Russian text of his address (PRAVDA, January 22, 1961) appealed merely to American citizens in the world. It was of no concern to anyone other than a U.S. citizen. This is probably the way it was understood by the peoples behind the Iron Curtain who read the Soviet translation of the address.

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
Of greatest importance, positions, general for our movement..."	the major issues facing our movement..."

The first of the above excerpts is merely offered as an illustration of the juggling with prepositions practiced through the two translations. The second and third excerpts are of greater interest. By rejecting the word "Conference" and using "Meeting" the translators turned a formal consultation into a friendly gathering. The word "meeting" has apparently become the rendering of "conference" accepted by Soviet translators when reference is made to the assembly of Communist and Labor Parties held in Moscow in the fall of 1960. This is inaccurate. "Conference" is the generally accepted translation of SOVESHCHANIE (RUSSKO-ANGLIISKII SLOVAR by N.S. Rotshstein, OGIZ, 1942); Louis Segal (NEW COMPLETE RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, New York, 1951) places "conference" as second after "deliberation;" the OGIZ State Encyclopedia by S.K. Boyanov and V.K. Miller (1932) gives it third place after "council" and "deliberation". None of these sources lists "meeting" among the words suggested for SOVESHCHANIE. Only one of the Soviet dictionaries consulted, RUSSKO-ANGLIISKII SLOVAR edited by Smirnitski (GIZ, 1959, 1952, 1957) lists "meeting" although it too gives preference to "conference." Of the Soviet-Anglo-Russian dictionaries examined (ANGLO-RUSSKII SLOVAR, Gos. Izdat., 1955; ANGLO-RUSSKII SLOVAR, by B.D. Arakin, Z.S. Vygodskaya, and M.N. Iliina, 1951) not one translates "meeting" as SOVESHCHANIE, and the TOLKOVYI SLOVAR RUSSKOGO YAZYKA (Professor Ushakov, 1954) explains SOVESHCHANIE AS ZASEDANIE which, in turn, appears in Soviet dictionaries as "conference, meeting, session, sitting."

The translation of "international" as "world" is practiced constantly in the English texts in paragraphs dealing with the international communist movement. While in itself of minor importance, this inaccuracy is effective in purging the English text of memories of the "defunct" Communist International. Of particular interest is the mistranslation of the last excerpt. The Russian text discusses an assembly summoned to "elaborate" a general program; the English text presents a meeting of persons with conflicting opinions who arrived at a "common standpoint".

The presentation of the Conference as a meeting of a limited group rather than as an international rally is reinforced by the mistranslation of references to the participants.

TABLE IV

Literat translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January 1961, p. 26: "...We welcomed in Moscow with joy, Conference par- ticipants from the frater- nal communist parties..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW January, 1961, p. 19: "...We were glad to welcome at the Moscow meeting rep- resentatives from the fra- ternal Communist parties. ..."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 3: "...Veterans of our move- ment, hardened in class battles, participated in the work of the Conference ..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW January, 1961, p. 3: "...The Meeting...was attended by veterans steeled in class battles. ..."

In both excerpts, the Russian text speaks of participants in the work of the Conference. The English text portrays these "representatives from the fraternal Communist parties" as guests at a meeting.

The mistranslation in the documents under review

of relatively common words, seems to suggest that this practice is intentional. In the "Statement," the word "fighter" (BORETS) is either translated as "champion" and the words "to fight" or "struggle" (BOROTSYA) as "to work" or "be against" or these words are simply omitted. (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, pp. 20, 21, 23, etc.; WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, pp. 17, 18, etc.) The word "toilers" (TRUD-YASHCHIESYA) is translated as "working people" (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, pp. 24, 26, 27, 31, etc.; January, 1961, pp. 26, 30, 31, etc.; MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, pp. 19, 20, 21, 23, etc.; January, 1961, pp. 20, 22, 23, etc.) or "working masses" (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, p. 25; WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, p. 19.* The word "cause" (DELO), specifically when relating to peace ("the cause of peace") is omitted in the English text of the "Statement" with surprising regularity (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, pp. 13, 14, 19, 23, 24, etc.; WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, pp. 11, 12, 16, 18, 19; etc.; KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 31; WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 24). The word "provision" (POLOZHENIE) in the Russian text is translated as "proposition" or as "thesis;" it loses its formal and obligatory character in the process (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, pp. 26, 31; WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, pp. 21, 23; KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 27; WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 23).

The scope of the present study is too restricted to permit listing all the discrepancies between the English and Russian texts of the two documents. Per page of KOMMUNIST, the number of inaccuracies sometimes exceeds a dozen. While on the surface,

*The explanation for this inaccuracy may lie in its didactic significance. Classical Marxism enjoys greater respect in English speaking countries than elsewhere. The "working class" carries greater appeal as reminiscent of the "proletarian class" and

single inaccuracies appear minor, and occasionally may be regarded as permissible and entering within the category of a translator's prerogatives for selection, combined they lend a tone to the English text which is absent from the Russian. The following excerpts from the "Statement" may illustrate this point.

TABLE V

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, p. 14: "...Through concerted and vigorous action of all peaceloving forces one can maintain peace, and prevent another war..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, p. 12: "...Concerted and vigorous actions of all the forces of peace can safeguard the peace and prevent a new war..."
KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, p. 22: "...In the process of this struggle / of liberation from the yoke of capital / ...conditions are created for decisive battles for the overthrow of capitalism..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, p. 18: "...In the process of this struggle / of liberation from the yoke of capital / ...conditions arise for decisive battles for the overthrow of capitalism..."

The translator shifts the accent in each of the above excerpts and, as a result, slightly distorts the meaning. The Russian text implies that an unidentified group "can maintain peace" and that "conditions are created." The English text clearly states that "the forces of peace" can safeguard peace and that "conditions arise." Khrushchev's report offers further examples of minor inaccuracies and their effect on the text:

"working people" is a term more all-embracing than is "toilers."

TABLE VI

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
<p>KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 23: "...In our times the disarmament slogan was advanced as a practical task by V.I. Lenin and the first Soviet proposals for complete disarmament or for partial, should the capitalists fail to go for complete disarmament, were introduced at the Genoa Conference..."</p>	<p>WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 17: "...In our times disarmament was first advanced as a practical goal by Lenin and the first Soviet proposals for complete disarmament - or, for partial disarmament - were made at the Genoa Conference..."</p>
<p>KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 23: "...Then peace will be assured and the most favorable prospects will open before the peoples for arranging their lives in accordance with their hopes and interests..."</p>	<p>WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 18: "...Peace will then be ensured and the peoples will be able to arrange their lives in keeping with their wishes and interests..."</p>

Minor changes in the translation of the text have altered the meaning of both paragraphs cited above. The omission of the word "slogan" and the replacement of "task" by "goal" in the first excerpt, turned a tactical communist manoeuvre into a noble enterprise. In the second excerpt, the Russian text merely opens "prospects" while the English dispels all doubt.

A similar shift in emphasis may be observed in two other paragraphs, one appearing in the "Statement," as well as in Khrushchev's report, the other contained only in the report.

TABLE VII

Literat translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 31; November, 1960, p. 26: "...The communist parties ...have always been against the export of re- volution. At the same time, they are fighting resolutely against im- perialist export of counter-revolution..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p.23; December, 1960, p. 20-21: "...The communist parties have always rejected ex- port of revolution. At the same time they are definitely against the imperialist export of counter-revolution..."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 23-24: "... He /Lenin/ said that in the struggle for the maintenance of peace, we must also utilize reason- able representatives of the bourgeoisie... "	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 18 : "...In the struggle for peace, he /Lenin/ said, we should not overlook the saner representa- tives of the bourgeoisi- sie..."

In the first of the above excerpts, the English text has the communists rejecting export of revolution to which, in the Russian text, they are merely opposed. On the other hand, in the English text, the communists are merely opposed to the "export of counter-revolution" which they fight "resolutely" in the Russian text.. As regards the second excerpt, the replacement of "utilize" by "overlook" transforms Lenin's remarks from cynical opportunism in the Russian text, into an effort to achieve peace in the English.

A colorful inaccuracy is contained in one of the closing paragraphs of Khrushchev's report. Khrushchev is cited as speaking of: "our times when the lines of the Party Anthem resound with particular force: We'll build our own, we'll build a new

world, the man of no account will become all..." (KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 37). In English, Khrushchev speaks of "our times, times when there is an especially powerful ring to the lines of the Party Anthem: "Let power be wielded by the masses, Let those who labor hold the reins..."

3.

As may be observed from the excerpts cited in the preceding pages, the abundance of inaccuracies in the translation alters the text of the original to a considerable degree. It has been already stated that many of the inaccuracies, although relatively slight and seemingly unimportant in themselves, by reason of their number and tendentiousness lend to the English texts of the "Statement" and the Khrushchev report, a tone contrasting with that of the Russian version. The forcefulness of the Russian text is constantly attenuated by the English translator with the result that the impression produced varies depending on whether the document is read in Russian or in English. The Russian text speaks of communist parties as "actively fighting" for revolution and "vigorously acting" against anti-democratic developments (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, p. 14). The English text explains that peaceful coexistence increases "the prestige" of the communist parties (WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, p. 14). Instead of "aiding the peoples in their fight to strengthen national independence" (KOMMUNIST, November, 1960, p. 21), the socialist countries "help the peoples in strengthening their independence" (WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December, 1960, p. 17). The extent reached in this attenuation of wording may be judged from the fact that even Khrushchev's "report" was turned into a "speech" by the translator.

By such subtle amendments, the English text decreases the role of communism as an organized movement and subversive force, and presents international communism as evolutionary rather than actively

revolutionary.

This major and general effect is supplemented by the creation through improper translation, of a possibility of misinterpretation. Khrushchev's report, for example, contains references to the relations existing between individual members of the "world socialist system." In almost every instance, in contrast to the precision of Khrushchev's original statements, the English text, less assertive, opens a slight possibility for misinterpretation.

TABLE VIII

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January 1961, p. 15: "..Between socialist countries there are no, and can be no, insoluble contradictions.."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 12: "..There are no insoluble contradictions between the socialist countries.."
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961 p. 34: "..in the Communist movement, as in the socialist camp, there has been, and is, complete equality and solidarity of all the communist and labor parties ..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW January, 1961, p. 12: "..in the Communist movement as in the socialist camp, there has always been complete equality and solidarity of all the communist and workers parties ..."

The distortion in the following excerpt, possibly unintentional, is one of tone rather than meaning.

TABLE IX

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 36: "..The representatives of the communist and labor parties	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 27: "..Representatives of the Communist and Workers'

exchanged opinions on questions of the present international situation... or as was picturesquely expressed by comrades at the Conference, "compared our watches". Indeed, it is necessary for socialist countries and communist parties to 'compare their watches'..."

parties exchanged opinions on questions of the current international situation...or as comrades put it figuratively at the Meeting, we set our watches. Indeed, the socialist countries and the Communist parties need to set the time..."

There are subtle differences between the two versions. One sets one's watch when it has stopped or does not run true to time. One compares one's watch with a comrade for joint action. One sets the time when one is an authority. Comparing watches, on the other hand, implies consultation.

Khrushchev's reference to Soviet relations with China also appears in two different aspects, the Russian and the English.

TABLE X

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January, 1961, p. 36: " I want to speak of our inalterable ambition to strengthen the bonds of fraternal friendship with the Communist Party of China..."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 28: "...I want to emphasize our constant effort to strength- en the bonds of fraternal friendship with the Com- munist Party of China..."

The Russian "inalterable ambition" has been replaced by constant effort". This is but a minor change but it causes the Russian reader to visualize two friends, one working enthusiastically at strengthening the bond of friendship with the other. The English reader, meanwhile, sees one of two partners

making an effort, possibly futile since it is "constant", at strengthening these bonds. One conclusion only can come to the mind of the Russian reader. The text submitted to the English reader is open to more than one interpretation.

-4-

The English text of the two documents is published for the English reader outside the Soviet bloc. The difference in tone between the Russian and English texts invites the assumption that the English translation carries a message adapted to the communist propaganda line in English speaking countries. The changes wrought by translation in the "Statement" and in Khrushchev's report seem to reflect the Communist approach to non-communist audiences at the present stage of political development. Another point which seems to evolve from the study of the two documents is that this propaganda approach depends on the political needs of the day.

Indeed, the inaccuracies present in the English text of Khrushchev's report of January, 1961, differ from those contained in the English text of the "Statement," both in wording and in number. Khrushchev's original is distorted to a greater extent than is the "Statement." The tone of Khrushchev's report has been softened more noticeably than the "Statement's." A possible explanation is that the shocked reaction in English-speaking countries to the aggressive nature of the "Statement" disturbed the communists, and the communist leadership decided to mitigate this effect. The inaccuracies in the translation of Khrushchev's report stress with greater insistence the nonbelligerence of communism.

Possibly symptomatic is the inaccuracy in Khrushchev's treatment of Sino-Soviet relations, as presented by the two texts of his report. One must bear in mind that this inaccuracy in translation coincided with rumors in the Western press of the outbreak of a Sino-Soviet conflict. If intentional, this inaccuracy is therefore worthy of particular consideration. The same holds true with regard to the

KHRUSHCHEV SPEECH OF JANUARY 6, 1961

97

last excerpt in Table 3 (page *) where the English text implies the existence of differences of opinion between communist groups, smoothed out at the conference.

The contrasting tone and even wording of the Russian and English texts of the two documents raises the question of whether English translations of communist origin should be viewed as translations. The specific phraseology used in the approach to the English reader and the propaganda carried by the English text were the main topics of the preceding pages of this study. The Russian text, however, indicates a similar slant apparently directed at the Soviet citizen. As revealed by the excerpts in Table 1 (page 4) the Russian text attempts to convince the reader that the Soviet fatherland is absorbed by the task of constructing communism.

TABLE XI

Literal translation of the Russian text	English text
KOMMUNIST, January 1961, p.8: "..One can count a many million army of semi-un employed in the USA.."	WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, January, 1961, p. 7: "..There are millions of part-time employed in the United States.."

The "part-time employed" of the English text are "semi-unemployed" in the Russian original, a subtle difference.

5

Faced with the hypothesis that a communist "translation" into English of communist political material is an independent version of the original document rather than a translation, one is justified in regarding the Soviet "translations" as documents of considerable political significance. If the hypothesis is correct that the inaccuracies present in these translations are intentional, the English version of a Russian document can contribute effectively to Soviet objectives in the non-communist world.

Opinions of English readers are shaped by the English version which they read. The English reader, as a rule, knows no Russian, nor is he likely to compare if he does, the translation he reads with the Russian original. He thus accepts the English text as reflecting the true policy of communist leadership. The research worker, on the other hand, often limits his reading to the Russian original alone. As a result, he is confused and baffled by the reaction of his English entourage to a document which leaves no questions unanswered in his mind.

The study of both versions should prove of value to the research worker. The English text examined against the background of its Russian counterpart, may expose the methods of camouflage and misinformation practiced by communism and may help define the propaganda line adopted by communism against "imperialism". More important still, should the hypothesis of intentional distortion of translations prove correct, a comparison of the Russian text with that intended for circulation outside the Iron Curtain may bring to light points which the Soviet leaders feel must be stressed before Soviet audiences.

Before a final judgement can be passed on Soviet translations and their value, the tentative conclusions of the present study should be amplified by further research. The field for such research is extensive. It stretches over material translated into West European, Asiatic and African languages from a Russian original, and over translations into, and from, the languages of members of the "world socialist system" other than the USSR. Opportunity for analysis is not lacking. The importance of translations as tools of misinformation of public opinion, should inspire research workers to undertake this task.

INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

A

"About the Possible Transition to Socialism by Means of the Revolutionary Use of Parliament and the Czechoslovak Experience" (book).....	Page 13
"Abraham Lincoln in the War Years," by Carl Sandburg (excerpt), appendix II.....	50
Academy of Social Sciences.....	4, 12
Aesopian language.....	15, 16, 20, 37, 39
Africa.....	34
Algeria.....	72
Angara cascade.....	59
Anglo-French-Israeli aggression.....	64
Appendix I: From "Preamble, and Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association".....	51
Appendix II: From Carl Sandburg, "Abraham Lincoln in the War Years".....	51-a
Appendix III: Khrushchev Report on Moscow Conference.....	52
Appendix IV: Communist psychological offensive.....	79
Arab countries.....	64
Argentina.....	72

B

Baku.....	59
Batista.....	65
Belgium.....	72
Benes, Dr. Eduard.....	42
Berlin, East.....	6
Berlin issue.....	7, 8, 10
Berlin, West.....	26
Birmingham.....	65
Britain.....	64, 72
British Chartists.....	74
Bratsk GES.....	59

C

Castro, Fidel.....	35, 65
CENTO.....	26, 66
China.....	64
Comintern, First Congress of the.....	72
Communist and Workers' Parties.....	15, 17
Declaration of Meeting of Representatives of November 1960.....	13, 15
Communist International:	
Fourth Congress of.....	19, 58
Sixth World Congress of.....	28, 38
CPCS.....	38, 44
Communist Party, Chinese.....	15, 78
Communist Party, Denmark.....	39
Communist Parties of all the Socialist countries.....	61
Communist Party of Soviet Union.....	4, 13, 15, 16, 22, 43, 45, 59, 60, 63, 73, 76, 78
Central Committee.....	12, 25, 52, 57, 58
20th Congress of.....	28, 47
Communist Party, U.S.A.....	40
Congo.....	72
Cremer, W. R.....	50

	Page
Cuba	36, 65
Cuban revolution	69
Czechoslovakia	26, 41, 67
Czechoslovakia National Assembly	40
D	
"Das Kapital"	50
Denmark	72
E	
Eden	64
Egypt	64
Engels, Friedrich	16, 32, 62, 72, 76
F	
Factory Guards (of CPSU)	44
"First International"	15, 67
"Forward Strategy for America" (book)	1
France	26, 27, 64, 72
Frunze	27
G	
Gates	74
Geneva summit conference	5
Georgetown University	1, 12
German Democratic Republic (GDR)	26, 27, 67
German Federal Republic	26, 67
German militarism	67
H	
Higher Party School	52
Hitler	63
Hungary	64
Hungarian Soviet Republic	48
I	
Institute of Marxism-Leninism (of Central Committee, CPSU)	4, 12
International Workingmen's Association	16
K	
"Khrushchev's Mein Kampf" (title of presentation by Dr. Possony)	2
Khrushchev's November (1960) Declaration	36, 37
Khrushchev Report on Moscow Conference (app. III)	52
Kazak, Jan	13, 42, 43, 45, 46
Kremlin	38, 48
Kursk	59
L	
Laos	72
Laos situation	8
Lancashire	65
Larsen group	74
Latin America	34, 35
Lenin	19, 30, 34, 39, 40, 48, 53, 58, 62, 65, 67-70, 72, 74, 76-78
London	65
M	
Mansfield, Senator	9
Marx, Karl	15, 16, 40, 50, 54, 62, 67, 72, 76, 77
Millionaires' Levy	42
Mollet, Guy	64
Mongolian People's Republic	63

Morrison, Right Honorable Lord.....	Page 13
Moscow.....	6, 69, 72
Moscow conference in 1937.....	72
MTS.....	61
N	
NATO.....	7, 10, 26, 64, 65, 67
North Vietnam.....	64
O	
October Socialist Revolution.....	18, 21, 70, 73
P	
Paris Commounards.....	74
Parliament of the Czechoslovak Republic.....	45
Pauling.....	65
Pennsylvania, University of.....	12
Poland.....	26, 64, 69
Portugal.....	72, 76
Possony, Dr. Stefan T.: Testimony of.....	1-12
Statement by.....	12-48
"Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association" (ex- cerpt), appendix I.....	49
R	
Red army.....	39
Rhodesia.....	69
S	
SEATO.....	26
Second All-Russian Congress of the Communist Organizations of the Peo- ples of the East.....	69
Siberian Yenisey.....	59
Sixth World Congress of the Communist International (1928).....	37
Soviet Bloc.....	13
Soviet Government.....	25, 58
Soviet Home Service (Moscow).....	52
Sovetskupnost.....	61
Spain.....	72, 76
Stalin.....	27, 30, 40
U	
Uganda.....	69
Ulbricht, Mr.....	7
United Nations.....	64, 71, 72
United States.....	26
U.N. General Assembly.....	36, 71
Union of South Africa.....	69
V	
Vietnam.....	64
Volga.....	59
Y	
Yugoslav variety of contemporary revisionism.....	74
Yorkshire.....	65
W	
West Berlin.....	26, 27, 67
World Marxist Review (WMR).....	4, 13, 15, 16, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29-33, 34, 41