

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (5)

Summary No. 2846

2 November 1960

Prepared by

Foreign Documents Division
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
2430 E St., N. W., Washington 25, D. C.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

W A R N I N G

THIS MATERIAL CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE
OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS,
TITLE 18, USC, SECS. 793 AND 794, THE TRANSMISSION OR REVELATION OF
WHICH IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (5)

This report contains material on Communist revisionism and dissidence as reflected in Communist and non-Communist sources. The latest source date used herein is 2 October 1960.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Part 1. Far East	1
I. China	1
Issue of International Revisionism After Bucharest	1
A. Early July: Dispute Submerged	1
B. Mid-August: Dispute Re-Emerges	5
C. September: Parties Meet in Vietnam	10
D. Mid-September: National Liberation Struggle	13
E. 1 October: National Day	16
II. North Vietnam	21
Need for Peaceful Coexistence Stressed	21
III. Indonesia	22
PKI Pursuing Middle Road	22
IV. Outer Mongolia	27
Activities of Mongolian-Chinese Friendship Association	27
Press Reprints Coexistence Portion of <u>Pravda</u> Article	30
Part 2. Eastern Europe	32
I. Czechoslovakia	32
Fifth Bucharest Conference of Communist Historians Reported by Party Almanac	32
II. East Germany	38
Ideological and Cultural Revisionism	38

- 8 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

	<u>Page</u>
III. Hungary	42
Official Party Statements Stress Orthodoxy as Writers Seek New Ideological Orientation	42
Agnes Heller Condemned --- A Classical Case of Revisionism and Marxist Ethics	46
IV. Poland	58
Existentialism Becoming Significant Revisionist Force Among Intellectuals	58
V. Rumania	61
Manifestations of Economic, Ideological, and Cultural Revisionism in Press	61
VI. Yugoslavia	63
Peaceful Coexistence	63
Inhibited Soviet Sociology	65
"Commune" Is Not Communism	66
Part 3. Western Europe	67
I. Finland	67
Communist Party Supports Moscow Line on Peace and War	67
II. Italy	68
Socialist Deputy Raps Misuse of Term "Revisionism"	68

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 1. FAR EAST

I. CHINA

Issue of International Revisionism After Bucharest

Having developed the charge of "revisionism" against the Soviet leadership in respect to its position on strategy for the world Communist movement, the Chinese Communist press withdrew into relative silence on this charge following the Soviets' all-out counterattack in June 1960 at the Bucharest meeting of Communist bloc party leaders. Beginning on 1 July 1960, the press ceased to feature the issue; in mid-August, the press and party spokesmen again joined the dialogue with the Soviets.

The following survey covers developments in the dispute, as seen in the Chinese Communist press, from the beginning of July 1960 to Chinese National Day, 1 October 1960, the major yearly occasion for celebrating the regime's achievements and voicing its view of the world situation.

A. Early July: Dispute Submerged

For nearly 1 1/2 months, the Chinese press refrained from carrying the argument to the Soviets in articles, editorials, or reports of speeches devoted to the issue of international revisionism, or even of foreign affairs, but published semiprivate discussions, buried in items on domestic subjects. A partial exception to this was the speech of the Chinese representative to the World Peace Council meeting in Stockholm, which event by its nature brought from the Chinese a discussion of the substantive issues in the dispute; but the Chinese speaker did not mention "revisionism," nor did he criticize, even indirectly, any Soviet views on the related issues.

On 10 July 1960, as reported in Jen-min Jih-pao of 15 July, the head of the Chinese delegation, Liao Cheng-chih, virtually bombarded his audience at the World Peace Council meeting with varied and repetitive uses of the word "struggle." On this and on "imperialism," the object of struggle, he brought the standard Chinese reading of the previous months. But he especially stressed "struggle toward relaxation of international tension, for disarmament, for reconvening a summit conference, and for peaceful coexistence." These objectives, he insisted repeatedly, were dependent on struggle. Only by incessantly increasing the strength of the socialist camp, the national independence movements, and all other "peace-loving" forces, and by uniting these in a "long, tireless struggle against imperialism," could "imperialism be compelled to accept peaceful coexistence." Only by making the "imperialists" realize, through struggle, that refusal

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

to carry out disarmament would be to their disadvantage could they be "forced to sit down and negotiate" on disarmament. "To compel imperialism to accept negotiations and reach certain agreements with us and to safeguard these agreements against violation during implementation, there must be intense struggles, and diplomatic negotiations must be closely coordinated with the struggles of the masses," he said.

In this connection, he professed to see the Soviet part in the abortive summit meeting as one of a number of "recent peoples' struggles" in defense of peace, stating, "The just struggle of the Soviet government and people against US imperialist provocations and wrecking of the four-power conference has effectively exposed the US imperialists' peace deceptions.... China, the other socialist countries, and all the world's peoples who love peace and uphold justice resolutely support the just struggle of the Soviet Union...."

The Chinese press had begun, even before the period of its de-emphasis of the dispute, to speak occasionally of internal ideological problems in terms of revisionism, and now this practice increased. Before a national congress of writers and artists, as reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 July 1960, two officials of the party propaganda department -- its chief, Lu Ting-yi, and a deputy director, Chou Yang -- discussed international revisionism in a domestic context. Amid lengthy considerations of the role of literature and art and of the problem of bourgeois thinking among those who produce them, they brought the matter up in terms which were relatively new:

Making the standard observation that the modern revisionists were tailoring their policies "to the needs of imperialism" and that in fact revisionism is a "product of imperialist policy," Lu Ting-yi also said: "Under the label of so-called 'active coexistence,' the modern revisionists are attempting to confuse the masses with bourgeois pacifism and with the deceptive ideas of bourgeois 'humanism'; they oppose collectivism with individualism, and Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle, proletarian revolution, and proletarian dictatorship with the bourgeois theory of 'human nature.' They try to use these ridiculous ideas to emasculate the revolutionary will and numb the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries...in a fruitless effort to have the people abandon their struggles against imperialists and reactionaries, and toward eliminating the revolution."

Chou Yang observed that the revisionists were spreading the bourgeois theory of human nature, humanism, and pacifism in order to obscure class antagonism and thus deny class struggle and revolution, and to create illusions about the capitalist class. He asserted: "Modern revisionists place historic idealism counter to materialism, class compromise counter to class struggle, the theory of human nature counter to that of classes, and corrupt bourgeois human nature counter to proletarian revolutionary human nature." He also reiterated the Chinese contention that revisionism "is the main danger in the international workers movement."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The same application of the issue to domestic concerns was seen on a local level. In a speech to a Shanghai youth congress on the problem of bourgeois ideology, reported in the 17 July 1960 Chieh-fang Jih-pao (Shanghai), a secretary of the municipal committee of the Communist Youth League observed that "class struggle exists not only in our country; a more serious class struggle exists even in the international arena." He remarked that the modern revisionists were "assisting the imperialists" in spreading bourgeois ideology; exalting bourgeois pacifism, humanism, humanitarianism, and sentimentalism; and trying to find a market for these among certain youths in the socialist countries. He held that anyone who had properly established a proletarian world view would courageously defend the cause of revolution anywhere and any time; he would inevitably be concerned with the struggles of the people of the world and move to the front to "wage the irreconcilable struggle against the national and international enemies and modern revisionism." In closing he said: "We must further strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union; strengthen our unity with the people of the whole world; and forever courageously stay at the forefront of the struggle against US imperialism and modern revisionism."

An article of 21 July 1960 in the same city daily, on the subject of taking a political approach to problems, asserted: "The modern revisionists, represented by the Tito clique and serving the aggressive policies of imperialism, have venomously slandered our people. This must, indeed, be dealt with seriously." It said that to wage a determined struggle against these people, "we must constantly analyze international developments from the viewpoint of class struggle; we must exert, strengthen, stimulate, and encourage ourselves, and perform all aspects of our work well, so as to underlay and amplify the forces opposing imperialist aggression and defending peace. Failure to observe international problems from this viewpoint and to help intensify the struggle by one's own action are manifestations of political deviation."

Ai Ssu-ch'i, a party theoretician, in a long philosophical article in Jen-min Jih-pao of 31 July 1960, which explained at great length the presence of a "dialectical uniformity" between thought and existence, touched briefly on the matter of revisionism at the end of his disquisition. Here he observed that one who cannot apply dialectics to the theory of cognition and who does not understand the dialectical uniformity "is bound to embark on the road of anti-Marxism-Leninism." He recalled that the question of uniformity of thought and existence had been an important one between revisionists and Marxist-Leninists in the latter's struggle against bourgeois idealism, and held that currently there was an "extremely important realistic, as well as a theoretical, significance" in the idea of this uniformity. He added: "The modern revisionists are now everywhere sabotaging the materialist theory of cognition and materialist dialectics in ideology. For us to correctly resolve the question of uniformity between thought and existence will benefit our struggle against revisionism.... The world outlook of right opportunists and revisionists being largely idealistic, they regard the uniformity between thought and existence as a metaphysical one, seeing existence as something no different from their own subjective consciousness."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Similar to this was a philosophical essay appearing as the last article in Hung-ch'i of 1 August 1960, entitled "On the Unity of Opposites." Again "revisionism" was unobtrusively discussed at the end of the treatise, though this time more at length and in more concrete terms. It complained that "the enemies of Marxism-Leninism," the revisionists, negate the absoluteness of the struggle between opposites, distort the "unity" aspect of dialectics into sophism and relativism, and obliterate the fundamental conflict and the qualitative difference between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism, between the socialist and "imperialist" camps, and between righteous and unrighteous wars. It stated that to obliterate the difference between "imperialist" wars and nationalist wars "is purely a revisionist technique to which we must resolutely object," but that it was also extremely erroneous to deny that "imperialist" wars may turn into nationalist wars, and to this too it stated resolute objections. It noted that Lenin had said the latter error was extremely harmful in practice because it might lead to misleading propaganda for "disarmament," since it might seem that there may never be any war other than the reactionary war and thus the people might adopt an attitude of indifference toward nationalist movements.

At the beginning of August 1960, Army Day, usually celebrated with fanfare and speeches, was notable for the absence in the official daily, Jen-min Jih-pao, of speeches of such military notables as Defense Minister Lin Piao or Chief of Staff Lo Jui-ch'ing. There did appear in the issue of 3 August, however, a report on the speech in Moscow of Major General P'an Chen-wu, Chinese military attache. He was reported to have professed the desire of the Chinese people for peace and their steady adherence to a "peaceful foreign policy," as well as their advocacy of peaceful coexistence and "constant efforts to reduce international tension." This he qualified with: "We nevertheless cannot but see, while we actively defend world peace, that US imperialism vigorously carries on arms expansion and war preparations.... We must necessarily maintain high vigilance against its plots and carry on a determined struggle against it. We are firmly convinced that the great unity of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, is unbreakable." Continuing on to dwell on the "friendship and unity" between Chinese and Soviet armed forces, he interlarded these protestations with China's determination to remain vigilant and carry on this struggle.

There was evinced more clearly during the post-Bucharest period a facet of the dispute which had begun to appear during its earlier stage: an apparent sensitivity over the fact that China was the butt of abuse not only from without the bloc, but from many parties within it as well. Articles by such familiar spokesmen as T'ao Chu, first secretary of the Kwangtung Province party committee, left the impression that the Chinese were beginning to feel they were in fact being "isolated," as the Soviet party had predicted would be the case if they held to their position.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In a long article on the problems of the transitional period in China, published in Jen-min Jih-pao of 5 August, T'ao Chu complained:

"At present, the international reactionary clique headed by the US imperialists is constantly working against our country and is following a policy of aggression and war throughout the world, while the modern revisionists, to meet the imperialists' needs, distort and emasculate Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principles in order to lull the revolutionary will of the masses and break up the ranks of the international Communist movement. This situation has confronted us with the task of studying and mastering the theory of socialist revolution and construction, combating revisionism, defending Marxism-Leninism, and speeding up the pace of our revolution and construction."

At the end of this article T'ao demonstrated another characteristic of spokesmen in this period -- that of apparent concern for the alliance, mixed with a persistent holding to their position and implicit criticism of that of the Soviets. He urged the strengthening of the international unity of the proletariat, "especially the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union," a step he called a "holy mission" necessary to the carrying out of the socialist cause. He saw the Chinese revolution as a "great component of the world revolution," but as also being inseparable from the aid of the socialist camp, the Soviet Union, the international proletariat, and other revolutionary forces. He said: "Our fundamental interests lie in strengthening the unity of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, and the international unity of the proletariat. Imperialists and modern revisionists, headed by the Tito clique, are working deceitfully to sabotage this unity, an effort we must drastically expose and destroy."

B. Mid-August: Dispute Re-Emerges

The Chinese brought the argument out from the semicover of domestic philosophical articles on 13 August 1960, when Jen-min Jih-pao carried an editorial on foreign affairs, ostensibly in refutation of US State Department charges that the Chinese were warlike.

The editorial was defensive throughout. It asserted Chinese adherence to a peaceful foreign policy, tying this to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence initiated in 1954 in company with Nehru of India. The US, it said, had "always rejected Chinese peace proposals and peaceful coexistence," and its charge of "belligerence" against China was slander of a country which had signed treaties with neighbors and advanced a proposal for a Pacific peace pact. True, it said, China's propaganda had "exposed imperialists' aggressive policies consistently, but how can peace-loving people throughout the world not expose it?"

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The editorial reached its real point in the last paragraph: "We definitely believe that the overwhelming majority of the world's people, including workers, peasants, and progressive national bourgeoisie and intellectuals, sympathize with and support us. The most recent strong evidence of this is the praise and support for Premier Chou En-lai's proposal by the peace-loving public opinion of all countries. The modern revisionists and their followers have gone to the extreme of loudly affirming the US imperialist slander that China is 'warlike,' or that it 'desires war,' or that it 'does not want peace or peaceful coexistence'; they have concocted the lie that China tries to 'promote world revolution through war,' and so on. By all this they do nothing but place themselves in the position of apologists of imperialism. This cannot harm China at all, and will place them in an unfortunate situation. The Chinese people have contempt for all this blasphemy and will never relax their efforts to expose and struggle against the US imperialist policies of aggression and war. They will consistently and firmly stand behind the just struggles of all peoples. China will continue unwaveringly in its peaceful foreign policy, striving to coexist peacefully with countries with differing social systems.... We are completely aware that the realization of any proposal which actually serves world peace is possible only if we rely on the continuous struggle of the masses of all countries to frustrate the plots for aggression and war of the imperialists headed by the US...."

Two days later, in Jen-min Jih-pao, 15 August 1960, on the occasion of the observance in Peiping of the North Korean liberation anniversary, politburo member Li Hsien-nien showed the same defensiveness, stating: "US imperialism, to disguise its new aggressive and expansionist activities and divert the attention of the world's peoples, has employed its old tricks of hollering 'thief,' when it itself is the actual thief, and of playing its old tune of slander to damage the Chinese people." He asserted that the Chinese people were not opposed to the American people, to whom they would, "as always, be forever friendly." Though "imperialism" had been hostile to China and occupied Taiwan, China "continued the initiative of suggesting that they sit down and negotiate this by peaceful consultation." The Chinese, he insisted, had "consistently stood for peaceful coexistence and the Five Principles," but the US had "turned down the Pacific peace pact proposal." He asked if it were not clear "who was the aggressor and who wanted war."

He also used this occasion to make clear his party's general position in the dispute which had lain dormant for 1 1/2 months:

"The Chinese people are adamant in their stand against imperialist aggression and for world peace, and they are consistent in their support of the just struggles of the people of various countries for national independence, democracy, freedom, and socialism.... We are pleased to note that the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, has become unprecedentedly strong; the national democratic movements in Asia, Africa, and

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Latin America have surged to great size; the struggling forces of the people in the West and the peace-loving forces of the whole world have developed rapidly; and a storm of struggle against US imperialism and its lackeys is forming and gaining speed in many areas of the world."

As to China's socialist bloc neighbor, he observed: "The Korean people have worked unceasingly and in a spirit of internalism for the unity of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, and against modern revisionism represented by Tito. In its position as sentinel in the East for the socialist camp, the Democratic Republic has contributed much to the work of opposing the policy of war and aggression of imperialism headed by the US and of defending peace in Asia and the world. Through their victory in their war of national defense, the Korean people preserved the independence of Korea and the security of the socialist camp, and also dealt a great blow to the aggressive mood of US imperialism and upset its war plans. By their brave fight, they tore the paper tiger which looked so powerful but which in reality was not, and proved that if only an oppressed people will rise and struggle determinedly, they can disrupt the warring, aggressive activities of US imperialism. This has given endless courage to the people of the world in their opposition to imperialist aggression and their struggle to win and defend world peace, national independence, democracy, and freedom."

He spoke of the traditional, deep friendship of the two peoples, developed in their long struggle against common enemies, and of how in the "great, just war against US aggression" they had shed blood together, "highlighting the noble spirit of proletarian internationalism" of the two peoples. He said, "Our comrades-in-arms friendship was formed through bloodshed.... We shall give mutual support and aid, learn from one another, and make the greatest contributions to the unity of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, and to the development of our common cause.... We shall forever join hands with the countries of the socialist camp and, with all peace-loving peoples and countries, struggle to the end against US imperialist aggression and for the defense of peace in Asia and the world."

Chou En-lai on the same occasion, as reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 16 August 1960, remarked that the "foreign policy of peace" pursued by both governments was "unshakable," and that it was exactly for the defense of world peace that they had fought "imperialist policies of war." "We are deeply convinced," he said, "that if the Chinese and Korean peoples, the peoples of other countries of the socialist camp, and all peace-loving peoples in the world strengthen their unity and persist in struggle, we will certainly realize the peaceful reunification of Korea, will certainly liberate Taiwan, and will certainly preserve peace in the Far East and in the world."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

As of mid-August 1960, the official party theoretical semimonthly Hung-ch'i (Red Flag), which had ceased on 1 July to carry any articles on international affairs, still concentrated solely on domestic subjects. However, Li Fu-ch'un, politburo member, who was a very important spokesman on national policy during this period, brought up the matter of international revisionism in a long, key article on problems of the general line for "socialist construction," in the 16 August issue. Remarking on the importance of socialist-camp aid and of support of people throughout the world for China's socialist cause, he noted that the progress of its construction in turn strengthened the camp and the "oppressed and struggling peoples" of the world.

"This," he said, "is the reason each of our victories receives encouragement from the people of the socialist camp and the world and earns the hatred of the handful of imperialists, reactionaries, and modern revisionists and of those who echo them. They have conducted campaigns against China since 1958, in an effort to isolate us and undermine our great cause of socialist construction, but events have gone contrary to their aims. Their anti-Chinese activities, as far as we are concerned, are to the good, not the bad, because they prove we are real Marxist-Leninists and that we are not doing badly. They have not damaged us at all, but rather have aroused our whole party and people to unite still more closely and to establish the bold target of catching up with and surpassing the most advanced capitalist countries of the West, economically and culturally, and by our own efforts. For them, their anti-Chinese activities are not a benefit but an evil portent. They will see that ultimately the rock they cast at others will crash down on their own feet. They will expose their own ugly features and will isolate themselves from the well-intentioned people who form more than 90 percent of the world's people."

In the closing statement of his article Li said: "The present international and domestic situations are both greatly favorable to our socialist construction. No lies or slander by the forces of the reactionaries and modern revisionists can prevent our advance."

Reporting on efforts to propagate Chinese points of view at the world conference against nuclear bombs by the Chinese delegation to that conclave, its leader, Liu Ning-yi, wrote in Jen-min Jih-pao of 27 August 1960 that the delegation, in company with those of other countries, had militantly promoted the idea of struggle against "the common enemy, US imperialism." When the Chinese speaker there said that "US imperialism is the enemy of the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America and of all peace-loving people in the world" and that if these all unite and resolutely struggle against it, "lasting world peace can be maintained," according to Liu, he "won sympathy from the delegates from Japan and other countries and received repeated, warm applause." Liu said: "At this international meeting there was no market for the attempt to beautify or create illusions about imperialism. A speaker who tried to neglect the difference between the US and the Soviet Union was shouted down as he began to speak, and the Yugoslav modern revisionists, who did not mention US imperialism, also made themselves ridiculous."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

On 30 August 1960, Jen-min Jih-pao carried two articles on the Boxer rebellion, which it presented as the classic illustration of the need for struggle, especially for oppressed and colonial peoples. The Chinese people in this period, one article held, "had no alternative but to rise and struggle against imperialism." Among the "imperialist abuses" it listed as existing then was the division of China's territories into the spheres of influence of "Russia, Britain, Germany, France, and Japan." It described the rebellion as "an anti-imperialist war, a revolutionary war, a war for progress." Precisely because it was "in direct opposition to imperialism and drew its strength from the masses," the article said, it has since "drawn the hatred of all reactionaries and has been misrepresented by all kinds of bourgeois apologists." The article credited the movement with initiating the "anti-imperialist struggle by the colonial peoples" which was to take place in the 20th Century.

It also took up a question which previously had not been much discussed in the Chinese press --- that of which class should lead the "revolutions of the oppressed peoples." The Boxer rebellion was a demonstration of the revolutionary activism of the peasants, it held. "The national question is in fact a peasant question. The anti-imperialist struggle cannot be thoroughly carried out unless proper leadership has been provided the masses of peasants," it said. The bourgeoisie are revolutionary to an extent and should be made maximum use of by the working class, it continued, but some of the bourgeoisie of colonized countries have won powers from the "imperialist bourgeoisie," through the establishment of independent nations as a result of national movements, and have used such powers in dealing with other revolutionary classes. This class in the colonies has a double character and "to regard the bourgeois movement as the main current of national liberation, to support it energetically and exclusively, keeping silent on the struggles of the broad revolutionary masses, is to take the bourgeois point of view and to act against Lenin's teachings." It asserted the "historical law" that "imperialist aggression" inevitably leads to revolution in the colonies, and though the revolution may begin in crude form, the masses will in the long run be the decisive forces, and though the struggle may follow a tortuous course, they are sure to win. "The question is, whether or not people dare to struggle against imperialism, and whether the weak bourgeoisie or the masses will be depended on in such struggle. This was true at the time of the Boxer rebellion, and is no less true today," it held.

The second article on the same subject was used as a vehicle to present the position of Mao Tse-tung himself on the question of the "oppressed peoples." It said that when Mao had received visitors from the underdeveloped countries, he expressed the following sentiments: "The peoples of the world are the friends of the Chinese people. The imperialists and their jackals are the enemies of all, and are small in number. World peace must be won through the struggle of the peoples of all countries; people

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

are the decisive factor.... To defeat the reactionary rule of the imperialists, a broad united front must be formed, and all the forces possible should be rallied to continue the arduous struggle. The US imperialists are the greatest imperialists in the world at present and are the common enemy of all peace-loving peoples, and these should all be united to drive them from Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Mao's words, the article said, showed among other things "the common purpose of the Chinese people and the peoples of the other Asian, African, and Latin American countries." It said: "The attitude of the Chinese people toward the national democratic movements of the peoples of Asian, African, and Latin American countries, as conveyed by Comrade Mao, is in complete accord with the views of Lenin and of all Communists in the world who are loyal to Marxism-Leninism."

C. September: Parties Meet in Vietnam

Li Fu-ch'un figured prominently in the dispute when, at the beginning of September 1960, he traveled to Hanoi to represent China at the North Vietnam Workers Party congress. Here, where representatives of the Soviet Union and other bloc countries also spoke, the argument came more clearly into the open than had been the case since the meeting of party leaders at Bucharest in June. Li made three speeches on this occasion.

The first, made at a ceremony in honor of North Vietnam's National Day, prior to the congress, carried no punch in respect to the dispute, and was in fact heavy with statements which made it seem that Li, on this occasion, might take a relatively agreeable approach to the issue. As reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 2 September 1960, Li made some brief references to struggle, but more noticeable were his observations that the Vietnamese had always upheld the principles of "proletarian internationalism" and made constant efforts to strengthen the unity of the camp headed by the Soviet Union. He remarked that they, at the southern front of the camp, had determinedly "opposed the imperialist policies of aggression" and greatly contributed to "safeguarding peace" in the region. He also spoke of their victories in the "war of resistance to France" and in the 6 years since, which he said had increased the strength of the camp and "strengthened the will of the oppressed peoples to struggle for independence and freedom." But he also observed:

"Our two countries are united in the great family of socialism headed by the Soviet Union. We have closely cooperated and supported one another in the cause of opposing US imperialism, defending Southeast Asian and world peace, and building socialism. Our two countries in the past few years have developed greatly in political, economic, cultural, and scientific and technical cooperation....

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The present international situation is very good. The socialist camp is growing more and more prosperous. The economies of the Soviet Union and all the fraternal countries have developed on a great scale, while the imperialist camp is rent by contradictions and troubles. An increasing number of people and countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have become more and more aware of the decaying nature of imperialism and colonialism, and have risen against them. The struggles of the people in South Korea, Turkey, Japan, Laos, and South Vietnam against US imperialism and its lackeys have dealt heavy blows to the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

"Our socialist countries have persistently followed a foreign policy of peace and stood for peaceful coexistence between countries with differing social systems. The Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the other socialist countries have made continual efforts to achieve this aim.... The Vietnamese people now have the arduous task of building socialism in the North and peacefully unifying the motherland."

However, in his later speech made at the congress, as reported in Peiching Jih-pao of 7 September 1960, Li depicted the Vietnam Workers Party as characterized by "unremitting struggle" and a "great example of struggle to the exploited people in the South." It had made "important contributions to the struggle against the imperialist war policy, for defending Asian and world peace, and for peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, and to the struggle to support national liberation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." China and Vietnam always supported each other he said, in the struggle against "US imperialism," which had "now resorted to more deceptive tactics in spreading a smoke screen of peace to lull the vigilance and numb the fighting will of the people of various countries against imperialism. We staunch Marxist-Leninists will of course not hold any illusions about imperialism." In the "anti-imperialist struggle," he said that it was instructive to recall Lenin's teaching that revisionist thinking was most apt to spread "whenever the bourgeoisie changes its tactics." Then he said:

"In conformity with US imperialist tactics, the Yugoslav modern revisionists are now feverishly depicting imperialism in glowing terms and desperately attacking the Marxist-Leninists. They make great efforts to undermine the unity of the Communists of various countries, and particularly revile and slander those who firmly hold to Marxism-Leninism. This again bears out the Lenin thesis as above, and also the Moscow Declaration's point that modern revisionism remains the principal danger in the international Communist and workers movement.... It is absolutely impermissible to relinquish fundamental theoretical Marxist-Leninist positions on the pretext of opposing dogmatism, or to replace Marxism-Leninism with revisionism. Marxism-Leninism is guiding us with all its brilliance from victory to victory, to final, complete triumph. Its great theories and revolutionary spirit are not outmoded and will never be so."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In his final speech, at a rally "celebrating the success of the congress," reported in the Peiping Kuang-ming Jih-pao, 12 September 1960, Li Fu-ch'un hailed the Vietnam party's "determined struggle for peaceful reunification" of Vietnam, "a patriotic and just struggle" which the Chinese, he said, completely sympathized with and supported. He continued:

"The Chinese and Vietnamese people are brothers living side by side and are close comrades in arms who have always been concerned for and supported one another's struggles for national liberation. Now, too, we support and encourage one another, cooperating closely and advancing shoulder to shoulder in our struggle against our common enemy, US imperialism, in socialist construction, in defending the cause of Asian and world peace, and in supporting the just struggles of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples.... In the defense of world peace and to realize peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, the Chinese people have conducted a determined struggle against the vicious enemy of the world's people, US imperialism. This struggle by the Chinese people has given a telling blow to its policies of aggression and war, so that it is especially hostile to us and attacks us frantically. But we have won the universal sympathy of all oppressed nations and peoples and of the peace-loving peoples of all countries."

In Peiping, Li Fu-ch'un received some high-level backing. Politburo Member Po Yi-po, at a Peiping rally in celebration of North Vietnam's National Day, as reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 2 September 1960, observed that a "storm of struggle by all the peoples of the world is raging and gaining force," and that the "forces of peace, national independence, and socialism are growing stronger each day, as is the influence of the socialist camp." He cited the launching of the second Soviet spaceship and Soviet scientific achievements as again having "stimulated greatly the fighting will of the peoples of various countries to oppose imperialist aggression and defend world peace." He expressed the conviction that if the "world forces for peace and against imperialism" would further unite and conduct sustained struggles, they would "definitely defeat US imperialist war activities and constantly win victories for the defense of peace." He added that China and Vietnam "both love peace, and have consistently followed a peaceful foreign policy and worked tirelessly for realization of peaceful coexistence, relaxation of international tension, and the defense of Asian and world peace." He said: "The stand of China and Vietnam in defending peace in Indochina is staunch and immovable. No force can shake the determination of the peoples of the Indochinese states against foreign intervention and in the defense of national independence."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Premier Chou En-lai, at a North Vietnam embassy reception, contributed the observations, as reported in Chieh-fang Jih-pao, 3 September 1960, that the Vietnam republic "was born, developed, and flourished in the midst of the protracted struggle conducted by the Vietnamese people against imperialism." Its people "had carried out revolution to overthrow long imperialist rule," and through 9 years of resistance "had destroyed the French imperialist dream and safeguarded the revolution's gains."

"As a staunch member of the socialist camp," he said, "it is now vigorously defending peace in Indochina and Asia and making greater efforts for world peace and mankind's progress. It has always maintained a peaceful foreign policy and stood for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems." But he also observed: "The Vietnamese people's struggle for the peaceful reunification of their fatherland is forging ahead. This struggle has become an important component of the stormy struggle of the people of the whole world against US imperialism. The Chinese people have supported, do support, and in the future will continue to support their struggle, and believe that their just demand will be realized. The Chinese people and government, persisting in the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, have always been concerned for peace in Indochina and hope to see this area on China's border become an area of peace."

Chou closed his speech with the observation that the two peoples had always been "comrades in arms and brothers in the great socialist family," and that their mutual cooperation and assistance had promoted the building of socialism domestically and also had furthered the strengthening of the socialist camp. The Chinese people would "stand forever at the side of the Vietnamese" and make still greater efforts to strengthen the unity of the camp and "defend peace and the progress of mankind," he said.

D. Mid-September: National Liberation Struggle

The visit to China of President Sekou Toure of the Republic of Guinea provided the backdrop for the Chinese party to elaborate its case in respect to "struggle by the oppressed peoples" and on the "true nature of imperialism." The new note here was the "change" in the international situation as the Chinese professed to see it, apparently to counter the contention the Soviets had made from the start that it was the changed world realities which justified their position and invalidated some classic Leninist teachings.

Liu Shao-ch'i, Chairman of the People's Republic of China, led off with the following assertion, as reported in Kuang-ming Jih-pao, 11 September 1960: "The vigorous development of the African national independence movement reveals a tremendous change in the contemporary international situation. The swift, sweeping progress of the struggle of the people of the world for peace, democracy, national liberation, and socialism has

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

become the main stream in the world situation." He noted that Toure had devoted himself to the Guinean people's cause of national independence, and led them in "protracted, unremitting struggles against the imperialists' repeated, subversive plots" and in development of the nation's economy, thus helping to "strengthen the unity of the Asian and African peoples, oppose imperialism, and defend peace." Their victory, he said, had inspired other African peoples in struggles against colonialism. Today, African peoples who had achieved independence, he added, were "waging heroic struggles to continue to free themselves of imperialist political and economic control and cultural influence, while others were "stubbornly struggling" to realize national independence.

Liu, as other spokesmen had done, coupled this with a statement which mixed elements of the Chinese and Soviet positions on peace and struggle. "The Chinese people," he said, "have spared no effort to strengthen the unity of the countries of the socialist camp and that of all the peace-loving countries and people of the world, and to fight unwaveringly against US imperialist aggression and in defense of world peace. China has consistently followed a peaceful foreign policy, stood for peaceful coexistence among nations with differing social systems, and made persistent efforts to this end.... We stand for peaceful settlement of international disputes without resorting to force. We always support the Soviet Union's proposals and steps toward disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons, and others aimed at easing international tension. Our peaceful foreign policy is daily winning increasing sympathy and support from the peoples of the world."

Peng Chen, member of the politburo, in a Toure welcoming rally speech reported in Jen-min Jih-pao on 18 September 1960, gave his own reading of the changed situation: "The socialist camp grows mightier by the day. The national democratic movements have undergone a new development. Imperialism, headed by the US and its lackeys, is now encircled and besieged by the peoples of the world. The sympathy and support of the people of the whole world go to the African peoples opposing imperialism and defending and struggling for independence and freedom." Peng warned that "the imperialists are trying to penetrate into Africa to supplant the old colonialists, using so-called economic aid to impose new fetters on the peoples." He added: "Imperialism remains imperialism, and the African peoples have come to see from experience that to win and defend their independence, they must struggle persistently against it and its lackeys.... The Chinese and Guinean peoples, in the common cause of opposing imperialism, safeguarding national independence, and attaining world peace, have always shared whatever came and have provided one another support.... Let us more closely support one another in our struggle against colonialism and imperialism and for peace, and in our construction work."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Jen-min Jih-pao of 10 September 1960 contended that events demonstrated that the existence of a new, independent Guinea had "accelerated the disintegration of the imperialist colonialist system." But the "imperialists" were not "reconciled to their defeat" and would make a "desperate, last struggle," it said, so that the Guinean people saw it their duty to support the struggle of other African peoples. "The Chinese government and people determinedly support the people of Guinea and other African countries in their struggles against imperialism and colonialism and to attain and defend national independence," according to the paper, which added that the visit of Toure would promote "the comradeship-in-arms of the two peoples, formed in their struggle against imperialism and colonialism and for the defense of world peace."

The issue of 14 September 1960 said: "The Asian and African peoples deeply realize from experience that imperialism and colonialism are the enemies of independence and freedom of the people in all countries, as well as of peace in Asia, Africa, and the whole world. Imperialism and colonialism will never change their aggressive and warlike nature.... The leaders of China and Guinea, in their talks, completely agreed that the winning of the world peace depends mainly on the determined struggles of the peoples of all other countries against imperialism and colonialism, and that the present tide of the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to oppose imperialism and colonialism is an indispensable and vitally important force for safeguarding world peace.... Let the imperialist slander all they will; the people of the world realize that the brave struggles against imperialism and colonialism of the Cuban, Congolese, Algerian, and all oppressed peoples of the world for independence and freedom are making greater and greater contributions to the defense of world peace."

In recognizing the establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba, Jen-min Jih-pao of 29 September 1960 said: "Every struggle which the Cuban people wage against US imperialism is inevitably in support of the Chinese people. The deep friendship between the Chinese and Cuban peoples, established on the battleground against US imperialist aggression, will last forever. US imperialism bitterly detests the friendship existing among the peoples of various countries, and fears their unity. It particularly detests the friendship and unity between our two peoples. Since the victory of the Chinese people's revolution, it has been attempting by all possible means to isolate us, but without the slightest success. We have friends all over the world.... Chairman Mao Tse-tung said on 8 May of this year that the people of Cuba, of Latin America, and of the entire world are the friends of the Chinese people, while the imperialists and their running dogs are their common enemy.... Common struggle and common historical destiny have bound us closely together; let us go forward arm in arm in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism and in the defense of peace."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

On the same day, the paper used the occasion of the arrival in China of the premier of the Algerian Provisional Government to develop this theme further. It remarked that the Chinese people had "great sympathy" for the Algerian people's persistence in 6 years of struggle under very adverse conditions against the French colonialists "backed by US imperialism." They could rely, it said, on the continued complete support of the Chinese, as they continued their struggle in the future, for the Chinese people would always stand with the Algerian people. Though the two countries are far apart, the "common struggle against imperialism" linked them closely together, it said. It also observed: "All who have the courage to stand and fight for independence and freedom, to struggle determinedly against imperialism and colonialism, are unconquerable. The brave Algerian and other African peoples will win certain and complete victory. The Algerian people's struggle is not isolated, for it has earned the wide sympathy and support of the African and Asian peoples and those of the whole world.... The Chinese people see the Algerian people's struggle for national liberation as an important support to their own struggle being waged against imperialism."

E. 1 October: National Day

The speeches of Chou En-lai, carried in Jen-min Jih-pao on 1 October 1960, and of Foreign Minister Ch'en Yi, carried in the same paper on 2 October, both made in observance of National Day, were perhaps most noteworthy for their display of the defensiveness and sensitivity which had become a feature of many statements by the Chinese.

Chou, presenting the now familiar formula of Chinese adherence to a foreign policy of "peace and support for peaceful coexistence," cited a number of examples of treaties and negotiations his government had undertaken. These showed, he said, "how sincerely and practically the Chinese people and government have acted, and the concrete efforts they have made for the cause of defending world peace." Ch'en Yi observed how "unwaveringly" the Chinese had "guarded the unity of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union," and how they had striven to "strengthen the mutual help and cooperation" between the two countries toward their common cause; how the Chinese had supported the Soviets' "peace proposals and efforts to relax international tensions."

Chou stated: "We are clearly aware that there exist in the world a handful of people, the imperialists and their followers, who have never held good intentions toward us, who have never stopped cursing and reviling us, and who have always counted on the failure of our cause. But their hopes will not be realized. The more they attack us, the stronger the proof of the justice of our cause and the correctness of the road of the Chinese people. Like other socialist countries, a prosperous, strong, socialist New China is absolutely no threat to anyone and can only benefit the world, and for this reason our cause has the support of all peoples,

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

especially the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Chinese people are profoundly grateful for such world support and will always need it. We will never disappoint other people's expectations and the support they give us. We are determined to proceed victoriously and with still firmer resolve along the road that has been charted and the goal that has been established.... Imperialism and its followers have always tried in vain to damage China's international prestige and to isolate it internationally by the slander that it is warlike and aggressive. This plot will not succeed. The determination of the Chinese people to struggle for peace can weather the test of time, and can never be shaken."

The same theme was followed by Chen Yi. He contrasted "the imperialists, reactionaries, and modern revisionists" with the peoples of the world by attributing to the former a "deep hatred for China's domestic successes, especially the leap forward." Repeating Chou's observation that they had awaited the regime's failure, he asserted: "Contrary to the expectation of the imperialists, reactionaries, and modern revisionists, the Chinese people's cause of socialist revolution and construction has not fallen behind but advanced with great strides, and no power on earth can prevent China from proceeding victoriously to its great goal." He advanced the examples of the Burma and Nepal boundary negotiations and various treaties as "facts which fully demonstrate that the Chinese people, who fervently love peace, can never be harmed by lies or isolated by slander."

Chou stated: "Whether in the past, the present, or the future, the Chinese people always stand with the oppressed nations and peoples, resolutely supporting the peoples...in their just struggles.... They consider the struggles of other peoples to be a powerful support to themselves, as well as an indispensable safeguard to world peace. The Chinese people are determined to strengthen their unity with the peoples of the other socialist countries and with the peoples of the whole world, and to struggle to the end for the victory of our common cause."

The tone of the 1 October 1960 Jen-min Jih-pao editorial on the subject of National Day contrasted considerably with that of the foregoing speeches. Developing the theme of the changed international situation, it held that "the struggle for world peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress" had reached a new high in the current year, the peoples of the world were "seeing imperialism for what it was," and more and more of them were "participating in the movement to prevent it from starting another war and to safeguard peace." The workers movement in the capitalist countries had made progress, it said, while the economic situation in these countries was deteriorating, "with the US facing a new economic crisis." It asserted that the "struggle between the US and other imperialists to gain spheres of influence" was becoming tense throughout the world and "their internal problems and the contradictions among them" were growing.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The development of the international situation over the past year," it said, "has seen the forces of socialism, national liberation, peace, and democracy forge still further ahead of the forces of imperialism, reaction, and war. In other words, with the East wind prevailing further over the West, the situation is very greatly advantageous to the struggle of the world's people for peace, democracy, national liberation, and socialism, and to the construction of their motherland by the Chinese people in a peaceful international environment."

Discussing its own domestic victories, the editorial expressed "warm sympathy and high respect to the people of various countries in the world for their struggle for brightness and prosperity." It observed that the socialist camp, "headed by the Soviet Union," had become "more consolidated and more powerful, the Soviets having achieved greater successes in their all-out construction of Communism, and, in science and technology, having left the US still further behind." In the "fraternal" countries, it said, construction had advanced with vigor, and "the socialist countries have earned wide support from all peoples for their foreign policy of peace, and their world standing and influence have risen continuously; pursuing their great common ideal of Communism, and opposing their common enemy, friendly relations between them will endure forever and no force can undermine their unity." The Chinese, it said, had consistently conducted "dauntless struggles for the cause of peace," and had supported the Soviets' "peace proposals and efforts for disarmament and relaxation of tension." To this it added:

"The Chinese people warmly support the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples' struggles to attain and safeguard national independence, and regard these struggles as a powerful support to themselves. They have always made great efforts toward the establishment and development of peaceful coexistence with all foreign countries, and for the broadening of the area of peace in Asia."

The editorial closed with the now customary note of sensitivity: "US imperialism's plots to isolate New China by using shameful tactics will never succeed. The Chinese people believe that if the people throughout the world will continue to take full advantage of the present profound situation...they can defeat the policy of aggression and war of the imperialist clique headed by the US and realize the great goal of defending world peace.... The Chinese people will struggle to defeat the aggressive war forces headed by US imperialism and to defend world peace, in company with the peoples of the whole world."

Hung-ch'i of 1 October 1960 used the celebration of National Day and the simultaneous publication of the fourth volume of the selected works of Mao to review the Chinese position in the dispute and to give the credit for the "correctness" of the whole span of Chinese views to Mao Tse-tung

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

himself. The concentration in the editorial, however, was specifically on the "correct, revolutionary approach to dealing with imperialism," as centered on Mao's concept of slighting the enemy strategically (seeing him as a "paper tiger"), but of taking him seriously and making careful efforts to defeat him tactically. The editorial boasted:

"The victory of the Chinese revolution is a great, historically significant world event, after the victory of the Russian October Revolution and the victory of the international antifascist war. It has penetrated the imperialist front in the East and has struck a death blow to the imperialist colonial system. It has greatly strengthened the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, further altered the appearance of the world, and greatly inspired the people of the whole world who are struggling for liberation from imperialist and reactionary oppression. Its victory is a victory of Marxism-Leninism, a victory of Mao Tse-tung's thinking. His theoretical guidance played the very great, decisive role in the victorious, protracted revolutionary struggles of the Chinese people against enemies internal and foreign."

Continuing on the theme of revolution, the editorial commented that in the revolutionary civil war, the Chinese people had "displayed to the full their revolutionary spirit and had formed an invincible force, under the guidance of Comrade Mao's theory." It further observed that where the "Chinese party and people desired to transform the country into a New China led by the proletariat and belonging to the masses," the question "whether our party should follow the revolutionary line and determinedly lead the people of the country to overthrow the reactionaries, or should take an opportunistic line, abandon the gains of the people's victory, and compromise with and surrender to imperialism and its lackeys" became a vital issue affecting the nation's destiny.

Mao, it said, had pointed out long ago that the "imperialist camp headed by the US was opposing all the democratic forces headed by the Soviet Union and preparing for a distant third world war to defeat these forces, a plot which the democratic forces must and definitely can defeat." It quoted him as saying: "The anti-imperialist camp of the world is more powerful than the imperialists; it is we who are superior, not the enemy.... All attitudes which overestimate their strength and underestimate the strength of the people are incorrect. With strenuous effort, we, in company with all the world's democratic forces, can definitely defeat the imperialists' scheme of enslavement, prevent a third world war, destroy all reactionary rule, and win a lasting peace for mankind."

The editorial asserted that Mao's concept of strategically slighting the enemy but of tactically taking him seriously was the result of historical experience in revolution. "It demonstrates," it said, "endless devotion to the cause of proletarian revolution, and absolute courage, determination,

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

and confidence in winning revolutionary victory, and it displays Marxist-Leninist wisdom and skill in conducting struggle against the enemy and gaining step-by-step victory. The history of the Chinese revolution proves that the revolutionary line based on this concept has strengthened the revolutionary forces and led them out of defeat to victory, and from local to national victories, in contrast with the results of opportunistic lines." It observed that "there are some" who, taking a metaphysical world outlook, think that to follow the concept of taking the enemy lightly strategically is to take an adventurist viewpoint, while to take him seriously in tactics is to overestimate his strength and underestimate one's own. Such people do not understand the "dual nature of imperialism," nor do they understand Marxist dialectics, it said.

"This law," the editorial asserted, "has been proved by the past revolutionary experience of the Chinese revolution, and it will continue to be proved in the victorious development of the world revolution of the people in the future.... The people of our country, together with those of the great Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and the people of the whole world, are struggling against imperialism and colonialism, against modern revisionism, for the defense of world peace and for national independence, democratic freedom, and the victory of the socialist cause." To this end, it held, Mao's aforesaid fundamental strategic-tactical concept must be applied.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

II. NORTH VIETNAM

Need for Peaceful Coexistence Stressed

A survey of several North Vietnam papers and periodicals made from 17 August through 8 September 1960 seems to indicate that on the surface, at least, the Sino-Soviet controversy has abated to some extent.

Since the 15th anniversary of the founding of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam occurred on 2 September 1960, almost all press space during the period of this survey was given to some phase of this anniversary, and from 2 through 8 September, Nhan Dan, the official organ of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party, carried full texts of the speeches made by heads of delegations from the Soviet Union, China, and many other socialist countries.

The fact that the paper printed the text of these speeches indicates that the regime in North Vietnam may have finally decided to acknowledge the Sino-Soviet conflict. Heretofore, when dealing with speeches made by various Soviet or Chinese leaders, Nhan Dan usually excerpted or summarized them and in this way managed to omit any statements prejudicial to either side. The statements made on this occasion by the foreign delegates (including the Chinese) and the North Vietnamese leaders all stress the theme of unity and peaceful coexistence, vigilance against "imperialist aggression," and the leadership of the Soviet Union.

These points were all emphasized by Premier and Politburo member Pham Van Dong, when, according to the 2 September issue of Nhan Dan, he said: "The nature of imperialism, particularly US imperialism, is aggression and warmongering. However, the balance of forces in the world has now changed in favor of socialism, national independence, and world peace. Today the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are successfully building communism and socialism and have become an invincible force. Along with peace-loving people all over the world, they are able to prevent war, check the blood-stained hands of the imperialists, preserve peace, and save mankind from a new world war, a nuclear war.

"At present, the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence of the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc, and the Soviet proposal for complete and general disarmament, fully meet the interests and aspirations of people the world over....

"The imperialists, with the US imperialists at their head, are cruel and treacherous, but the Vietnamese and the people of the world are constantly heightening their vigilance, deepening their hatred for the imperialists, and exerting ever more vigorous efforts to defeat them. Final victory will certainly belong to the people. It is clear that

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

the present era is not an era in which the imperialist countries can freely rule the roost in the world.... It is an era 'when socialism is on the upgrade and imperialism is on the decline.' It is the era 'when the forces of peace have grown so that there is a real possibility of averting war.'"

Exactly the same points were made in a more succinct manner by Zenon Nowak, Alexander Dubcek, Ferenc Nezsval, Nicolae Glosan, Dimitr Dimov, Baqir Balluku, Mrs Pak Chong-ae, and Damdin, respective heads of the party and government delegations from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, North Korea, and Mongolia.

The only person who made any overt reference to the Sino-Soviet dispute was Baqir Balluku, head of the Albanian delegation. Unlike other delegates, who did not mention China at all, he devoted a large part of his speech, which appeared in Nhan Dan on 2 September, to the "diabolical aims" of the US against China in occupying Taiwan and in preventing China's entry into the UN. Unlike the other delegates, who gave great praise to the USSR for its achievements in all fields and for its "unstinting efforts for peace," Balluku mentioned the Soviet Union only twice and then apparently in a routine manner. Once he stated that "the imperialists will never succeed in their wily schemes because there now exist the glorious and unrivaled Soviet Union and the glorious People's China...."

His other mention of the USSR was in his closing remarks, when he said: "All together we will safeguard the unshakable unity of the socialist bloc, which is headed by the Soviet Union...."

III. INDONESIA

PKI Pursuing Middle Road

A survey of Harian Rakjat from 3 August 1960, when the Indonesian Army lifted its ban on that paper, to 15 September 1960, when the ban was again imposed, seems to indicate that the moderate middle-of-the-road group which has controlled the party since 1951 is still concerned with defending its position against attacks from both right and left. As indicated in previous issues of Communist Revisionism and Dissidence, the PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) has long been plagued by the danger of revisionism inherent in its policy of collaboration with the national bourgeoisie in a united front. At the other extreme, double encouragement emanating from developments on both the domestic political and international Communist scene has been given in recent months to a faction desiring to pursue a more vigorous line both toward the Indonesian government and in interpreting Marxist-Leninist dogma.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Because of the conjunction of certain Indonesian internal political developments and the growing ideological disagreement between the Soviet Union and China, it is not clear whether at this particular time either of these presumed dissident factions is motivated primarily by theoretical or by pragmatic political considerations. Furthermore, statements of position by these factions are entirely lacking in the period under consideration. However, one can infer from the most insistent arguments in the articles of the moderates within the party the main points on which they are being attacked. In addition, the amount of coverage given in the daily Communist press to statements by leaders of either the Soviet Union or China which might tend to support the position of one or the other of the factions can also be viewed as an indication that the party may be leaning to one side or the other.

To start with an examination of this latter possible key to the situation, no significant Soviet article which might have acted as a counterweight to Chinese arguments was published in Harian Rakjat during the period covered. In contrast, there was a certain amount of republication of Chinese statements. This was concentrated at the beginning of August 1960 and led off with HNA dispatch on Chou En-lai's proposal of a Pacific Peace Pact and denial of Chinese abandonment of a peaceful coexistence policy in the 3 August 1960 Harian Rakjat. The same issue contained an NCNA report on a speech by General Lo Jui-ching on the anniversary of the People's Liberation Army. The general supported peaceful coexistence in his remarks, but also noted that if "the imperialists" were to launch an aggressive war, they would "be sure to suffer total defeat."

The 4 August 1960 Harian Rakjat carried a report on Chen Yi's speech at a reception for military attaches on the same occasion in which he noted the similarity between the Chinese struggle and the present one of the African nations and attributed China's success in this struggle to the People's Liberation Army. On 6 August 1960, Harian Rakjat summarized at length Lu Ting-i's speech to China's Third National Congress of Writers and Artists and included the full text of three paragraphs which, in an attack on "modern revisionists" (identified with Tito), neatly summed up the main Chinese positions in their ideological dispute with the Soviet Union. The article also summarized a speech to the same congress by Chou Yang, which included criticism of revisionists.

At this point, however, coverage of Chinese materials pertinent to such controversial questions ceased abruptly until 12 September, when there was a brief report on Liu Shao-chi's speech to a banquet honoring the President of Guinea. This item noted that Liu called for heightened vigilance against "imperialist intrigues" in the Congo and elsewhere, but did not develop the subject. This cessation of coverage of the Chinese position is of particular interest since it came at a point when the Chinese themselves were issuing major statements in their rebuttal of Soviet criticism.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

During this period, there was no direct discussion in the Indonesian press of peaceful coexistence per se. However, the generally mild tone of the speech made by the chairman of the Indonesian delegation to the anti-A and H bomb conference in Tokyo, the main theme of which was that the struggle for peace cannot be separated from the struggle for national independence, contrasted with the greater militance of the speech by the general chairman of the Japanese Anti-A and H Bomb Council. Both these speeches were reported on in the 5th August 1960 Harian Rakjat. Similarly, in a long article which appeared in the 10 August 1960 issue of the paper, Kartinah Kurdi developed the theme that women are lovers of world peace by stressing the horrors of atomic warfare and thereby indirectly implied that another war would be unthinkable.

The main concern of the Indonesian Communists at this time, however, was a continuing examination of the nature of their own revolution. To this end, a 3 to 30 August series of articles marking the 15th anniversary of the 1945 revolution, which occurred on 17 August, was used as a vehicle for justifying the position and interpretations of the moderate faction within the party and may have been intended to counter possible dissidence. The general pattern which can be discerned in these articles does not differ from that well established over the years in PKI material. However, there are certain focal points around which the main arguments revolve, and a consideration of these highlights the principle areas in which the established party line may be being challenged for both practical and theoretical reasons.

The most basic of these problems is the question of the present stage of the Indonesian revolution and its ultimate goal. In a 10 August 1960 article, Umar, who is not further identified, spelled out the "orthodox" position by asserting that the August Revolution could only be a national democratic revolution or a "bourgeois democratic revolution of the new type." He said that "it does not yet have the form of a socialist revolution." But neither is it a revolution which leads to capitalism. In short, as explained by D. N. Aidit, "the perspectives of the Indonesian revolution are socialism and Communism."

On 20 August 1960, A. Anwar Sanusi, a member of the Central Committee, published a further definition of the PKI's view of the stages of revolution. He distinguishes between the national democratic stage, whose task is to abolish "imperialism" and the remnants of feudalism completely and create a transitional society between capitalism and socialism, and the socialist stage, in which "all forms of exploitation will be ended." Here he is careful to specify that exploitation by indigenous private entrepreneurs is included in that to be ended and that the end of individual ownership of the means of production will mean the end of individual ownership of land. Sanusi repeats the assertion which has appeared so frequently in recent PKI literature that there is no "Chinese wall" between the two stages of revolution, but also notes

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

that socialism is the "inevitable future" of every national democratic revolution. The important thing is "to know the limits of this revolution" and thus to avoid "stage-jumping" which would endanger it. For example, he says, nationalization of all land at the present stage would be premature, for it would make a real national front impossible by alienating the peasants. On the other hand, an interpretation which would permit the continued ownership of large industries by "imperialist" capital and would even allow for new foreign capital investment in Indonesia would be rightist.

Sanusi makes these points in an appeal for correct understanding of the 1945 Constitution, for "there is a danger that the 1945 Constitution may be interpreted as a socialist constitution and so give rise to a leftist and sectarian line. There is also a danger that it may be interpreted in a rightist and even in a counterrevolutionary way." He indicates clearly that impatience exists in regard to the slow progress of the revolution by almost apologizing for the fact that the socialist stage has not yet arrived, despite the passage of 15 years since the August Revolution. He also seems worried about the wide use of the term "socialism" in Indonesia at present and the possible misunderstandings which may arise from this practice.

A similar concern was evidenced in an article contributed by Thaher Thajeb, a member of the Central Auditing Commission, on 9 August, which insists that the only successful socialism is that of Marxism-Leninism, thereby implying the appeal of a less orthodox socialism.

The idea that orthodoxy is essential is also inherent in the second theme which runs through these articles. It is first stated by Umar when he argues that victory can be achieved only if the people support the one political party armed with Marxist-Leninist theory and therefore able to provide correct leadership for their struggle. Later in the article, he states the problem even more clearly when he insists that the "historic task of leadership of the revolution and the united front can be borne by no other class than the proletariat." Umar cites the failure of the proletariat itself and of the peasants in Indonesia to understand this as a major weakness, particularly in the development of antifeudal peasant movements. Given this need for proletarian leadership of the revolution, the party of the proletariat "must preserve its political and organizational independence and ideological purity" in the united front. Hence the current PKI slogan "unite and struggle."

In discussing this, Umar quotes a passage from Aidit's report to the fourth plenary session of the PKI central committee in 1956 calling for constructive criticism of the democratic groups allied with the party in the united front. Umar applies this policy by inference to the 8 July 1960 poliburo criticism of certain policies and members of the cabinet, arguing that such criticism will save rather than destroy the united front.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Aidit himself discusses this problem in an article marking the anniversary of the August Revolution which appeared in the 17 August 1960 Harian Rakjat. He reaffirms the PKI position that the united front must comprise the "wavering middle forces" as well as the progressives, but that it must rely primarily on the latter as "it is impossible to rely on the wavering forces. He bolsters his argument with a quotation from Lenin, "it is only the proletariat which can be a real fighter for democracy," and warns that the proletariat must be joined in this struggle by the peasants if the bourgeoisie is not to take over the democratic revolution and distort it. The same refrain appears elsewhere in this issue of Harian Rakjat, in an article by the foreign editor which warns that the leadership of the revolution must not be surrendered to nonrevolutionaries.

Another aspect to this question of who is to participate in the revolution is indicated by Umar's statement that efforts at cooperation in the united front will fail if any cooperative bodies which are formed are not based on the alliance of proletariat and peasants and if they do not generate revolutionary actions by the broad masses. The purpose of such revolutionary action is, of course, to move the government to action in its turn. A suggestion that the Indonesian government has perhaps been less responsive than the PKI may have wished is made by M. T. Peleng, candidate member of the Central Committee, on 13 August, when he condemns certain unnamed "leaders" who heed only their own interests and warns that the people can distinguish between true and false leaders.

Aidit takes this idea and ostensibly basing his argument on a statement made by Sukarno on National Veterans Day, 10 August 1960, that "the Indonesian revolution must proceed from above and from below; a revolution from above is not a revolution because the masses do not participate and that which is only from below is a rebellion," he shifts the emphasis slightly in his August Revolution anniversary article to warn that "it is only possible to prevent a revolutionary rebellion if the revolution also proceeds from above." If it does not, "a revolutionary rebellion is a necessity." Aidit elaborated further on this concept in a 19 August speech which was published in the 22 August Harian Rakjat. He demanded a revolutionary "retooling" of the government apparatus to ensure proper governmental response to the thoughts and feelings of the people, defining the revolutionary process as "measures from above and pressures from below."

The final point emphasized in this series, as well as in most PKI writings, deals with the target of the revolution. This remains "imperialism and feudalism," although in these particular articles "imperialism" is given more attention. Thaher Thajeb insists that Indonesia must not compromise with or waver in its attitude towards "imperialism." Such compromise is blamed by M. T. Peleng for all of Indonesia's current problems. Furthermore, he warns that "the influence of imperialism in Indonesia is still extensive and feudalism runs rampant. The reformists

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

still betray the revolution; liberalism and bureaucracy still flourish in all fields, including the political, economic, and that of democratic rights." In the view of the PKI, the "treachery" of the reformists at home is equaled by that of the revisionists on the international scene. Although they are not mentioned specifically in this series, Umar, in his article, cites as one of the lessons drawn from the experience of the August Revolution the fact that cooperation with other nations struggling for national independence and consequent opposition to "every form of bourgeois chauvinism" are necessary. Furthermore, the Harian Rakjat foreign editor insists that there must be no compromise with the "imperialists" and that if there is firm unity against them, they will back down both domestically and internationally as they are only "paper tigers."

In sum, during the period reviewed, the PKI has made no new departures in either theory or practice but has simply further clarified its already known positions. Its overriding concern still seems to be to defend a policy falling somewhere between that of the reformists, who would allow the revolution to be captured by the bourgeois liberals, and that of the "stage-jumpers," who would move on to a socialist revolution without bourgeois allies. It might be possible to draw an analogy between the position in which this middle-of-the-road faction finds itself within the PKI and that of the Soviet party within the international Communist movement. Assuming the validity of such a comparison, a continuing ambivalence in PKI policy is to be expected, for the party's dominant faction will be forced to modulate the tone of its pronouncements depending on the audience which it is addressing, just as the Soviets pursue a not always well-demarcated line between revisionists and leftist deviationists.

IV. OUTER MONGOLIA

Activities of Mongolian-Chinese Friendship Association

An editorial in Unen on 21 September 1960, "Ten Days of Friendship Among Neighboring States," dealt with the activities of the Mongolian-Chinese Friendship Association. A summarized translation in Chinese appeared in Jen-min Jih-pao of 22 September 1960. The following is a translation of the Mongolian text. The portion of the text in parentheses is not included in the Chinese translation.

"Ten days of Mongolian-Chinese friendship activities begin today throughout Mongolia. The occasion is a suitable one for further developing friendly relations between the two countries. (Six hundred and fifty million) Chinese people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, have transformed the appearance of their native land and

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

have attained great success within a short period of time in the field of socialist construction. The Chinese people have successfully accomplished the socialist industrialization of their country, and are now engaged in carrying out a revolution in cultural and technical matters. The form of collective property in the field of economics has been completely successful. (A mere glance at last year reveals the fact that the over-all production of the Chinese people in industry and agriculture increased 31 percent over 1958. In 1959, the Chinese people produced 13 million tons of steel, 347 million tons of coal, 41 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, and 540 billion chin of grain.) The heroic Chinese people have been extremely successful in the work of peaceful construction. (They have also contributed continuously their share in the great competitive struggle between socialist and capitalist economic system. By so doing, they have demonstrated that they are continuing to increase the power of the socialist camp under the leadership of the Soviet Union.

"The influence of the great October Socialist Revolution was immediately felt by both the Mongols and the Chinese. The victorious Mongolian revolution of 1921, followed by the victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949, opened up a new period in the friendly relations between the people of Mongolia and China, whose past had witnessed long-standing ties of friendship as neighbors. This great friendship between the two countries was demonstrated in 1952 by the agreement on mutual economic and cultural cooperation, with the result that all features supporting proletarian internationalism were further developed and greatly strengthened.

"The aid provided by the Chinese people to the Mongolian people has been very extensive. (By means of a grant of 160 million rubles and a long-term loan of 100 million rubles, the People's Republic of China has caused the following to appear in town and country throughout Mongolia: in Suhe Baatar City have been erected the electric power plant, a model building, the plywood industrial complex, and a paper factory; and in Ulan Bator, a textile factory, highway bridges, the Orhon irrigation system, and additional fine buildings. In this manner, the Chinese workers and industrious technicians have contributed much energy in the construction of socialism in Outer Mongolia. Moreover, the Mongols are learning a great deal from the rich experience of the Chinese.)

"A few months ago, Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, arrived in Outer Mongolia on a friendly visit. He signed the 'Mongolian People's Republic and the People's Republic of China Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Aid,' 'The Agreement on Economic and Technical Aid to the Mongolian People's Republic on the Part of the People's Republic of China,' and the 'Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation Between the Mongolian People's Republic and the People's Republic of China.' This event has created a new period of friendship

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

and cooperation for the people of Mongolia and China. These treaties and agreements have not only greatly expanded the friendship and cooperation of our two countries, but are also highly significant for strengthening the solidarity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and for strengthening peace and security among nations.

"(According to the agreements drawn up at the time of Premier Chou En-lai's friendly visit to our country, the People's Republic of China is to provide a loan of 200 million rubles and to take part in the following large-scale enterprises: metallurgical works capable of producing 100,000 tons of steel a year; a cotton textile factory capable of producing 30 million meters of cloth a year; glass production; a sugar plant; apartment houses covering an area of 220,000 square meters of land; and a new culture building.)

"(In the problem of carrying out successfully the Third Five-Year Plan, which will develop both the national economy and culture of the Mongolian People's Republic during 1961-1965, the large amount of generous aid offered by the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China helps to speed up the material and technical basis of socialism in Outer Mongolia. Instructors from these countries are also applying their energy to meet the educational needs of our country.)

"The many millions of Chinese people are completing the work of the Second Five-Year Plan 3 years ahead of schedule. The great lessons available from the rich experience of the millions of hard-working Chinese, who have attained tremendous success in a shorter period of time than ever observed previously in world history, are of great value to the Mongolian people in their struggle to build socialism. (The opportunity has now arrived for mutual study of the work accomplished by our industrious Chinese comrades during the 10 days of activity inaugurated by the Mongolian-Chinese Friendship Association. During the 10-day period, aside from extensive training of our people with regard to the phenomenal success of the People's Republic of China in the fields of economics and culture, evenings will be spent exchanging experience with Chinese technicians and workers. With regard to their special experience in innovations, the subject matter will be broadcast by radio on a large-scale to explain it in great detail. By discovering new ways and means, as well as their over-all results, additional material is made available for both our party and our public institutions.)

"The 10 days of Mongolian-Chinese friendship activities will add significant stimulus to the development of Mongolian-Chinese friendly relations and will strengthen the confidence and determination of our people in their great struggle to construct socialism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Press Reprints Coexistence Portion of "Pravda" Article

An article in Unen on 30 August 1960, "Problems of War and Peace Under Present Conditions," is a summarized translation of an article by Yu. Frantsev published in Pravda of 7 August 1960. The following is the section of the article called "The General Line of Our Foreign Policy." The Mongolian translation of this section from Russian was complete.

"Leninism arises from the fact that in the final analysis, the problem of the victory of a new social system is decided in the all-important sphere of the activity of man and in the field of production. Lenin wrote, 'The productivity of labor, in the end, is the most important factor contributing to the victory of a new social system.' This is one of the basic precepts of Leninism, defining the process of transition from capitalism to socialism. Socialism displays its gigantic resources in the field of creative labor productivity. Throughout the period of the civil war, Lenin recognized clearly this major task of the new society. At the height of the embittered battles against the followers of Denikin, he examined closely the question of the interrelationship with capitalist countries which were outstanding in technical and economic fields 'during that period when socialist and capitalist states exist side by side.' Lenin advanced and established the principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems.

"With regard to relations between socialist and capitalist countries in the present historical period, the principle of peaceful coexistence as advanced by Lenin is the only true as well as indispensable route. The policy of peaceful coexistence serves the interests of the working class. It serves the interests of all working people as well as Communism itself. Today, while fighting against the Cold War policy, we are winning over to our side broad sections of the public in capitalist countries, further isolating the aggressive tactics of monopoly capitalists, both in the world arena and within capitalist countries. This promotes the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism.

"The struggle for peace and for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist camp. The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries receives the support and approval of all nations. A clear manifestation of this policy is exemplified by the Soviet proposals concerning general and complete disarmament, the realization of which would deliver humanity from the fear of a new war.

"New and extremely favorable conditions have arisen now in the struggle for Communism, compared with the time when the working class first assumed power in our country. At that time, the 'charm of bourgeois civilization' was quite apparent. However, along with the advance toward

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Communism in our country, the 'charm of bourgeois civilization' diminished at about the same rate as the attraction for the bourgeois ideas of workers in capitalist countries. However, at present, the Soviet Union is in a position to demonstrate the material and spiritual wealth which the Soviet citizen receives as the result of the creation of the socialist system.

"The imperialists have long fought against this historical perspective. They have openly endeavored to destroy the peaceful competition of socialism with capitalism by means of war. Hence, by utilizing Cold War methods, they have been trying, as Khrushchev has said, 'to force the socialist countries to squander their material resources on unproductive goals.' Along with the armaments race, they have been attempting to stop the development of science and culture in socialist countries so that their internal destruction would discredit the socialist system. These plans of the imperialists have resulted in failure. The time is not distant when the socialist camp will overtake and surpass the capitalist countries in per-capita production. The Soviet Union will have the highest standard of living for the workers and the shortest workday, and the people will no longer be required to pay taxes.

"Socialism is gaining great victories in peaceful competition with capitalism. During the last 6 years, our industrial output has increased 90 percent, whereas that of the US increased only 15 percent. On the whole, industrial production in socialist countries has increased 600 percent over the prewar period. On the other hand, industrial goods in capitalist countries approximately tripled during the same period.

"Socialist society is organized for production of means of production and means of consumption instead of production of means of destruction. The imperialists have set up the Cold War to avoid open and direct warfare with the socialist camp. This has contributed to the increasing power of the latter. At present, the Soviet Union and the world socialist camp are in a position to liquidate the Cold War.

"Time and again the imperialists have concocted wild stories about the 'aggressiveness of Communism.' Their calculations were aimed at terrifying the people in bourgeois countries. However, as the result of the consistent peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and of our party, the imperialists have demonstrated their true nature as aggressors. Their 'peace-loving' mask has been torn off. All people blessed with common sense are able to see that the Communists, the Soviet Union, and all socialist countries are unyielding in their fight for peace, and that Communism embraces the ideology and policy of creation which is responsible for the peaceful and constructive work of the masses."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 2. EASTERN EUROPE

Deviations from the Soviet line on peaceful coexistence are denounced in East Germany and Hungary and openly espoused in Yugoslavia, where a Soviet attack on Kardelj's book on socialism and war is answered. In both East Germany and Hungary, there are rejections of ideological coexistence in the sphere of the social superstructure, the specific targets being attempts to water down Marxist doctrine on the class struggle and class-political structure. However, the East German press contains a "revision" of the Soviet position in the form of a statement which categorically rejects peaceful coexistence with West Germany. Czechoslovak and Rumanian studies denounce revisionist manifestations in the economic base. A Czechoslovak report on the 1959 Party Historians Conference emphasizes the "falsity of revisionist hopes" for a "second industrial revolution" in the West which would bring about changes in production relations in the direction of socialism. In Rumania, the leading economic monthly pointed to the "absurdity" of revisionist attempts to identify capitalist nationalization with socialization of the means of production by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The problem of existentialism occupies the attention of publications in Hungary and Poland. In both cases, the primary complaint is against the prediction contained in Sartre's latest book of the eventual acceptance of existentialism by Marxism. The Hungarian press also provides the added feature of linking Agnes Heller's views on individual freedom with existentialism. Concerning sociological research, the East German press publishes a denunciation of the revisionist tendency to evolve an independent Marxist sociology separate from historical materialism. This form of revisionism apparently holds an appeal for a Yugoslav sociologist who bases his critique of Soviet sociology on its "doctrinaire 'explanation' and guidance of social processes."

I. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Fifth Bucharest Conference of Communist Historians Reported by Party Almanac

In 1957 the KSC (Communist Party of Czechoslovakia) began irregular publication of an "almanac of scientific works" entitled Prispevky k dejinam KSC (Contributions to the History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia). In the preface to the first issue of the almanac, which was published in 1957, the editors stated that the new publication will contain "scientific articles, smaller monographic works, and documents unpublished to date which deal with the workers movement and the history of the KSC.... The task of the publications will be to familiarize the reader

with results of our historical science, attempting to overcome the shortcomings and mistakes of the past, and to ideologically and politically arm the broad cadres of political workers not only for the struggle against unfriendly ideologies, but also for the solution of the new tasks arising from the construction of socialism in our country...."

Ten issues of the Almanac had been published by January 1960. The following excerpts of the proceedings of the Fifth Bucharest Conference of Communist Historians, held 25 August -- 2 September 1959, are from an account of this conference by Miroslav Boucek which appeared in the No 10, January 1960, issue of Prispevky k dejinam KSC. (A full translation of this article appeared in Joint Publications Research Service Report No 6007, 26 September 1960.)

"The Bucharest Conference of Historians of the Communist Parties was held from 25 August to 2 September 1959. This was the longest conference to date and the most comprehensive as far as delegate participation was concerned. Representatives of 14 fraternal parties attended the Third Prague Conference in 1957 and representatives of 20 countries attended the Fourth Berlin Conference in 1958. The Fifth Bucharest Conference was attended by 63 delegates who represented as many as 25 Communist and workers parties. The conference was attended by representatives of institutes, institutions, and commissions for the history of the Communist Party of the following countries: Soviet Union, People's Republic of China, Austria, Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Great Britain, Hungary, Vietnam, German Democratic Republic, German Federal Republic, Denmark, India, Indonesia, Italy, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, France, Czechoslovakia, Chile, Sweden, and representatives of the periodical Problems of Peace and Socialism. This growing number of countries participating in conferences of party historians shows the continuously expanding cooperation and close mutual contacts of party historians in individual countries. This also increases the responsibility which individual historians must assume in their work, because their work literally becomes a part of the over-all tasks of Marxist historiography.

"The conference dealt with two principal questions. First, the question of the Communist and workers parties' struggle for the unity of the working class and, second, the tasks of historical science in the struggle against contemporary revisionism. Introductory reports were presented on both principal points on the agenda, followed by a discussion in which 36 conference participants took part.

"Comrade G. Vasilichi, director of the Institute of History of the Rumanian Workers Party, presented a report on the struggle of Communist and workers parties for the unity of the working class. The principal report (to which the report by Comrade E. Sereni, head of the Italian delegation, was closely related) contained three parts. The first part dealt with the theoretical foundations of the fight for the unity of the

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

working class, which is a requirement if the working class is to gain political power. The second part contained a survey of the successful struggle for working class unity in the People's Democracies, and inserted an attempt to draw generalizations from this struggle. The third part dealt with the problems of the struggle for the unity of the working class in capitalist countries after World War II.

"The entire discussion was concentrated on those questions. The following persons took part in the discussion: V. Joannes (France), F. Knittel (German Democratic Republic), S. Madchi (Albania), Le Manh Trinh (Vietnam), E. Sereni (Italy), Kim Ghen In (North Korea), A. Buchmann (German Federal Republic), L. Dugersuren (Mongolia), M. Boucek (Czechoslovakia), A. Aizmer (Poland), S. Balint (Hungary), J. Rosner (Austria), I. Bakri (Indonesia), E. Nekocha (Chile), J. Jacobs (England), W. Sidney (Canada), K. Vasiliev (Bulgaria), and S. Dange (India).

"It has been demonstrated convincingly that to achieve working class unity through struggle is a historical necessity resulting from capitalist production methods and from the position of the working class in the capitalist society. The laws of class struggle in capitalist society create tendencies toward working class unity. In the beginning, they unite in an elementary and unorganized fashion to defend their immediate economic interests; only when revolutionary worker parties are established and strengthened does the struggle for real political unity of the working class become the real thing.

"Theoretical conclusions and generalizations, based on many years of experience of the Communist parties, were the starting points of almost all contributions to the discussion. However, it appeared that theoretical generalizations of experiences lagged behind, especially after the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. The delay in generalizations was particularly apparent with regard to experiences gained by the Communist and workers parties in their struggle for working class unity during World War II and in the postwar era. The Declaration of Communist and Workers Parties, approved in Moscow in 1957, generalized these experiences in the most elementary fashion, but historians still must work out the new conclusions and experiences which the international Communist movement has gained in the last 20 years.

"The introductory report to the second point on the agenda, the tasks of historical science in the struggle against contemporary revisionism, was presented by N. I. Shatagin, Doctor of Historical Sciences and head of the Soviet delegation. The following comrades took part in the discussion: K. Endre (Hungary), Le Manh Trinh (North Vietnam), T. Danishevski (Poland), P. Reiman (Czechoslovakia), S. Manushi (Albania), T. Ch'un-fan (People's Republic of China), L. Einicke (German Federal Republic), L. Michelsen (Belgium), Tjoo Tikt Tjoen (Indonesia), S. Avirmid (Mongolia), P. Georgiev

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

(Bulgaria), I. Norlune (Denmark), J. Rosner (Austria), N. Goldberger (Rumania), N. P. Donia (USSR), J. Chambraz (France), L. Gruppi (Italy), and J. Jacobs (England).

"The report and discussion were based primarily on the Declaration of Communist and Workers Parties. The declaration pointed out that revisionism is the greatest danger at present because it is a direct manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the labor movement. The greatest majority of the Communist parties concentrated attention in their ideological work on the struggle against revisionism. The substance of revisionism was unmasked successfully and destroyed ideologically; and where the revisionists attempted to take over the party, they were successfully smashed, also from the organization viewpoint.

"Institutes and commissions for the history of Communist parties joined actively in this foremost task of the Communist parties. A series of publications were issued to combat revisionism. Three Leninist almanacs against revisionism were published in the Soviet Union, and almanacs of historical articles about the struggle against revisionism were published in almost every country. The works of classic writers were of enormous importance in this struggle. Among these, the complete works of V. I. Lenin were published in many countries. A new textbook of the CPSU and a six-volume history of the CPSU, which is being prepared for publication, will be a big help in unmasking falsifiers and revisionists who are attempting to discredit the glorious road of the CPSU.

"However, it appears that while we paid greater attention to problems of the history of the Communist Party, particularly in the last years, we did not pay enough attention to the history of the international workers and Communist movement. Therefore, the foremost task for the coming years will be to prepare a historical outline of the international Communist movement. The Institute of Marxism-Leninism attached to the Central Committee CPSU, in cooperation with other scientific institutes in the USSR, is preparing for publication a two-volume history and a two-volume almanac of documents of the Communist International; a three-volume history of the worker and national-liberation movement in the 19th and 20th centuries; a two-volume history of the European workers movement after World War II; a two-volume historical survey of the workers movement in the Far East; and a two-volume history of the Second International. Through a common effort, all the institutes of history are to prepare a popular textbook on the international workers and Communist movement and an almanac of articles on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the First International. The Bucharest Conference has directed all the institutes and commissions for the history of the Communist parties to proceed in this direction, to pay greater attention to questions of the international workers and Communist movement and to questions of most recent history.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The report and the discussions concerning the second point concerned three problems which were subjected to concentrated attacks by the revisionists. First, they covered the role of the Communist parties in the contemporary workers movement. The attacks of revisionists in this direction are well known. They deny that there is any need for the existence of Communist parties. Their attacks against democratic centralism are equally dangerous. This attack is deliberately concealed, but its basic aim is to liquidate the Communist parties, because to violate the basic organizational principle of establishing Marxist-Leninist parties means to convert the Communist Party into a professional association, as it is so much advocated by the revisionists.

"That is why the 21st Congress of the CPSU and the congresses of all the other Communist parties attributed so much importance to questions concerning the party's role. This provides an urgent task for the historians: to show ever more penetratingly the real role of the Communist Party in the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie, to show that the Communist Party must have a leading role if victory is to be won over the bourgeoisie. More attention must be paid to the role of the Communist Party during the phase of building socialism, particularly with regard to the new views of the 21st Congress of the CPSU about the growing leading role and continuous strengthening of the organizational role of the Communist Party during the phase of building socialism and during the transition to Communism.

"The second problem under discussion concerned special characteristics of the contemporary workers movement. The revisionists, who base their views on new phenomena occurring in the development of capitalism, arrive at conclusions in which they even talk about the so-called second industrial revolution; according to them, the latter will automatically bring about changes in production relationships in the same way it happened in the first industrial revolution -- though this time in a socialist direction. This question is related to another problem: the possibility of a transition from capitalism to socialism in individual countries. The revisionists claim that capitalism transforms itself gradually into socialism and that therefore there is no need for any party or for any special effort on the part of the working class to fight for socialism. The report and the discussions fully disproved these false 'theories' of the revisionists. The discussion presented an almost complete analysis of the new phenomena in the capitalist world, based consistently on Marxism. Though these problems are more in the nature of economic analyses and relate more to tasks of economics and philosophy, historians must also remain on guard, because the repercussions of these 'theories' are frequently sneaked into the record of history by the revisionists. This was borne out of a series of recent cases in Poland and Hungary.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The report from the conference would not be complete without mentioning the work of the commissions. The commissions held their sessions in the afternoons and discussed the following subjects: (1), a proposal to draft a popular textbook on the international workers and Communist movement; (2) the problems of publishing party documents; and (3) an exchange of experiences. After the deliberations, the commissions accepted a recommendation addressed to individual institutes and institutions for the history of the Communist parties.

"The proposal for an international textbook, which was submitted for discussion by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism attached to the Central Committee CPSU, was approved in substance. The textbook is to be completed by 1963, and all institutes of history and the most important commissions on the history of the Communist Party in capitalist countries are to participate in its preparation. The textbook will summarize the history of the workers and Communist movement from the rise of the working class to the present. An editorial board has been created for the textbook; its members are representatives of institutions and institutes of history from the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the GDR, Rumania, Italy, and France. The Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee CPSU was put in charge of coordinating and concentrating the material.

"A recommendation of the second commission, which is engaged in publishing party documents, states that in the future the institutes of history should pay more attention to an extensive publication of party documents. Collections of documents are important supplements for the study of the history of the Communist Party of each country; at the same time they are a means for detecting all falsifiers. Party documents included in the almanac should be published without any alterations of the text. The system of annotations should be prepared with particular care. The question of publishing documents which were prepared by a collective of workers and signed by persons who later became renegades will be decided separately in each case. Since a number of institutes have issued their own instruction on the publication of documents, the conference recommends that, on the basis of these instructions, a common effort be made to outline general methodological principles for the publication of party documents.

"The third commission recommended that the institutes of party history intensify their mutual cooperation. When the institutes of history work on individual questions which are dealt with by several institutes, these institutes must be in constant touch; they must exchange their material and consult each other. Most of the institutes recently prepared a bibliography on the history of the workers movement. The commission recommended that copies of these bibliographies be sent to the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee, CPSU, which will coordinate the entire project.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In the same way, it is necessary to intensify the exchange of archive documents; it is therefore recommended that the institutes organize exchange visits of archive workers. It is recommended that the institutes of history cooperate more closely in publishing periodicals by exchanging long-term plans, articles, and information."

II. EAST GERMANY

Ideological and Cultural Revisionism

East German sources have reflected to an increasing extent the dilemma of attempting to justify to zealous party members a peaceful resolution of the "basic contradiction" between East and West Germany (i.e., between the "peace-loving forces" of East Germany and the "militarist imperialists" of West Germany), while at the same time cultivating and building up this contradiction to the East German populace to the point of denying that peaceful coexistence with West Germany is at all possible at present. By setting up the "militarist-imperialist" issue as a barrier to coexistence, East Germany appears to be adhering, deliberately or not, to the Chinese view. The following statements from the No 18, September 1960, issue of Neuer Weg further indicates, that many party officials have not yet been brought into line with the Soviet view:

"Members of party managements in our Kreis [Berlin-Mitte] said that there is nothing new in the decision of the Central Committee...on the results of the Bucharest conference. They said that we have been talking of coexistence for a long time, as well as of the...possibilities of maintaining peace.... These comrades have not studied the decision well.

"Several comrades in one seminar [on the other hand] said that imperialism has always brought forth new wars.... They said that as long as imperialism exists, there will be wars.... These comrades have clearly characterized imperialism correctly, but have overlooked the new situation in the world in which imperialism is no longer the ruling force....

"In the seminar, the opinion arose that the imperialists would never surrender and that, thus, peaceful coexistence of states with different social orders is not possible...."

An article entitled "The Basic Contradiction in Germany" in the No 6, 1960, issue of Deutsche Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie (DZfP) says, "As propaganda experiences show, there are many who cannot understand from a theoretical viewpoint that a deep antagonistic contradiction can be resolved peacefully and thus, gradually. On the other hand, there are others who from a practical standpoint cannot imagine that the basic solution of the antagonistic contradiction which demands the victory of the peaceful

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

democratic forces in West Germany and the deposing of the aggressive imperialist forces of financial capital, can take place without open, violent, military fight.... From the demand [that the "aggressive imperialist" forces in West Germany be eliminated]...arises the question of whether this is not a case of the GDR interfering in the internal affairs of West Germany and whether the policy of peaceful coexistence applies to the relation between the two German states. He who wants to give a 'yes' or 'no' answer to this question understands neither the content of the national German question nor that of peaceful coexistence." (However, a local party secretary in Bezirk Magdeburg, gave a clearly negative answer to the possibility of peaceful coexistence between East and West Germany in the 3 September 1960 issue of the Magdeburg Volksstimme.) The above article in the DZfP further said, "In any case (and on this point the policy of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] and the KPD [Communist Party of Germany] basically differs from that of all revisionists), solution of the basic contradiction in Germany is only possible through revolutionary means, i.e., by overcoming the aggressive militaristic forces in West Germany and not by cooperating with these forces.... Under certain circumstances the...contradiction can be...peacefully resolved...if, for instance, the progressive side of the contradiction was so strong that it could determine...the solution. I do not consider exact [correct] those views which intensify the antagonistic contradictions.... For example, the fourth issue of the series, Wissenschaftliche Weltanschauung, says 'Antagonistic contradictions do not become less severe in the course of development, but rather grow and deepen. The development of antagonism leads as a rule to violent conflicts of opposing forces which usually end in violent disagreement....' This generalization, I think, lacks historical immediacy."

In East German sources, the question of determinism and the applicability of dialectical materialism to aspects of modern science continue to be discussed. The September 1960 issue of Einheit includes an article on determinism and modern biology which points out that the complex problem of causality, including correlations, dynamic and static legality, and "organizedness" (Organisiertheit), must be solved by joint work on the part of Marxist philosophers and natural scientists. The No 6, 1960, issue of, DZfP (signed for the press on 15 May 1960) includes an article, "The Philosophic Significance of Heisenberg's Indeterminate Relations," which reiterates the importance of differentiating between dialectical and mechanical determinism. This point is again made in the same issue of DZfP in one of the contributions in a survey of articles (compiled by a Czech) from 1959 issues of the Czechoslovak philosophical journal, Filosoficky Casopis. In this survey, an article entitled "On Mechanism in the Concept of Historical Materialism" severely criticizes the Czechoslovak revisionist, Tondl, for his "mechanistic" view of causality.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Tondl is denounced in two other articles in the survey, essentially for reducing Marxist philosophy to an "epistemological and neopositivist" problem. Also included in this series is criticism of the philosophic and sociological views of the "influential representative of Czechoslovak positivism during the inter-World War period," Josef Kral. An article in the No 5, 1959, issue of the Czechoslovak philosophical journal, entitled "Pseudo-Materialist Tendencies in Our Philosophy," objects to the "neopositivist tendencies in contemporary Czechoslovak philosophy and shows that, in addition to these tendencies, there are also Hegelianizing, pseudo-Marxist tendencies influenced by Lukacs and Lefebvre. In an article [source not given] 'Classes and the Real Structure of Society,' K. Kosik represents...that pseudo-Marxist view of social development which Lukacs presented in his book, Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein (History and Class Consciousness).... Similar pseudo-Marxist tendencies are also manifested in many other articles and publications [in Czechoslovakia] where the work of the young Marx is used to replace materialistic and revolutionary-democratic ideas by unmaterialistic concepts.... Lukacs...underestimated the possibilities that imperialist, bourgeois ideology has for exploiting and misusing parts of Hegelian philosophy. To be sure, criticism of Hegelianizing tendencies in Marxism must not mean a return to nihilistic relations harmful to Marxism, to German classic philosophy. Both tendencies (the neopositivist and Hegelianizing) are essentially un-Leninist, Social Democratic tendencies in Marxist philosophy...."

The No 6, 1960, issue of DZfP also includes an essentially favorable review of the East German book, Beitraege zur Erkenntnistheorie und das Verhaeltnis von Sprache und Denken (Contributions to the Theory of Knowledge and the Relation Between Speech and Thought), by Erhard Albrecht. In this book the following critical remarks are made against the Polish philosopher Adam Schaff:

"[Albrecht] questions whether truth is only an attribute of judgments (as A. Schaff says).... Albrecht sees in Schaff's view a 'separation from the sensory-empiric and logicorational step in the process of knowledge.'... He [Albrecht] opposes any identification of reality and truth, and says that only reality, and not truth, exists independently from judgments."

The entire book appears to deal with many of the main issues on which revisionist views have developed. For example, "In connection with causality..., Albrecht discusses the often-asked question as to whether the... defense of determinism does not lead to fatalism and to a denial of freedom." In another section of the book, "Albrecht...rejects the revisionist line held by Herneck and Havemann in 1956 and 1957 which...transformed the Marxist theory of knowledge into pure methodology and, thus, separated its world view from its class-political content." Albrecht is also described as the first East German philosopher to dispute modern bourgeois ontology as represented by N. Hartmann. With regard to neo-Thomism, which is described as the philosophic basis of political clericalism, Albrecht says,

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"It is the strongest organized ideological force of the present-day West European bourgeoisie which even has some effect in socialist countries where the Catholic faith is widespread (particularly Poland and Hungary). Thus, all revisionist theses on ideological coexistence and all...attempts to weaken the contrast between objective-idealistic neo-Thomism and Marxism...and to offer subjective idealism as the common opponent (as is done in the works of G. Lukacs) are all the more dangerous."

Several isolated references have been found to tendencies toward creating a sociology independent of historical materialism. This charge was made by Dr Kalab from the Charles University in Prague at the 9-11 May 1960 conference of East European Bloc social scientists in Berlin (reported in the August 1960 issue of Einheit). Also, an article entitled "Historical Materialism and Practical Social Research," in the No 5, 1960, issue of DZfP (signed for the press on 31 March 1960) includes the following statements.

"The methodological directives worked out by Lenin in his work Who Are the 'Friends of the People' and How do They Fight Against the Social Democrats?, are the...bases which Marxist social scientists should use in investigating the social processes in the GDR and in West Germany. They [these directives] cannot be replaced by anything else, neither by a special Marxist sociology which exists next to historical materialism as an independent discipline with its own object, which has been variously proposed especially by revisionist groups, nor by worshipping bourgeois sociology and uncritically accepting their methods, techniques, and thus also their basic theoretical elements. Historical materialism is the Marxist sociology.... Where practical attempts have been made to create a Marxist sociology which boasts of an independent right to exist next to historical materialism..., historical materialism has been replaced by bourgeois sociology." This was the charge brought against Juergen Kuczynski, the former revisionist East German historian, in an article in the No 5, 1957, issue of the Soviet philosophical journal, Voprossy filosofi which was reprinted in the No 3, 1960, issue of the DZfP (see Eastern Europe Press Survey (101), Summary No 2578, pp 6-9). As far as is known from source references, Kuczynski has not published a modification of his views on this; he remains a member of the economic section of the East German Academy of Sciences and was listed as one of the East German participants at the 11th International Historians Conference held in August 1960 in Stockholm.

Disagreement arose between East German participants at the above-mentioned East European social scientists conference in May on the issue of "spontaneity." As reported in Summary No 2830, Review of Communist Theoretical Journals (8), two East German Marxist professors (one of them was Professor Havemann) were criticized for imparting positive "creative" qualities to the concept of "spontaneity" and thus "giving spontaneity a certain place in the fields of science and art."

With regard to art, there have been continued objections to collectivizing the profession and to the negative influence imposed on art by the doctrine proclaimed at the April 1958 Bitterfeld Cultural Conference. In reference to the first point, an article in the No 5, 1960, issue of DZfP says that there are "opportunist and revisionist distortions and simplifications" of all kinds which say that the cultural development "from I to we" aims toward eliminating the individual personality. A series of articles appearing in recent issues of the East German youth organization weekly, Forum, deplore East German artists' insistence on individuality, an attitude reflected in their current slogan, "Each has to wield his own paint brush alone."

On the second point, this same source says that certain artists consider the Bitterfeld directive one which leads to dictatorship by the untalented and the dilettante. Two articles by the same author (one in the No 3, 1960, issue of the Weimarer Beitrage and one in the 21 August 1960 issue of Forum) admits that artists have "misinterpreted" the Marx/Engels statement in Deutsche Ideologie (German Ideology), which says that there will be no painters under Communism -- only persons, among others, who happen to paint. The author insists that this does not mean that art will become an avocation or that the artistic level will decline. Yet artists continue to point to these precise results now developing in East Germany since the Ulbricht doctrine was proclaimed at the Bitterfeld meeting.

III. HUNGARY

Official Party Statements Stress Orthodoxy as Writers Seek New Ideological Orientation

In its combined August-September 1960 issue, the Hungarian theoretical journal Tarsadalmi Szemle published a long item titled "For the Lenin Party Spirit of Philosophy -- Theses of the Philosophy Work Group Operating With the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Concerning the Situation and Tasks of the Philosophical Front." This article presented no startling changes in the party line on philosophy. It pointed to the danger of nationalism, and it condemned the revisionist deviations of Lukacs and his students (Agnes Heller, Istvan Hermann, and Istvan Meszaros) and the revisionist "errors" of Erik Molnar (who still leads discussions on economics, sociology, and history both in Hungary and as Hungary's representative abroad). It did not, however, applaud the recent work of the Hungarian Philosophical Institute in its criticism of Lukacs and Heller. The article gives a general impression of official dissatisfaction with current philosophical work and it is an effort to restate the official orthodox line.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Similarly, an article by Endre Molnar titled "Concerning the Laying of the Foundations of Socialism" in the "For Propagandists' Work" section of the August 1960 Partelet restated the orthodox line on the problem of the transition to socialism. Such articles indicate an increasing concern with the ideological justification of the Communist movement and the leading role of the party therein, but they do not clearly indicate what pressures, internal and external, prompt this increasing concern.

Another article in the August 1960 Partelet did, however, point to a problematic internal pressure. In a discussion of the intellectuals policy of the party, Laszlo Nagy noted the "solid political alliance" between the intellectuals and the working class, but he deplored the fact that the nonparty intelligentsia did not yet stand on the "world-view soil of Marxism-Leninism." He recommended a stepped-up program of ideological training but he also noted the party's failure to react quickly enough to modern problems. He said of the intellectuals: "They are seeking the 'modern world view' which gives the answers to the present...." He concluded that "Marxism-Leninism is the most progressive ideal of this age," and he referred the propagandists to the theoretical statements of the CPSU congresses for answers to "the most important questions of our age."

In the Hungarian literary weekly Elet es Irodalom, these problems were also discussed from varying viewpoints. In the 2 September 1960 issue, Imre Gyore, a confirmed party hack, complained that there were groups of writers who "expressed major or minor reservations, even if they did not hostilely oppose the fact of socialist construction." And he added, "It is a shame not to speak of this."

Bela Illes, an old Muscovite, also entered the debate in Elet es Irodalom. In the 9 September 1960 issue, although he attempted to appear liberal, he stated: "Literary backwardness can be liquidated... only...when the direction has been indicated, not by the poets, but by the party...." And he added in his conclusion: "We are free to criticize everyone, but we are not free to criticize so recklessly...." Illes was answered in the 16 September 1960 issue by the editor of Elet es Irodalom, Miklos Szabolcsi, who, while pretending to defend a position of strict orthodoxy, wrote: "The Communist critic, without regard to persons, bravely and on principle, with quality and fighting spirit, must criticize everything which he considers objectionable ideologically or critically.... We will do this in the future too -- we hope, always with greater quality and more courage, but at the same time we intend to maintain the mood of literary debates which has recently formed, a more sober, more resolute, and more polite mood."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In the 23 September 1960 issue of Elet es Irodalom, in a rather elliptical article labeled a "reader's comment" on the debate on young writers, Imre Bata made the following statement: "The struggle of the humanly inspired intellectuals has emerged, a struggle for a scientifically equipped, modernly based materialist view and culture. The time question culminates here and becomes here a serious concern for the young and the mature alike...."

The September 1960 issue of Nagyvilag, the Hungarian world literature monthly, also contributed to this veiled ideological debate. An unsigned note of Sartre's Critique de la Raison Dialectique, while critical of Sartre's position, also observed that "that Marxist who ignores the individual and the particular to the benefit of the general sins seriously against Marxist dialectics."

A long article by the eminent populist writer Laszlo Nemeth, also in the September 1960 Nagyvilag, reviewed the short stories and plays of the modern Swiss author Durrenmatt. Judging from the published material, this article was commissioned by Nagyvilag as part of its defense of its "modernist" policy, but it was also used by Nemeth, apparently, as a pretext for presenting his own ideological views. This use of Durrenmatt was noted before in the case of Agnes Heller (see Summary No 2470, Eastern Europe Press Survey (87) and Peter Veres (See Summary No 2598, Eastern Europe Press Survey (104)). The following is perhaps the most dramatic of Nemeth's many double entendre observations on the paraphrases of Durrenmatt: "The powerful are powerful -- discount this worthless thing and oppose them without weapons. Power can take away everything: your wife, your daughter, even your wisdom; the only one it cannot reach is he who has nothing. So, let man be gray. Creep, in the guise of foolishness, as a slave, as a merry pal, into the castle; put up with shame and explode the walls from within, with humanity...."

Laszlo Kardos, editor of Nagyvilag, issued an appeal in the September 1960 issue for an international conference of socialist writers. Western writers are to be excluded so that questions need not be discussed in a state of "delicate poise." Among the outstanding problems that Kardos would like to see resolved by the writers (not by the party) are: the narrow and broad definitions of socialist realism, the position of critical realism, and modernist literature.

A curious sidelight on the continuing activity of the literary liberals and modernists is Miklos Szabolcsi's recent attack on nationalism. In the 19 August 1960 issue of Elet es Irodalom, Szabolcsi reviewed a recent volume of poetry by Lajos Konya, a Communist poet and a leader of the 1956 intellectual revolt. Szabolcsi praises Konya in general, comparing him with Gyula Illyes, but he criticizes Konya's "regressive" poems which returned to the "image of the 'eternal people.'"

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In the 9 September 1960 issue of Elet es Irodalom "M. Sz." (Miklos Szabolcsi) was more explicit in his criticism of the poet Gyula Sipos who had written of the "Little Hungarians" and the criticism included Peter Veres among those writers who entertain ideas of the "eternal Hungarian people" opposing the "leaders." This criticism of the "narodnik-nationalist" view may be a result of party pressure, it may be a reflection of the old Hungarian argument between cosmopolitan urbanists and nationalistic populists, but it is also possible that those liberal and modernist writers who are now seeking a new ideology to oppose tyrannical Marxism are deliberately purging their ranks of passionate nationalists who, it may be felt, acted too precipitously in 1956 and who could not be counted on in a prolonged international struggle.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Agnes Heller Condemned -- A Classical Case of Revisionism and Marxist Ethics

The following is a condensation of "A Critique of the Ethical Revisionism of Agnes Heller," by Maria Makai and Tamas Foldesi. This article appeared in two installments in Magyar Filozofiai Szemle, January-March 1960, pages 33-99, and April-June 1960, pages 203-396. The first installment is available in full English translation as Joint Publications Research Service Report No 3740, 22 August 1960.

Agnes Heller, who was recently expelled from the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party for her unwillingness to abandon her revisionist positions, is a philosopher whose work is distinguished by its rigid adherence to Marxist categories. Unlike the literary participants in the "revisionist clan" (see Summary No 2622, Communist Revisionism and Dissidence(1)), who probably use a Marxist language only insofar as they are forced to do so by the situation in which they find themselves, Agnes Heller (like Gyorgy Lukacs and Istvan Hermann, both recently condemned for revisionism) is a convinced Marxist. As a result she presents a rather tragic picture -- she seeks to answer the questions which trouble all humanist, liberal intellectuals behind the Iron Curtain, but she is doomed to failure by the inadequacy of the framework into which she seeks to force the answer.

Magyar Filozofiai Szemle is a quarterly review published by the Philosophical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The editor in chief is Jozsef Szigeti, Lukacs student turned Lukacs enemy, and the clique which dominates the publication is made up largely of students of Bela Fogarasi, one-time revisionist, later party-line critic of Lukacs, always a dialectician and passionate enemy of "physical idealism," and now dead. The recent party statement on the "philosophical front" suggested what has long been obvious, that personal animosities have dominated post-1956 Hungarian philosophy. The article condensed below is part of this feud, but it also describes the general concerns with which Agnes Heller was dealing when her Introduction to General Ethics was adopted as a university text in 1957. Heller's concern with freedom, her hatred of tyranny, and her reference to the "ethical socialist" tradition are of general significance even if her answers to the problems raised are very limited.

The following condensation is written from the viewpoint of Heller's critics. Most of the sentences are translations of statements by Makai or Foldesi, but their argument has been greatly telescoped, averaging about one sentence here to one page in the original. Quotations attributed to Heller, Lenin, etc., are exact but not necessarily full translations. The sequence of ideas follows the original. The headings are, in general, those in the original.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

First Installment

"Introduction"

"Agnes Heller is the principal representative of revisionism in ethics in Hungary. Her 1957 book, though not officially published, was widely used as a university text. Heller applies to ethics the anti-Marxist concepts of Gyorgy Lukacs, which he developed for aesthetics. But ethics stands closer to reality than aesthetics, because aesthetics studies reflections whereas ethics studies real relations. Thus ethics is under a greater obligation to take class interest into consideration. Marxist ethics stresses consequences of acts, not the subjective purpose of acts; Heller reverses this. Marxism places politics above ethics; Heller pretends to put ethics above politics but really she is putting petit-bourgeois views above proletarian views.

"Lukacs was a latent revisionist; Heller is an outright revisionist. Lukacs sincerely tried to fight the bourgeois symptom of deviationism in the movement, but he used bourgeois arguments. Heller, on the other hand, is an outright revisionist. Lukacs argued for 'ideological coexistence,' but Heller expands this to 'political class peace.' Lukacs urged a search for principles of 'reason' on which all could agree, but Heller actively annihilates those elements of Marxism which a bourgeois democrat cannot accept. Lukacs had humanistic illusions but he projected them onto an era to which they did correspond; Heller makes these illusions absolutes.

"Heller sees the realm of public affairs as alien and hostile to ethics, even in a dictatorship of the proletariat; she thus recommends retirement from public affairs and she is thus decadent. For Heller, progress is the result of the materializing of a 'good and general humanum.' Although Heller gives evidence of being an independent thinker, her thinking, under the pressure of class influence, leads to the old revisionist positions.

"Originally, revisionism was based on the belief that capitalism was stable. Now, revisionism is based on disillusionment over the slow solution of problems by socialism. Thus the old revisionism was active but the new revisionism is passive. Both fail to recognize the primary importance of the interests of the working class.

"The petit-bourgeoisie always play an ambiguous role; when the bourgeoisie are in power they join the proletariat. But when the workers are in power, the petit-bourgeoisie are the base for every kind of deviation.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The degradation of the interests of the working class comes from an emphasis on Kantian ethics. These Kantian theorists defined the problem of socialism as the interest of all mankind. This was a complete revision of the foundations of Marxism. These theorists questioned materialism and declared that dialectics was only a method, an aid to thinking. Thus, rejecting Hegel, they returned to Kant and dualism and approached value-personalism.

"The new revisionists, unlike the old, must use 'Aesopic language.' Thus Heller is responsible not only for what she says, but for what can be deduced therefrom. She detaches socialism from the worker movement. She sees the highest manifestation of Marxist moral development in the so-called 'abstract' norms.

"Heller's revisionism has made articulate the disillusionment of large intellectual groups. Her viewpoint parallels that of Kolakowski but Kolakowski is more open and Heller is more dangerous. In 1953-1954, Heller wrote on Chernyeshvski's ethical opinions; she was not then a revisionist. But in her 1956 work Az erkolcsi normak felbomlása (The Dissolution of Ethical Norms) she began to show her revisionism, even though one of the authors of this criticism, Maria Makai, failed to notice this at that time.

"The State"

"The central thought in Heller's chapter on the state is the problem of man's becoming an instrument. She thinks that this is a characteristic of every state. Heller wrote: 'This characteristic of the central state power was and is present everywhere, where there was and is at present a central state power.' Heller openly and unequivocally denies the democratic character of the socialist state. According to Heller, the fundamental condition of social democracy is the satisfactory amount of leisure time that makes it possible for people themselves to participate in the direction of the state and of production, so that this function would be performed by them and not by an outfit which is alienated from them. Heller wrote: 'With the 8-hour working day, and naturally with an even longer working day..., it is objectively impossible for there to be a real democracy.' But Heller goes even further, she not only deprives the socialist state of its democratic character, she sees in it the main obstacle to the evolution of human freedom. She denies that there is any radical change in quality with the transition from capitalism to socialism. She holds that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a necessary evil, which transforms the subjects of the state into instruments, using a force which is alien to man and which is democratic, at the very best, only in its outward appearance, but with its coercive power it is one of the most formidable obstacles in the path of the realization of human freedom.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"In her analysis Heller regards states as general and men as singular factors; thus she ignores class. In fact, the state is the instrument of the class. Heller's fault is that she 'absolutizes' the Marxist doctrine about the alienation of the state. But this is not valid for a proletarian state.

"The fountainhead of Heller's opinion is Kantian ethics. One of the fundamental tenets of Kant is that the social phenomena, among them the state and jurisprudence, are to be judged and evaluated according to their moral value. Hegel sees the state as the greatest good, Heller sees it as one of the greatest evils, but both mystify the state power. Almost all of Heller's teachings can be discovered in the concepts of the Neo-Hegelians. Stirner, one of the founders of anarchism, not only mystified the state but held it to be the greatest negative factor. Bakunin, in his debates with Marxism, expounded such opinions; but Bakunin denied the necessity of the socialist state while Heller stresses its necessity. Yugoslav revisionism also makes this final step.

"Heller did not necessarily pick up her ideas from these sources, but Heller's concept is old and is a concoction of different idealist, anarchist, and revisionist ideas.

"Force

"Heller holds that force is a necessary evil and she places the emphasis on 'evil.' Engels opposed such ideas in Duehring, and Lenin opposed them in Otto Bauer. Heller's theory of force is directed straight against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Heller claims that the dictatorship of the proletariat uses force even against the revolutionary masses. In 1956-1957, counterrevolutionary powers were temporarily successful in influencing wide masses of the working population. In this exceptionally difficult case, so far the only case in the history of proletarian dictatorships, the dictatorship of the proletariat actually used force not only against the former exploiting classes, but also against some groups of the deceived working masses. But this force could be applied successfully and it could be followed by a speedy consolidation only because fundamentally it was identical with the interest of the entire proletariat. [Note: Beginning immediately after "In 1956-1957" above, the passage just given is a full translation of the original passage.]

"Heller's reasoning recalls the debate which took place 40 years ago between Lenin and Kautsky. In this case Kautsky came to the same conclusion as the anarchist Sorel. Heller also agrees with Sorel, even though she seems to criticize him.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Political Freedom

"For Heller, the realm of freedom is a realm without a state. It is true that Lenin wrote: 'While there is a state, there is no freedom; when there will be freedom, there will be no state,' But Lenin also wrote: 'Freedom? But freedom from the oppression of what class?' The state of the proletarian dictatorship is not free but it guarantees freedom for the working class. Heller relegates the jump into the realm of freedom into the distant future.

"Heller's questioning is based seemingly on a Marxist thought: the emergence, development, and termination of the state is actually connected with the division of labor and the productive potentials of labor. Heller's concept, however, disclaims democracy not only for the present but also for the future of socialism. According to Heller, the condition of the realization of genuine democracy is such a decrease in working time as can be realized only under fully developed Communism. The core of Heller's fault is that she narrows the idea of democracy to primitive democracy.

"Law

"The central idea of Heller's legal concept is that law, like the state, is morally negative. She opposes 'outward' law to 'inner' morality. Heller wrote: 'The legal judgment is always deductive and never inductive like the righteous moral judgment.' But socialist law loses the negative characteristics of exploiting legal systems. The socialist constitution and the socialist plan express the will of the people. Heller's legal and moral concept is a revival of the Kantian opposition of legality and morality.

"Heller's revisionist concept reflects the pro-counterrevolutionary attitude of certain segments of the petit bourgeoisie who entertained utopistic-eclectic day dreams that the counterrevolution would preserve for them certain positive acceptable features of socialism (liberation from big capitalist competition, termination of economic crises, democracy, etc.) and at the same time end the negative features of proletarian dictatorship (the planning which restricts private commercial and industrial activity, the dictatorial characteristics of the proletarian dictatorship, etc.). In a word, they desired the contradiction creating bourgeois way of life without the contradictions.

"For Heller, the negation of socialist democracy, relegating its realization to the distant future, actually expresses the yearning of the petit bourgeoisie for a bourgeois democracy. It is not that Heller subjectively identifies herself with this petit-bourgeois standpoint, but that she expresses this standpoint in ethical terms.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Class Morality

"Heller denies the existence of 'eternal moral values' but she asserts that there are 'universal human values,' such as love, honor, honesty, etc. These values constitute a separate moral sphere; this separate moral sphere contains the 'genuinely' human element as opposed to elements reflecting class interest. But Heller is in error because universal moral interest can present itself only in a concrete system of norms -- in our times, only in the moral system of the worker class. Heller herself pointed out earlier that when Chernyeshevski talked about the 'abstract universal interest of mankind' he always meant the actual revolutionary interests of the Russian peasantry.

"L. Woltmann mystified the idea of universal interest, and Jaures did not fill his most general moral ideas with class content.

"Heller says that only in a classless society will abstract norms become concrete norms. She denies that traditional moral values have to go through the purifying fire of the revolutionary movement to be translated into real values. And she sees the seeds of the morals of the future not in proletarian morality but in generally recognized moral traditions.

"Heller handles formalistically and one-sidedly the question of whether a man is justified in reporting his friend to the authorities because of political reasons. According to her, this is the gravest sin under any circumstances. She does not discuss the political-moral contents of the friend's deed. A Marxist recognizes that conflict could arise here; only the sectarian would not see any conflict because he sees moral value only in loyalty to the class interest.

"Burke's argument against the French revolution, that it destroyed the already crystallized moral values and thus threatened the whole world system of morality with disintegration, is used by Raymond Aron against the proletarian revolution.

"Why does Heller make so-called abstract norms the criterion for all moral norm systems? Because she makes a universal law out of the lesson of the historical fact that fascism trampled under foot the entire moral inheritance. But when she attacks fascism, she is compelled to polemicize with the other extreme (which is for her bad), Communism, with socialist morality, which similarly means the impairment of those illusorily interpreted abstract norms that in her eyes are lifted to an ideological pedestal. [Note: Beginning with "she is compelled," the above passage is a direct translation from the original, as is the following sentence.] In this she gets dangerously close to that 'antitotalitarian' bourgeois theory which, alluding to the 'interests of the social and moral status quo' and to the 'moral and social interest of humanity,' brings Communism to a common denominator with fascism. In this Heller is similar to the antifascist democracy of Lukacs.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Heller wants to defend the moral legacy against 'moral nihilism.' She objects that when cadre was selected, prior to the counterrevolution, party and class loyalty were checked but not traditional morality. Heller writes: 'Among other things, this was the reason that party loyalty could become the safe-conduct of cruelty, inhumanity, personal envy, etc.'

"Heller has become a spokesman for the old line of ethical socialism -- the line of the neo-Kantians of Marburg and Freiburg, of Windelband, Vorlander, and Standinger, the line of Jaures."

Second Installment

"The Individual

"The individual is the central form, starting point, and end point for Heller's ethics. This placing of the individual in the center can already be found in her work on Chernyeshevski's ethical views. She says that morals come into being when individual interests come into being within and conflict with the community interests. Thus there was no morals in the primitive community and there will be no morals in Communism. She writes: 'In Communism the norms of class society become habits, and as habits they cease to be the subjects of morals.'

"Heller places the relationship of class and individual on its head. She starts from the individual; the class exists only as a collection of individuals. In her argument against the vulgar Marxists she comes to the conclusion that the individual is essentially independent of class definition; she does not say this openly but this is the only logical link.

"In reality, the class factor is the fundamental defining factor; individuals create classes only as class-individuals. We must also point out that Heller is wrong in saying that only an individual can be moral or immoral. For example, when we say that in the age of imperialism, new, negative aspects characterize bourgeois morality, we do not mean that every individual member of the bourgeoisie approves of these new norms, but the class as such does approve of them.

"In any case, differences between the community and the individual do exist even in the simplest case. And initially the judgment did not take subjective intentions into consideration, but only the consequences. This again opposes Heller's individualistic conception.

"Heller's individualistic ethics stems from Kant, like her other views. Like the Austro-Marxists she unsuccessfully attempts to combine Kantian and Marxist ethics. Heller's views show an outstanding kinship to

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

the revisionist weaknesses of Jaures; he also placed the individual in the center and forced class viewpoints into the background. Jaures wrote: 'The rule of one class is an outrage against humanity.' Ortega y Gasset is a modern representative of such individualism -- although this is not to say that Heller got her Kantian ideas from Jaures or Ortega y Gasset directly. Heller's immediate source is Gyorgy Lukacs.

"Freedom as a Concept

"Let us examine where this exaggeration of the individual leads in the problem of freedom. Heller seems to attack two extremes: the vulgar materialist emphasis on class and state freedom; and the subjectivist emphasis on individual freedom. But actually she denies the categories of class and state freedom. Heller writes 'Freedom is always the freedom of an individual.... The freedom of a class means that the freedom of individuals belonging to that class has been realized. If we say that one state is freer than another, then we mean that that state guarantees more freedom to individuals than the other state does.' But it is the Marxist view that only the liberation of the class opens the door to the liberation of its members. If we accept Heller's views, then it appears that the bourgeois slander is correct according to which the socialist state is not the dictatorship of the proletariat but the dictatorship of a few persons who oppress the proletariat itself. Heller's equation of the freedom of the state to the freedom of individuals is contradictory because a state has a freedom which it opposes to individuals.

"Heller also errs in making subjectivist criteria of freedom primary. In reality the decisive criterion of freedom is rule over natural or social factors in recognition of necessity. Frequently, men are free without being subjectively aware of it. For example, some peasants enter cooperatives against their will. According to Heller they are not free, but the peasant who sticks to his old individual farming is free. In reality, the cooperative peasant is much freer even though he receives his 'orders' from the cooperative leaders instead of from 'nature.' Heller's concept reduces freedom to bare spontaneity.

"This emphasis on the concept of self-realization is an existentialist idea, a Sartrean idea. One of the chief representatives of the Mensheviks, Axelrod, also made freedom of the personality central. In comparing the value of capitalist and socialist societies the problem of freedom should be considered not primarily in relation to the individual, but rather in relation to the classes.

"The Problem of Norms

"Heller says that we think of two things when we hear the word 'norm': first, that which is generally done, and second, that which should be done but which generally is not done. These are the concrete and the

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L-

abstract norms, respectively. It is our position that the abstract norms are nonexistent and of an idealist construction and that a development of the conception of Marxist norms must begin from the dialectics of the general and the particular (i.e., the socially determined and the class determined).

"According to Heller, the price of the 'supraclass' nature of abstract norms is that they cannot be realized. Thus they cannot be linked to the worker class movement. According to her, the worker class does not represent the universal interests of mankind.

"According to Heller, the most abstract demand is the demand of the highest order but in reality the highest demands are the most concrete (e.g., the demands of proletarian humanism). Heller's conception is a peculiar manifestation in ethics of epistemological idealism. In contrast to Heller's incorrect analysis into abstract and concrete norms, we propose the following categories: elementary norms (for social existence) and elementary moral inheritance (of a class).

"What political idea is being expressed in this theory of Heller's? Obviously it is that Lukacs type of ideological coexistence.

"Heller's ethics reflects the structure of capitalist society and the false consciousness of the individual living therein -- just as in the case of Proudhon, as Marx pointed out.

"Heller points to the 'positive' side of hypocrisy. On this point Heller joins Kolakowski, but Heller goes even further -- Kolakowski spoke of the positive role of hypocrisy, but Heller speaks of it as a 'positive phenomenon.' (It should be noted that hypocrisy is a peculiarity of the morality of bourgeois society. When Communists mislead their enemies, this is not a case of hypocrisy.)

"Heller also evidences a tendency to make peace with religious morality -- here the principle of ideological coexistence comes to the surface. According to Heller, as long as a class society or a state exists, there will be religious views. This is a justification of spontaneity. What sense is there in atheist propaganda if what she says is true? Heller's conception of morality is very similar to that developed by Gyorgy Ronay in Uj Ember [a contemporary Hungarian weekly put out by Actio Catholica in Budapest].

"Kautsky, Adler, and revisionists, reformists, and renegades in general have always made allowances for religion.

"Why did Heller come to an approval of the antihumanist content of religious morality despite her protestations of atheism and humanism? Because her atheism and humanism are bourgeois atheism and humanism.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L-

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Marxists must go beyond the position of bourgeois materialists and must evaluate religious alienation as originating from and subordinate to wordly alienation.

"Morality

"In analyzing Heller's conception of morality we see that she remains at the position of subjectivism represented by Kant. The starting point for the distorted understanding of morality lies in her incorrect solution of the freedom-necessity problem. Heller writes: 'A demand becomes moral if it confronts a person not only as an external demand, but also has become an internal demand....'

"Thus, according to Heller, external demands are nonmoral and cannot be binding on the moral individual. In reality, everything depends on what content is being expressed in the internal or external demand. Heller abolishes the entire dialectics of the objective and subjective side of morality. She completely loses sight of the historical fact that when the worker class organizes itself as a conscious class and builds socialism, the subjective and objective side of morality undergo an essential change. The objective moral demands developed by the worker class stand higher than the subjective moral feelings of the average individual. Heller's conception opens the gate to spontaneity. But Lenin pointed to the positive moral influence of the proletarian state power.

"Good and Evil

"What, according to Heller, is moral evil: 'That which does not satisfy the moral needs of man, or which impedes the satisfaction of these needs....' Heller does not take up the question of what role the moral evil has in the development of class societies. Heller ethicalizes history and puts ethics above history.

"Lukacs was able to reject aesthetic decadence in his knowledge of the bourgeois classics. Heller cannot do even this, but there is a theoretical weakness common to both Lukacs and Heller; neither is able to measure capitalist aesthetics or ethics by the yardstick of the labor movement.

"According to Heller, virtue is 'the conscious and voluntary assumption of the morality of a given community, an outer and inner harmony....' Apparently Heller's position is Marxist but it has an anti-sectarian purpose which ends in denying the morality of the movement. Heller hypothesizes that socialism can be established without its having a public character; she thus raises to general laws of socialism the sectarian errors committed in certain periods.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Heller's earlier position, when she showed the different class bases of the Goethe-Schiller 'beautiful souls' and the Chernyeshevsky ideal, a man developed from many sides, was clearer and truly Marxist.

"Value

"In Heller's analysis, reality becomes ever more split: on the one side are values (the embodiment of historical good), and on the other side are the necessary processes of reality, the historical evil. Philosophically this conception is based on the Kantianism which she could not overcome. According to Heller, values are the historical good, 'the abstract good which is embodied not in individual men, but which is brought into being by world history in the totality of mankind.' Ultimately, this means that morality creates the good sphere and history creates the bad sphere. This is similar to Kolakowski's position.

"Heller's acceptance of bourgeois value-ontologism abolishes the differences between the categories of being and consciousness, making it impossible to understand the categories of values as categories of ideological objectivity. Thus the definitions of various values lose their concrete determinants, primarily their historical, economic, and class determinants. If we pose the question of the moral good on a concrete historical basis, then the answer will be relative and in accordance with class interests.

"Heller denies that historical necessity which is the indispensable base for Communism, for the general social realization of the moral good.

"Heller defines humanism as respect for self and other as autonomous moral beings. A class-conscious worker will immediately understand the anachronism of this definition, but a petit-bourgeois will find this definition adequate.

"Heller admits that the hierarchy of moral values changes according to epoch and class, but she joins the value-ontologists by asserting that the character of a value is not class-determined. Thus we can agree with Kautsky, who said, before he became a renegade, that the 'back to Kant' slogan ultimately meant 'back to Plato.' Platonic ideas also hide in the conceptions of Jaures. Heller is not the only one to put forward these anti-Marxist ideas today. The Polish revisionist Kolakowski preceded her with the express intention of making the criteria of moral behavior independent of all philosophies of history.

"The Kantian humanist conception (i.e., never to use oneself or another as a means but only as a goal) stands in sharp opposition to the Marxist humanist conception the essence of which is that the liberation of the exploited majority can come only by means of violating the 'moral autonomy' of the minority.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"For the Marxist, just moral judgment is subordinate to the goal, the abolition of classes. According to Heller, this abolishes morality itself. Heller rehabilitates the basic principle of bourgeois law: equal moral judgment of moral individuals who are regarded as equal -- but they are not equal.

"Goals and Means

"According to Heller, if the means are without value from the viewpoint of 'moral development,' then the goal also loses its moral content. Heller considers this to be an ethical law which is applicable even to the labor movement.

"In this period, he who rejects the means of the labor movement rejects its goals also. The conceptions of the reformists and revisionists offer a happy opportunity to the demagoguery of the bourgeois theoreticians; they can theoretically hold the moral goals of socialism while rejecting 'only' its methods. For example, Dewey and A. Huxley reject socialism on this basis.

"Heller overlooks the simple fact that the goal determines the means. The revisionists overlook the fact that the goal becomes a means and that the means appear as goals. The goal transforms the means. In its relations with the class enemy the Communist movement has no regard for the abstract moral content of means.

"However, the Marxist viewpoint does not classify all means as abstractly justified, but only those which stand in an internal, causal interdependence with the goal. The adequate nature of the means is primarily a political question.

"The 'ethicalization' of the class struggle is an old wishful dream of the bourgeoisie and the revisionists.

"Morals and Politics

"Heller sees a moral sin in all political activity. Here renegadism replaces the well-known petit-bourgeois heresy which confuses democracy with socialism. Here Heller's ethics fails ultimately and appears, at best, as a refurbished Tolstoyan ethics.

"Heller writes: 'Political activity, in its narrower sense, is nothing more than a struggle for power....' According to Heller, even proletarian politics contains immorality. She does not say that it is morally forbidden to participate in social activity, only that this activity is accompanied ethically by sin. In some cases you must undertake to sin. This conception does not differ at all from that of Raymond Aron.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Marxism does not deny that moral contradictions come up in the course of progressive social activity. But Marxism views these contradictions from the side of the political goal.

"Summing Up

"Lenin stressed that there was no trace of ethics, in the revisionists' meaning of the term, in Marxism. He wrote that Marxism 'in the theoretical area subordinates the "ethical viewpoint" to the "principle of causality" and in the practical sphere refers it to the class struggle.' Revisionism does not want to hear of this definition, and it is not by chance that Heller never mentions it in her work on ethics. Heller's ethics carries the theoretical expressions of alien class interests into Marxism and it subordinates politics to morality.

"The common theoretical root of these revisionist views is a failure to recognize the priority of the interests of the worker class. Imre Nagy necessarily opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of the proposition that the worker class could not subordinate the universal interests of the nation to its own class interests.

"Heller proposes class peace instead of class struggle. And she abolishes the principle of party spirit. It is an old tactic of revisionism to oppose party spirit with the scientific spirit and to oppose the 'prophet-revolutionary' Marx to the 'scientist' Marx. In raising such problems, Heller develops further the conceptions of Lukacs. But Lenin pointed out that during the building of socialism the chief danger is the petit-bourgeois belief in spontaneity, a belief which hides in the above ideas.

"By developing her ideas on the immorality of politics in 1956-1957, Heller was attempting to paralyze the revolutionary forces and to justify the hostile passivity of the intellectuals."

IV. POLAND

Existentialism Becoming Significant Revisionist Force Among Intellectuals

The "fashion of existentialism" as an expression of revisionistic thought in Polish intellectual circles, especially among Marxists, appears to be consolidating its foothold and continues to give cause for serious concern. The first one to express such misgivings was Adam Schaff; writing in the 20 September 1959 Nova Kultura, he frankly blamed the failure of Marxist theory for fostering existentialism. In it he complained that back in 1951, existentialism was not even considered as a threat to the eminent position enjoyed by Marxist thought; however, "only a few years later, in

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

1956-1957, it became a real force, above all in the Marxist [revisionist] milieu, in which the most varied, supposedly original and innovating ideas were, in reality, variations on the subject of existentialism if not an outright plagiarism of its ideas."

There were various reasons, according to Schaff, for permitting existentialist thought to make such tremendous inroads within the ranks of Polish intellectuals, including Marxists: primarily, the failure of Marxist thought to take into consideration the fullness of the psychological life of man, the subject of the life of man, the proper behavior of man with relation to himself and to others, the responsibility of the individual for his actions, etc. In the words of Schaff, Marxism avoided these problems "because the union between Marxism and the revolutionary workers movement emphasized the problem of the justness of social development...and problems related to the struggle of the masses. These practical, political interests of Marxism put off until the future matters connected with the individual and his problems.... In this manner there arose, historically, a vacuum in the philosophical problems of Marxism." Schaff admits that it is a "considerable vacuum" which has created a situation in which "revisionistic tendencies" in Poland "borrowed ideas from existentialism and are actually navigating under its standard."

Schaff makes it clear that he has no intention of justifying the revisionists' flirting with existentialism, but that his aim is to answer "why existentialism became the fashionable philosophy of revisionists in Poland," and "what makes it so attractive."

A more recent series of articles, by Zdzislaw Najder in the 14 and 28 August 1960 Nowa Kultura, complains of the widespread obsession with existentialism among Polish intellectuals. Najder is apparently concerned not only because this phenomenon is prevalent among the older intellectuals, but "because it has a decidedly wider range and is more significant since it primarily includes the youth."

As for the reasons for the popularity of existentialism, Najder explains that "social upheavals and the catastrophes of war" are not enough. The principal reason for the change which took place among young philosophers was "the theory of the individual's responsibility for everything, for what he 'is' and what he does, responsibility which, in the opinion of Sartre, is undertaken in an inevitable manner in the name not only of oneself, but of all mankind as well. The flight from responsibility, both in the moral sense and in the ordinary sense of undertaking daily work decisions, became a social-political sickness of alarming proportions and had to evoke a violent reaction. No other element of existentialist philosophy has exerted such an influence, and none was as 'justified' in its influence."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In a follow-up article dwelling on existentialism as a philosophy and a social phenomenon, Najder insists that the second aspect is the more important of the two. During the occupation, he says, two slogans became crystallized in the mass consciousness: "the individual is nothing" and "everything is relative." But, he maintains, the individual in Poland has not the slightest desire to be nothing, at least internally, so this is the reason for the popularity of the new slogan, "silent republic." Thus, the slogan, "everything is relative," is the device of those people who do not want to become "engaged" at any price. That is why, Najder insists, existentialism is so dangerous in Poland: not as a philosophy for the "professionals" but as an ideological expression of a certain social attitude.

Concern over the adverse influence that Sartre existentialism may have on intellectual circles in Poland was voiced in a review of Sartre's latest book, Critique de la raison dialectique (Critique of Dialectical Reason), by Adam Schaff in the 15 September 1960 Przegląd Kulturalny. Schaff makes a distinction between Sartre the philosopher and Sartre the playwright, intimating that he does not think much of the former.

Schaff maintains that in his new book, Sartre is in effect reasoning that existentialism will eventually gain the upper hand over Marxism. Schaff writes: "Sartre closes his introductory remarks with the far-reaching prognosis about the dissolution of existentialism in Marxism...; however, it appears that existentialism is to disappear, but not in the sense that it will be vanquished by Marxism, which will solve its problems in its own way, but rather that it will be accepted by Marxism as the basis for all studies. Hence, it is not a question of a 'disappearance,' but of a clear advance of existentialism to the role of a foundation of all studies of Marxism, a question of 'supplementing Marxism with existentialism.'"

In conclusion, Schaff says, "Here we have this contradiction: historical materialism tells us to explain all the actions and motivations of an individual by special conditioning; existentialism, on the contrary, tells us to seek the final source of social phenomena in the autonomically understood freedom of the individual. Here we have two diametrically opposed trends which cannot be joined into one philosophical system. Sartre was also unable to do that, although he might have imagined that he fills existentialism with Marxism, while actually he tries to turn Marxism into a variation of existentialism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

V. RUMANIA

Manifestations of Economic, Ideological, and Cultural Revisionism in Press

The Rumanian party press in recent months has included condemnations of revisionist and dissident tendencies in economics, in matters concerning the ideological education of youth, and in literature and art.

In an article in Probleme Economice of August 1960, M. Paraluta discusses the development and strengthening of socialist ownership. The author condemns contemporary revisionism which, "by falsifying the Marxist-Leninist teaching about the need to eliminate capitalist ownership, attempts to rehabilitate the old reformist concept about the peaceful integration of capitalism, an idea repudiated by Lenin, claiming that the capitalist forms of ownership would pass through a process of qualitative transformation, of accumulation of 'socialist phenomena.'"

Paraluta continues: "The absurdity of these attempts is obvious.... In general, the revisionists try to identify capitalist nationalization with socialization of the means of production after the proletariat has seized political power. But, in reality, bourgeois nationalizations do not change the nature of capitalist ownership at all, while the passing of the means of production to the ownership of all the people after the proletariat seizes political power leads to the destruction of capitalist ownership and its replacement by ownership of an entirely different nature, an ownership which excludes the exploitation of man by man.

"There is no common element between capitalist and socialist ownership since they are not the same types of ownerships. Socialist ownership can be created only after the destruction of the capitalist system, after the seizing of political power by the proletariat. Its creation within the capitalist system contradicts the fundamental interests of the capitalist class, which holds all the economic and political power in the capitalist state. To speak about the accumulation of 'socialist phenomena' in capitalist ownership is equivalent to attempting to reconcile unreconcilable antagonisms, to attempting to deny the fundamental opposition between capitalist and socialist ownership.

"The wholly unscientific character of the theories concerning the pretended peaceful integration of capitalism into socialism -- of capitalist ownership into socialist ownership -- has been clearly demonstrated by realities in socialist countries. The experiences of these countries have proven that socialist ownership can be established only after the revolutionary seizure of state power by the working class."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Becoming more specific, Paraluta attacks the "Yugoslav revisionists, who, distorting Marxist-Leninist teaching about the general laws of socialist construction, assert that the means of production should be socialized only when they are at the disposal of the so-called collectives of producers, thus denying the need for establishing socialist state ownership of the means of production. It is well known that the classics of Marxism-Leninism understood the socialization of the principal means of production to mean the creation of ownership relationships which would guarantee all members of society the same situation in respect to these means, not allowing the utilization of these means by one part of society for the exploitation of the other parts...."

The Yugoslav revisionists are also criticized in another Rumanian publication. Scrisul Banatean, the monthly organ of the Timisoara branch of the Rumanian Writers Union, includes in its July 1960 issue an article by Ion Ariesanu discussing party First Secretary Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej's report to the June 1960 Third Party Congress. Ariesanu echoes Gheorghiu-Dej's condemnation of the Yugoslav revisionists for attacking the party in its role as leader and the socialist state as the instrument of building socialism.

According to Ariesanu, "In the matter of the state, the revisionists, denying the economic role of the socialist state, raise spontaneity to a supreme principle. The results of these 'theories,' applied to the very operation of the Yugoslav economy, are seen very clearly today in the anarchy of their agriculture, where the process of collectivization has stagnated, private wealth has increased and inflated, and small property-holders have been ruined."

Two Rumanian cultural publications express concern over the ideological training of the youth. Luceafarul of 15 August 1960 warns that the enemy (bourgeois ideology) "camouflages itself, adapts itself, and tries to infiltrate, especially where lack of experience in life or weakening of revolutionary vigilance lead it to believe it can remain unobserved for a while." The author of the article exhorts all Union of Working Youth members to combat "manifestations of individualism, disdain for the interests of the collective, nationalistic prejudices, symptoms of moral decay, and pathological curiosity about decadent Western society."

In Contemporanul of 9 September 1960, two university courses for future teachers -- courses in pedagogy and pedagogical psychology -- are criticized for their poor treatment of the historic and class character of education, as well as for their insufficient combativeness and lack of emphasis on Communist morality.

According to articles appearing in the press, writers and artists are not all adhering to the party line and do not all have the proper conception of the party spirit. Criticizing a recent plastic arts exhibit

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

in Bucharest, Scintela of 27 August 1960 comments that "what the artists call 'originality,' the fruit of personal experience, sometimes represents a superficial treatment, a unilateral understanding and a sterile plagiarism of the style of the masters."

Literary critic Savin Bratu's contribution to the recently published volume, Probleme actuale ale literaturii realist-socialiste (Current Problems of Socialist-Realist Literature), is attacked by Tribuna of 18 and 25 August 1960 for its "countless confusions." Also, asserts Tribuna, "The article by Savin Bratu...contains errors of a more serious nature which affect its political and ideological contents. Literary critics maintain, and concrete literary practice strengthens the assertion, that the writer of today is attracted by the new element of society since the new strikes the imagination of the creator in a special way. Savin Bratu maintains the contrary. The old is more evident than the new, since the morbid and abnormal have a greater power of attraction [according to Bratu]."

The Tribuna critic explains that "the error arises from Savin Bratu's bizarre and idyllic idea about the great revolutionary transformations taking place in our country.... Savin Bratu has a fatalistic, mechanistic idea about the development of society, an idea which is more reminiscent of Aeschylus than of the classics of Marxism-Leninism....

"The way in which Bratu conceives of the party spirit is a metaphysical error. According to the critic, the party spirit is an entity independent of the will of men, something which floats above them."

Discussing the writer's responsibility to base his work on actuality, the July 1960 issue of Viata Romineasca states: "We combat the 'theory of distance' not to forbid this or that theme, but because this theory disorients the writers and prevents them from understanding that the principal duty of socialist-realist literature is the reflection of actuality."

VI. YUGOSLAVIA

Peaceful Coexistence

The editor in chief of Belgrade Borba, in its 4 September 1960 issue, reviewing Edvard Kardelj's Socijalizam i Rat (Socialism and War), stresses the importance of maintaining peace and practicing coexistence. Stating that "a country's international behavior is governed by its concrete attitude toward the question of peace," Joze Smole asserts that "conscious socialist forces naturally are aware of their obligation to suppress the emergence of every sign of a lack of belief in the possibility of averting war" and adds that "disbelief as regards peace essentially means disbelief in socialism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Suggesting that the difficulties (economic and political at an international level) which are facing China "have apparently given rise to certain instances of demoralization," Smole submits that "disbelief has been noted [in China] in the development of socialism, the strength of the working class, and social progress in general." He asserts that "by its unrestrained anti-Yugoslav campaign, which is not solely a campaign against Yugoslavia, China has openly expressed its intention and exposed its attempt to force its disbelief as to the possibility of averting war upon other socialist countries and the international workers movement."

Joze Smole then says that conscious socialist forces "cannot remain indifferent to attacks against coexistence," in which these forces "see the most efficient policy of strengthening socialism and social progress." He points out that Kardelj's book "provides evidence of the correctness of the policy of coexistence for which socialist Yugoslavia has always been calling consistently for no purely pacifist reasons, but from the point of view of social progress, the workers movement, and socialism." It also "constitutes another example of the ideological and theoretical strength of the Association of Communists of Yugoslavia in the defense and creative implementation of Marxism and Leninism." Smole concludes that Kardelj's study, "as an indubitable contribution to the development of socialist thought in general, is of great significance to the international workers movement."

Another article by Joze Smole appeared in the 12 September 1960 issue of Borba in rebuttal to a Soviet criticism of Kardelj's book in the 2 September 1960 issue of Moscow's Pravda. Smole notes that the authors were clearly in a great hurry to launch a political attack on Yugoslavia, since they "did not even have enough time to read Kardelj's discourse to the end." He submits that their main intent has been to "forbid Yugoslav Communists to discuss a current problem of socialist international policy, retaining for others the monopolist right to interpret this problem."

A reading of Kardelj's book, he says, makes it clear that "Yugoslav Communists do not care to enter into abstract ideological polemics with others and least of all to become involved in Soviet-Chinese ideological differences." The author discusses the three "theses" of the Pravda discussion and points out that these "theses" have no connection whatever with Kardelj's study. In fact, he charges the authors with failing to act in a "middle role between dogmatism and 'revisionism.'" When they criticize the dogmatists, they use arguments which are the essence of Kardelj's study. When they attack Yugoslav 'revisionism,' they themselves fall into the very dogmatism which they otherwise criticize." However, says Smole, "there can be no middle road in essential socialist problems, such as coexistence. One can only be for or against coexistence.... It is obvious that the Moscow Pravda cannot boast that its 'criticism' has contributed to strengthening the forces of peace and to the unity of the socialist forces in their struggle for peace."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Inhibited Soviet Sociology

Soviet social education is criticized by Dr V. Milanovic in the No 7-8, July-August 1960, issue of the Yugoslav monthly Nasa Stvarnost for failing to interest Soviet researchers in the contemporary social processes.

The author notes that "the central position in sociopolitical education ought to be held by dialectic and historical materialism," but that this is not true of the Soviet educational system, where the basic subject of sociopolitical education is the history of the CPSU. In his view, Soviet historiography has, to be sure, attempted to view the past critically, but it is primarily a "unique synthesis of national history and world historical events" which contains "many elements of romanticism and subjectivism." He admits that the description and analysis of the past 40 years' development "represents in the teaching process a factor whose impressiveness the average student cannot resist and which he cannot accept critically." Thus, he says, Soviet "social education does not adequately develop a free, independent, critical, and investigative attitude in the students toward social phenomena and processes." He submits that an orientation of instruction in which historical science holds the central position cannot by its very nature develop a deeper interest in the problems of contemporary society.

Dr. Milanovic finds some of the Soviet conceptions about the relationship of material, objective conditions and subjective factors to scientific development "very interesting." He notes that Soviet authors frequently stress the material side of the question of the role and tasks of social science and its application in sociopolitical activity and that they continually point to the progress achieved in the material base of the cultural development in the USSR. The author admits that the educational process in the USSR had produced an increasing number of educated and scientific personnel, but when he questions their achievements in Soviet sociology, he suggests that "quantity" does not necessarily produce "quality."

As to the sociological works mentioned by one Soviet sociologist, Milanovic says that "these are great works of a historiographic character, but the Soviet author does not mention a single, more important work of research in social relations and contemporary social movements in the Soviet Union." Milanovic concludes that the reason for "the absence of concrete sociological research in the Soviet Union, the orientation toward historical themes, and the lack of connection between sociological research and the current social processes...should be sought in the political relations, in the current disregard for concrete sociological researches, and in the doctrinaire 'explanation' and guidance of social processes."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Commune" Is Not Communism

Red China's communes are undoubtedly the target of certain disparaging remarks appearing in a discussion of the Yugoslav communal system, in the 17 September 1960 issue of Zagreb Vjesnik, by Dr Jovan Djordjevic. The author remarks that discussions in the Yugoslav press at the time of the introduction of the Yugoslav communal system "did not have a primarily academic character, nor were they preparations for a sudden 'leap' in the introduction of a mechanical, doctrinaire, compulsory, or militarily administrative collectivism which, according to the expression 'commune,' ought to resemble Communism." Describing the social, economic, and political functions of the Yugoslav commune, the author stresses that "it is no longer a territorial grouping of inhabitants, or a 'natural environment' or a 'dormitory for citizens,' but a truly living society of consumption, production, and interpersonal relationships."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 3. WESTERN EUROPE

I. FINLAND

Communist Party Supports Moscow Line on Peace and War

The support of the Finnish Communist Party (FCP) of the Moscow line for peaceful development toward socialism was expressed by Ville Pessi, Secretary-General of the FCP, in his speech of 20 August 1960 at the Central Committee meeting, which was reported by Kansan Uutiset, the Helsinki Communist daily, of 21 August 1960. In the speech, which was devoted to the international situation, Pessi quoted a passage from the Moscow "peace manifesto" of 1957 and claimed that the communique signed at the Bucharest Conference was in complete accord with it. To substantiate his statement that the program of the FCP was in complete accord with both statements, Pessi quoted the following excerpt from the program: "The FCP attempts to promote the kind of democratic development that will ensure victory in our country to the working population, which represents the majority of the people; that will transfer political power to the working class and the workers who are in alliance with it; and that will form a majority grouping even in the Diet to put through reforms leading to a socialistic system. The Communist Party desires the victory of socialism through peaceful means. However, the violence of the antirevolutionary forces could necessitate repelling it with the workers' forces...."

The statement issued by the Central Committee of the FCP at the close of its meeting reiterated the support of the Moscow "peace" line. This statement, which was published by Kansan Uutiset on 23 August 1960, referred to the "unanimous approval" of the Bucharest communique and claimed that the policies practiced by the FCP, as well as the decisions of its 12th congress in April 1960, support the decisions reached at Bucharest. To corroborate the FCP's upholding of peaceful coexistence, the statement noted that the 12th congress established that the policies of peaceful coexistence had proved beneficial to the Finnish people in that they resulted in a stabilization of democratic conditions in Finland, led to favorable trade relations between Finland and the USSR, developed new work possibilities for the Finnish people, decreased reactionary prejudice and promoted an objective relationship toward the USSR, and make the USSR's achievements and policies known in Finland.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

II. ITALY

Socialist Deputy Raps Misuse of Term "Revisionism"

Misuse of the term "revisionism" by the Communist Party was charged by Antonio Giolitti, deputy of the Italian Socialist Party (PSI), in the 11 September 1960 issue of the PSI newspaper Avanti!, of Rome. Giolitti was responding to a query by Ulderico Pazzagli, of Pisa, who in a letter to the newspaper asked what was behind the "revisionism, dogmatism, extremism, sectarianism," and such apparent "windmills," undefined targets of the Communist Party's sallies.

Giolitti said that, far from being "windmills," these were real ideological and political positions held by certain men and groups, but that they and their proponents were very hard to describe and identify because "the Communist Party leaders always conceal and distort the thinking of the opponents whom they are combating within the party and at times outside of it also, especially when dealing with burning questions of ideology and labor history."

Furthermore, he continued, experience, especially since 1956, shows that the Communists "systematically reject open and loyal discussion and systematically resort to falsification and slander." As examples he mentioned the latter treatment accorded in Rinascita, theoretical journal of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), to his own volume, Il comunismo in Europa (Communism in Europe), as well as to the book by Sergio D'Angelo and Leo Paladini, La sfida di Krusciov (The Challenge of Khrushchev). (For reviews of these books published in Rinascita, see Summary No 2776, Review of Communist Theoretical Journals (6).) Not, he observed, that the PCI lacked arguments for a serious critique; it was only that its leadership had decided that one must not engage in discussion about the Third International and the Soviet Union, but must repeat only the content of "official versions carrying the imprimatur."

Giolitti concluded by giving the Bernsteinian definition of revisionism (or reformism) and decrying the "derogatory and slanderous" slant given now to a word used in connection with a "serious and honorable body of opinion which finds its place, with full rights of expression, within the labor movement and the struggle for socialism."

* * *

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120007-8

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120007-8