

THE MILITARY-POLITICAL PROGRAMME OF THE WORKERS' COMMUNIST
PARTY (MARXIST-LENINIST) OF NORWAY

1979

EROL Note: Unofficial English language translation [1980]

Internal Distribution by the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain

FOREWORD

This booklet contains AKP(M-L)'s military-political programme, which was adopted at a national conference in late spring, 1979. At the back of the booklet there are comments on the handling of the military programme from the party working committee. Also included are the most important votes on the programme by the national conference.

Here, right at the beginning of the booklet, we draw attention to the fact that the AKP(M-L) will gladly accept comments on the programme from people outside the party. This applies also to people who disagree with us politically and who are against the military programme.

AKP(M-L) does not look upon its military policy, as formulated from the national conference's resolutions, as complete or above criticism. The newspaper "Klassekampen" (Class Struggle) and the journal "Røde Fane" (Red Flag) are open to comments which are critical of the programme. AKP(M-L) will also gladly take part in public debates on the military question.

The danger of war between the superpowers, and particularly of Soviet attack, is now increasing rapidly. In this situation, the defence of the people of Norway is not a matter which only concerns the supporters of one particular party. If this programme can lead to a broader mobilisation for a genuine defence of Norway, both amongst ordinary working people and also amongst anti-imperialists, democrats, and communists who are politically in disagreement with our party, then the military programme will have fulfilled its purpose.

July 1979

Working Committee of AKP(M-L).

AKP(M-L)'s Military-political Programme

Adopted at the National Conference, Spring 1979

1) Introduction.

1.1) A Pre-war Era.

After the Second World War, the imperialist system stabilized itself for a time. Of the victors, the USA was the leading imperialist power and the only superpower. No imperialist power could compete with the USA in the struggle for world domination. After the Soviet Union became capitalist and imperialist, the picture changed. The SU is a newcomer and therefore lacks the same type of control which the USA has had. At the same time, as the USA has dropped back militarily and economically, the SU has advanced. The SU is therefore trying to expand its control, while the USA is trying to hold on to its control. This rivalry over world domination is bound to lead to an imperialist war for the re-distribution of the world, because under imperialism, there is no alternative to war in settling this type of contradiction. The realisation that we live in a pre-war era presents the working class with a long list of unsolved political problems. This document is AKP(M-L)'s answer to a number of these.

1.2) The General Line.

To a large degree AKP(M-L) has a military-political line which is laid down in its general programme. This military-political programme builds on these principles and develops them in relation to this general line. This is the main theme of the party's general line in the area of military politics:

AKP(M-L) has concluded, on the basis of the world situation at the end of the 1970's that we now live in a pre-war era. We have determined that the danger of a new world war increases for every day that goes by. We have correctly proved that the increased danger of war is a result of the rivalry between the imperialist superpowers, the SU and USA. We have proved that rising Soviet social-imperialism, through expansionism and the politics of war and aggression is forcing forward a demand for a new division of the world.

On this basis, we have said that if Norway is attacked by a superpower and the country occupied, it is only a people's war which can drive the enemy into the sea. We have said that the Norwegian people in such a situation must start a national revolutionary liberation war. Further, we made it quite clear that our strategy is to continue the socialist revolution after the war of national liberation has fulfilled its role.

We have made it clear that we are supporters of conscription and that we actively support people carrying out their conscription duty in order to learn military skills and the use of weapons.

Further, we have taken the standpoint that the Norwegian defence forces are the military apparatus of the bourgeoisie. It is not just directed outwards, but also inwards against the people. In certain situations, it can also be used in unjust wars outside the country's borders.

The Norwegian bourgeoisie is imperialist and therefore no reliable defender of Norwegian self-determination. The experience of the Second World War shows that the bourgeoisie provides the class basis for capitulationism. In connection with a superpower invasion, there is therefore a great danger of the bourgeoisie seeking an "arrangement" with the invading power in order to assure "peace and quiet" and thereby their profits.

At the same time, we have shown that the bourgeoisie can stand for defence of self-determination and thereby just defence against Soviet invasion.

We have shown that the rivalry between the SU and USA is making for an imperialist war for the re-division of the world. But we have also shown that if the Norwegian forces fight against invasion it will be just. In fact, the better they fight, the better it will be. We will support such a war actively. At the same time, we presume that the official bourgeois resistance will collapse.

In the battle to drive out an invasion force, we are willing to unite,

2.

on definite conditions, with those parts of the bourgeoisie who wish to fight.

The working class must not subordinate itself to the bourgeoisie's leadership in the war, but must itself hold onto the initiative and independence, regardless of what kinds of alliances might be on the cards.

We have defended this line against revisionist pacifism and against other attacks from the bourgeoisie. There is no reason to alter this general line.

But on a number of points we have re-assessed some questions on the basis of changes in the world situation.

At the same time that we have had a correct general line, we have also made errors in this area. These have expressed themselves, among other ways, in the party making correct statements on, for example, the defence forces, civil defence, and the content of military service, which have not been followed up in practical political work.

There have been some mistakes in the party's position on defence payments, female conscription, and the politics of alliances. These errors are an expression of dogmatism and revisionist influences.

2) Marxism-Leninism and its View of War.

2.1)

As long as there is exploitation there will be wars. In the world today there are imperialist wars of plunder, wars of national liberation, and revolutionary wars. We agree with the bourgeois theorist Clausewitz's thesis that war is the continuation of politics by other-i.e. violent-means.

Mao says that politics is bloodless war and that war is bloody politics. He says that war forces itself forward to solve contradictions in politics which politics are unable to solve peacefully.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought has also made clear that wars will exist as long as exploitation exists. It has shown that imperialism inevitably leads to wars between imperialists and to wars of plunder against oppressed people and nations. This inevitably leads to revolutionary uprisings and wars against imperialist exploitation and repression. Therefore, Mao says, "

"We go in for the abolition of wars. We don't want war. But war can only be abolished through war, and to get rid of weapons it is first necessary to take up the gun."

2.2) Just and Unjust Wars

We communists are therefore neither for nor against war in general. We distinguish between just and unjust wars. In "On Protracted War," Mao says, "History shows that wars are divided into two kinds, just and unjust. All wars that are progressive are just, and all wars that impede progress are unjust. We Communists oppose all unjust wars that impede progress, but we do not oppose progressive, just wars. Not only do we Communists not oppose just wars, we actively participate in them."

Which are just and which are unjust wars can only be decided on the basis of a concrete analysis of the war in question, whose interests it serves and what goal it has.

If a bourgeois, or for that matter, a feudal regime, is attacked by a country under bourgeois rule, there are those who would say that both sides necessarily are waging an unjust war. Such a simplistic view of what is a just/unjust war is an absurdity. Such a "principled stand" sweeps away the distinction between aggression and the victims of aggression.

Ethiopia under the feudal emperor suffered aggression from fascist Italy before the Second World War. The war the emperor's troops waged against Mussolini's armies was a just war of defence against imperialist aggression.

The extent that the Norwegian bourgeois forces waged war against the German invasion forces in 1940, this was a just war of defence against aggression, while the Nazi troops waged an unjust imperialist war.

When Mobutu's government in 1977 waged war against the Soviet-organized mercenary invasion, this was a just war of defence against social-imperialist

aggression. Mobutu's reactionary internal policies do not change this.

These are some examples of just wars where opportunists and social-chauvinists have put the aggressor and the victim of aggression on the same level, and even supported the aggressor because the victim of aggression was "reactionary."

Because the distinction between a just and an unjust war must be drawn on the basis of a concrete analysis of its content, it is impossible to decide the war's character according to whether it is waged on one's own territory or the other side's. The USSR's war against Nazi Germany was a just war. This war obviously became no less just when the Soviet army crossed Germany's borders to complete the task of smashing the Nazis' military forces for good.

In the same way, it was a just, and not unjust, action when the Soviet army crossed the northern border (of Norway-trans.) to attack the German occupation forces in northern Norway.

If the present-day, imperialist Soviet Union crossed the Norwegian border with a view to occupying Norwegian territory, then it is clear that that would be an unjust war of aggression.

The First, imperialist, World War (1914-1918) was an unjust war, in which both sides in the two imperialist power blocks fought for the right to exploit and oppress the colonies. Lenin condemned the opportunists in the labour movement who, in this war, under the slogan, "Defence of the Fatherland" defended their own bourgeoisie's "right" to commit aggression.

But this didn't mean that Lenin was against all wars of the capitalist countries of Europe from 1914-1918, and nor did he reject "defence of the fatherland" altogether and at all times, as various revisionists claim.

Lenin made it clear that it was quite possible for small capitalist countries to fight just national wars against annexation by the great powers. In "The Discussion on Self-determination Summed Up," Lenin made it quite clear that, "If Belgium, let us say, is annexed by Germany in 1917, and in 1918 revolts to secure her liberation, the Polish comrades will be against her revolt on the grounds that the Belgian bourgeoisie possess "the right to oppress foreign peoples!... There is nothing Marxist or even revolutionary in this argument."

With reference to the slogan, "Defence of the Fatherland," Lenin is just as clear. In "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution" he says, "To accept "defence of the fatherland" in the present war is no more nor less than to accept it as a "just" war, a war in the interests of the proletariat-no more nor less, we repeat, because invasions may occur in any war. It would be sheer folly to repudiate "defence of the fatherland" on the part of oppressed nations in their wars against the imperialist Great Powers, or on the part of a victorious proletariat in its war against some Gallifet* of a bourgeois state."

What sort of wars does Lenin view as progressive or just? Here he has already mentioned two types:

- national wars against aggression or annexation;
- socialist countries' defensive wars against reactionary wars of intervention;

-in addition, Lenin mentions proletarian civil war to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism.

Various kinds of revisionists claim that "progressive national wars under imperialism are impossible." They claim that countries which themselves are capitalist or imperialist cannot wage a just war against aggression. They claim justification for such a standpoint from Lenin. This is fraudulent. The example of Lenin's comments on Belgium proves this. But Lenin has also expressed himself on progressive national wars in Europe in the era of imperialism in general. In "The Junius Letter," Lenin says, "Third, even in Europe, national wars in the imperialist epoch cannot be regarded as impossible." (1916)

* (Trans. A counter-revolutionary general, participant in the suppression of the Paris Commune)

4.

In the same article, Lenin states that even "agreat national war in Europe" would be possible in certain circumstances!

If communists are to be able to work out a correct strategy and tactics towards the growing threat of war, it is essential that we manage to grasp these central principles in the Marxist theory of war.

3. The Danger of War Is Increasing

3.1) The rivalry for Europe.

The superpowers are obviously contending over land and sea areas all over the world, and they have even expanded this rivalry into space. However, both militarily and economically, Europe is the focus of their contention. Here, both the superpowers have their greatest forces. This is the world's greatest industrial region. If one superpower can force the other out of Europe, it will have gone a long way towards winning the battle for world domination. Areas such as the Middle East and Africa have great strategic significance in themselves, but they are, in addition, gateways to Europe. The struggle between the two superpowers for world domination in these areas is therefore also a part of the preparations for a show-down in Europe.

3.2) Norway between the superpowers.

Norway lies in the firing-line between the two-superpowers. As a member of NATO, Norway is an important piece in US imperialism's attempts to maintain its domination in Europe. NATO has trained for nuclear attacks in parts of Norway and carried out exercises against workers, students and revolutionaries.

But Norway is first and foremost threatened by Soviet aggression towards the west. Just as on its southern flank, the Soviet Union is involved in strengthening its forces, on its northern flank as a link in its preparations for a new world war.

An important goal of Soviet policy is, through political pressure, to push Norway gradually into a position of dependence on the Soviet Union, similar to that in which Finland has found itself. At the same time, the Soviet Union is carrying on military preparations for seizing Norway in a lightning attack early in the course of a European war. The Soviet military base on Svalbard (Spitzbergen) and the provocations against Norwegian territory in the north are an open threat to Norwegian self-determination and independence. This is a challenge to the working class, the trade union movement, mass organizations and all freedom-loving people in Norway. It is an imperative task of the struggle to stand up against this policy of aggression and isolate those reactionary forces which are the supporters of this policy in Norway.

It is Soviet social-imperialism which today represents the greatest military threat to Norway. It is of course possible that the USA will try to pre-empt the Soviet Union through a so-called "preventive occupation," with or without the Norwegian authorities' blessing. But this is not likely.

In today's situation, there is no basis in reality to claim that US imperialism constitutes the major military threat to Norway, as the revisionists do. But it is not only that. It is not even correct to put the danger of attack from the two superpowers on an equal footing. Such a comparison disguises the fact that today it is the Soviet Union which is pushing towards a new war.

If the Soviet Union attacks Norway, then armed resistance from the Norwegian side would be a just war of defence, regardless of whether it is the bourgeoisie who lead it or not.

If today, the Norwegian government takes steps which oppose Soviet pressure and expansionism, then this is just. If the bourgeois Norwegian government uses the army against a Soviet invasion, then this is just; it is a defence against aggression.

Not being clear about this from the start necessarily leads to capitulationism and even support of social-imperialism's policy of war and aggression.

3.3) Soviet Union on the offensive-the greatest threat to world peace.

The party programme of 1976 stated, "The struggle between the superpowers has now developed to the point where Soviet social-imperialism is on the offensive against US imperialism. The Soviet Union has pushed forward with determination, obtained bases in and control over strategic areas, won the upper hand in the arms race, all at the expense of the USA. The Soviet Union is a young superpower on the way up which wishes to obtain, by any means, a new division of the world. The Soviet Union is the superpower which will, in all likelihood, launch the war."

The Soviet Union is the younger of the superpowers, and the one which historically has had a smaller area under its hegemony. Economically, the Soviet Union is relatively weaker than the USA. On the one hand, this means that the possibility of the Soviet Union competing successfully with the USA through economic means is a very limited one, and the Soviet Union, therefore, is desperately turning to military means to achieve hegemony at the expense of the USA. We have seen this in many places in the Third World in recent times.

On the other hand, the growth of the USA's economic power has stagnated over recent years while the Soviet Union's economic power has grown. This is leading to increasing pressure from the Soviet Union for a new division of colonies and neo-colonies, to its advantage.

Despite the fact that the USA's total economic strength is greater than the Soviet Union's, we can see that the latter's position as a rising superpower inevitably makes for a new imperialist war for the re-division of the world.

Inevitably, this has become apparent in the Soviet Union's extensive expansionist and aggressive policies over recent years. The invasion of Angola, the colonial wars in the Horn of Africa, infiltration into Latin America, the extensive use of Cuban mercenaries, the use of Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea, the coups in Afghanistan and many other countries show that social imperialism will use any means to expand.

That this expansion will compel desperate measures from the other superpower is obvious. We must therefore ask, with Lenin, "What means other than war could there be under capitalism of removing the disparity between the development of productive forces and the accumulation of capital on the one side, and the division of colonies and "spheres of influence" for finance capital on the other?" ("Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism")

Developments in the world over recent years show that the world is pregnant with war. It is the Soviet policy of war and aggression in particular which gives grounds for disquiet. The new Tsars' systematic preparations for war and open aggression make it necessary to state clearly that it is the Soviet Union which is on the offensive and is the most dangerous source of war.

3.4) The struggle against the Soviet policy of war and aggression.

A war between the superpowers for world domination will be a third world war. It will be an unjust, imperialist war of re-division. Such a war will be a disgusting attack on the interests of the people of the world and will trample the national independence of a number of nations in the dust.

Therefore, all the peoples of the world will rise up in resistance and mount national revolutionary wars of liberation against annexation and occupation. These will be just and progressive wars, which will deal out new, historic defeats to imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction.

But a third world war need not necessarily be an unjust war for the main protagonists from the word go. If the world is launched into a third world war with a Soviet attack on, for example, socialist China, then, obviously, resistance by China would constitute a just war. Capitalist/imperialist countries which in this situation take up the fight against social-imperialism on China's side would likewise be waging a just war.

In this way, for example, the third world war can, right from the start, have the character of a worldwide war between Soviet imperialism and fascism on the one hand and a broad anti-social imperialist camp on the other.

Norway has borders with the Soviet Union, and lies inside the zone which the ~~social-imperialists~~ considers to be its defence perimeter. The Soviet Union will therefore put its all into rapidly gaining control of Norway and the northern flank on the outbreak of war. It considers a rapid occupation of Norway to be a decisive step in securing its Murmansk base and the enormous military installations on the Kola peninsula. Any idea that Norway will not be dragged into an approaching war is illusory.

Against this background, we have to make sure that we are vigilant against all superpower aggression. But it is first and foremost a Soviet invasion for which the Norwegian people must prepare themselves. The party must take seriously the job of making the threat of war clear to the people.

With the relatively slow development of the class struggle in Norway today there is little to suggest that a revolutionary situation will arise in Norway before the outbreak of a new world war. This also has significance for priorities in political work.

3.5) Can the war be avoided or delayed?

We communists do not want war, as the propagandists of revisionism and social-imperialism claim. On the contrary, we are opposed to the war which the superpowers, especially the Soviet Union, are preparing. Not only that. AKP(M-L) is the only Norwegian party which consistently fights against the preparations of both superpowers for war.

But, at the same time, we are materialists. We know that the world is pregnant with war, and it would be a complete betrayal of the Norwegian working people to gloss over this. To disguise the real threat of war which exists would be to actively work to make the Norwegian people impotent against approaching superpower aggression. Therefore, we fight against the war which the Soviet Union is planning to unleash.

What factors are there which can prevent this war?

Mao Zedong has given a clear and principled summary of this: "Either war will give rise to revolution, or revolution will prevent war."

It is only victorious socialist revolutions in the two superpowers—and first and foremost, the Soviet Union—which can prevent the definite imperialist war of re-division which is now being prepared.

Such is the level of class struggle in the two superpowers in reality that it seems unrealistic to believe such a development can occur in the near future.

What are the factors which can delay war? First and foremost, a worldwide struggle against the Soviet policy of aggression and the superpowers' preparations for war.

Of particular importance is the third world's struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. The more defeats the people and nations of the third world can inflict on the superpowers, the greater the problems the latter will have in launching a new world war.

The more countries in the second world stand up to pressure from the superpowers, the greater the problems the superpowers will have in the battle to gain strategic dominance. This means that the struggle which the peoples of the smaller capitalist countries conduct to defend their sovereignty and independence is an important struggle against the war preparations.

Appeasement, presenting the Soviet Union's aggressive policy in a rosy light, etc, will, on the other hand, help the Soviet Union's offensive.

The revolutionary foreign policy of the socialist countries, and especially the People's Republic of China, is an important factor in exposing the preparations of the superpowers for war. It is likewise an important factor in the struggle against hegemonism and the aggressive policy of the superpowers.

The further development of these factors can play a part in delaying war and frustrating the war plans of the superpowers. This is positive and to the advantage of the world's people because it will give them time to prepare to hit back at aggression and to strengthen their position in the fight against imperialism and all reaction.

3.6) A fight on two fronts

The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie remains the main contradiction in Norway. The struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie's economic, political and other oppression must therefore be put first on the agenda.

At the same time, the contradiction between Norway and social-imperialism is increasing in importance. Under an occupation, this contradiction will be the most important one, and it is already, during preparations for an occupation, of great importance. It is therefore necessary for the working class to conduct a struggle on two fronts. It is necessary to exploit any contradictions which can be exploited in order to make the basis for a war of national liberation as strong as possible. A strengthening of the working class in the domestic class struggle strengthens, at the same time, those forces which must be the leading forces in such a war of resistance. Thus, there is a link between the two struggles, but, at the same time, they are of a different character and cannot be treated as if they are the same thing.

3.7) The theory of the Three Worlds

Mao Zedong's theory of the Three Worlds is the key to correctly understanding the world situation, and making clear which forces can be mobilized in the struggle against imperialism, social imperialism and reaction.

This theory sums up the present development in the world of the fundamental contradictions of imperialism.

It shows that the two superpowers are the main enemy of the world's people. It makes clear that the most important expression of the rivalry between the imperialist powers is the rivalry between the two superpowers for world domination. It makes it clear that social imperialism is on the offensive and is the most important source of a new war.

The theory of the Three Worlds shows that the national independence and self-determination of the smaller imperialist powers is threatened and that they are oppressed by the superpowers. It shows that the countries of the Second World can therefore be pressed into taking steps against hegemonism and subjugation by the superpowers.

The theory maintains that the Third World is the main force in the fight against imperialism and social-imperialism in the present situation. This means that the wars of liberation against imperialism, joint action against the superpowers and defence of the right of self-determination for the countries of the Third World comprise a mighty revolutionary movement, which deserves all possible support.

To abandon the theory of the Three Worlds would mean to abandon a scientific assessment of the world situation. To abandon the theory of the Three Worlds means abandoning the recognition of the necessity for a revolutionary strategy, which unites all who can be united to advance the revolution and the struggle against imperialism.

To abandon the theory of the Three Worlds would involve, for revolutionaries in a country such as ours, abandoning the struggle against the preparations of the superpowers for war, abandoning the struggle against the Soviet policy of war and aggression, and going against the preparation of the Norwegian working people to meet a superpower invasion with armed resistance.

It is for this reason that the attacks on Mao's theory of the Three Worlds, spearheaded by the modern revisionists, are an expression of a counter-revolutionary policy. It doesn't help a bit to try and dress up this policy with radical phrases like the Albanian leadership does. It is still a reactionary policy, and first and foremost, support for Brezhnev and social-imperialism!

4. Fight Modern Revisionism on the Military Question

4.1)

A central thesis among modern revisionists of all types is that "the Soviet Union represents no threat of war."

The Albanian leaders, in reality, support such a thesis. This is revealed by, amongst other things, the way in which they have ceased in practice to carry on the struggle against Brezhnev's policy of war and aggression. They

8.

talk as though the revisionist party in Italy was more dangerous than Brezhnev. They present reactionary leaders in the Third World as more dangerous enemies of the world's people than the new Tsars! They support the Soviet-organized Vietnamese aggression against revolutionary Kampuchea, etc.

Reactionary parties such as "NCP" (Norwegian Communist Party) project the Soviet Union as "peace-loving" and "socialist."

Revisionists such as the "SV" (Socialist Left Party)* leadership claim that there "is no danger of war," there "is no aggressive fascist power in Europe," etc. For opportunist reasons, they direct a certain amount of "criticism" at conditions within the Soviet Union, but fight bitterly against accepting that the Soviet Union is an imperialist superpower.

The arguments of the various revisionists are different, but the content of their line is the same; pretty fying the Soviet Union and social-imperialism.

For these reasons, these forces form a common front in many areas; among other things, they carry out a common reactionary campaign against China's foreign policy.

4.2)

Particular revisionist groupings have made themselves spokesmen for imperialist pacifism. Particularly prominent among these are some groups in the SV leadership. They deny that a bourgeois army in a country like Norway can wage a just war against superpower aggression. They go in for "full disarmament" and try to justify this by the claim that there "is no danger of war in the foreseeable future."

Such a line is both reformist and constitutes support for Soviet expansionism.

Firstly, talk about "full disarmament" under capitalism is reformist fantasy. To believe that the bourgeoisie is willing to dissolve its military forces is the same as believing that it will give up state power of its own free will. It is only the proletariat's own armed power which can dissolve the bourgeois military power through revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. No parliamentary vote can do it.

Secondly, this line stands the world on its head by sweeping away the real danger of war with a stroke of the pen and thereby making (the superpowers-Translator) preparations for war easier.

AKP(M-L) considers fighting against these views and all other forms of revisionism on the military question as a central task. Such a struggle is crucial for exposing the superpowers' war preparations. It is extremely important for preparing the Norwegian people for waging a war of resistance against Soviet aggression.

5. Who Can Be Mobilized to Resist a Soviet Invasion?

5.1)

If the Soviet Union attacks Norway, which political and class forces will it be possible to mobilize for resistance? The Party Programme has, in principle, answered this question correctly: "The proletariat must reply to an attack by waging a war of national liberation against the imperialist war. The working people of Norway must answer the imperialist power which is waging an unjust war, with its own just war of defence.

Only the proletariat and the working people will have everything to gain and nothing to lose by fighting with all their strength against the attacking power. Only they have the power to defend the interests of the nation and people and to liberate Norway."

The working class and its allies will be the main force in the war of resistance against Soviet aggression against Norway.

But the Party Programme doesn't satisfy itself just with saying this. It also analyses which forces, in addition to the proletariat and working

*Translator's note: An alliance of various "socialist" groups similar to the "left-wing" of the Labour Party.

people, can be mobilized in such a struggle. The Party Programme considers the bourgeoisie. It states correctly that the Norwegian bourgeoisie is imperialist. On this basis, it states, "The position which the bourgeoisie will take will be determined by the fact that the Norwegian bourgeoisie is, by and large, a traitor to Norway's national interests."

But this also means that the bourgeoisie, or parts of it, can, under certain circumstances defend national independence and self-determination. If it does so, then this represents a just struggle which the working class supports. But not only that. On the basis of experiences in 1940 when the Norwegian bourgeoisie was characterised by capitulationism, it is vital that the working class fights against capitulationism on the part of the government to aggression from a superpower.

In this connection, the Party Programme says that, "If social-imperialism attacks Norway, there is no reason to suppose that the bourgeoisie's "defence forces" will put up any great resistance. Most likely, the armed forces will be dissolved as they were in 1940. If they should resist, under the leadership of the bourgeois government, an imperialist attack, then AKP(M-L) will see this as a just war which the proletariat supports."

Even though we have no illusions about them, AKP(M-L) will call on the proletariat to support a just war by the bourgeois Norwegian army against unjust aggression.

The working class has an interest in defending national independence. If this is violated by, for example, social-imperialism, it will mean that bourgeois democratic rule in Norway will be replaced by a fascist, social-imperialist occupation-dictatorship. Such a dictatorship will represent a general attack on the working class and the people's everyday interests. It will mean a historical step backwards and make the possibilities for social revolution much worse. It is for this reason too that the working class will fight against such an attack.

The front which it is possible to mobilize for such a war of resistance will be very broad. A policy which is based on the view that "the working class has no national interests" and which is based on having "clean hands in relations with the bourgeoisie" means only defeat. Such a "clean hands" policy will quite certainly end in defeat by a powerful enemy.

For this reason, the proletariat must work out real revolutionary tactics, tactics of mobilizing all forces which can be mobilized to meet the attacker with military resistance. It is therefore to the advantage of the working class if the bourgeois army resists an unjust invasion.

It is therefore necessary today for communists to work out a policy which to the greatest possible extent forces the government to resist and which to the greatest possible extent makes difficulties for capitulationism.

5.2) But the bourgeois military forces in Norway will not be capable of waging a protracted war against a Soviet invasion army. The whole armament, tactics and military policy of the Norwegian military forces is based on short-term resistance. The Party Programme therefore states quite correctly that, "Even if the Norwegian "defence forces" should put up a certain resistance to attack, it is most likely that this would fall apart after a short time."

It is therefore the armed people themselves who, during a protracted war, are the only force which could liberate Norway from occupation and foreign control.

But even if the official authorities will capitulate after a time, it is also likely that there will continue to be bourgeois resistance groups against Soviet occupation. The working class must, under particular circumstances, be willing to unite with such groups to defeat the main enemy.

But the working class must in no circumstances give away its leadership of such a struggle.

5.3) This is the prerequisite for being able to go forward when the war of resistance is won. If the proletariat and the working people succeed in defeating such an aggressor as social imperialism there will be an en-

10.

tirely new situation in the country. The Party Programme states that the way will then be open at once to carry on to complete the socialist revolution and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat."

5.4) The people of Norway will not stand alone in a great war of resistance to a superpower aggressor.

If Norway is attacked, this aggression will be part of a world-wide war unleashed by the superpowers.

The peoples of the whole world will rise up against aggression and subjugation and fight for national liberation and revolution.

The people of Norway will stand shoulder to shoulder with the proletariat of the whole world, with the people of the Third World and with all forces which fight against the unjust war.

This will be a powerful support for the people of Norway, both materially and politically.

6. The Masses Must Prepare Themselves For A Peoples War of National Revolution Against Social-Imperialism

6.1) A people's war against a Soviet army of invasion and occupation will be a great war of resistance which unites all patriotic forces which stand up against slavery under social-imperialism.

To wage such a war, the people's own armed forces must be built up. It is fantasy to believe that the bourgeois army can be "reformed" into such an army.

The working class must take the leadership of such an army and in such a war.

The people must be prepared to resist from the first moment that the new Tsars set foot on Norwegian soil. But they will be facing a mighty enemy with vast resources. Such a war of resistance and liberation will therefore be protracted and demand great sacrifice.

The people's armed forces will be weak and scattered at the beginning of such a war, but they must be systematically built up into a powerful armed force of the people.

The condition for this happening is that a great broad resistance front is built up which unites all genuinely patriotic and progressive forces.

Such a people's army must learn to apply Mao Zedong's theories on people's war and guerrilla war to Norwegian conditions. This is a condition for waging the war correctly, both strategically and tactically, and a condition for winning victory.

6.2) The more the working people prepare themselves before an eventual war, the more certain it is that they will be able to achieve the aims of a people's war: drive the occupying forces into the sea and liberate the country. The basis for carrying on towards social liberation will then also be laid.

We will not find ready made answers to the problems of waging people's war in a country like Norway anywhere. The working people of Norway must be prepared to tread new paths, to release all their initiative and exploit all positive factors to their advantage.

7. Our Attitude To The Bourgeois Armed Forces Today

7.1) Our basic attitude to the bourgeois armed forces is clear. "The bourgeois army is the nucleus of the bourgeoisie's state power. When it comes to the point, it will be used against the working class, against just revolts and revolution. The bourgeois army can be used to bring in fascism and terrorise working people. This we condemn and struggle against."

"The bourgeois army can wage a just war against aggression. This we support."

7.2) At the same time, we reject the pacifist illusion that the army under capitalism can be "dissolved" by "peaceful means". It is utopian to believe that the bourgeois army can be placed under "people's control." However, the bourgeois army is a reality, and it can wage just war. It is therefore necessary to have a concrete policy and tactics towards it.

7.3) We communists support having a conscripted army and are against having a professional army. We are for revolutionaries going into the army. Progressive and revolutionary work among soldiers must include agitation against the army being used against the people, and conscription must be utilised so that the people learn military skills.

As long as it is not possible for us to get rid of the bourgeois army and replace it with a people's army, we will fight for an army organization which is as much to the advantage of the working class and the people as possible. This means:

We fight for an organization of the army and defence forces which makes it as easy as possible for the people to continue the struggle if Norway is occupied and the central military and state leadership collapses.

We are for laws which forbid the use of troops against strikes, which prevent the use of Norwegian troops against liberation movements, etc.

We do not have any illusions that this will prevent the bourgeoisie from using the military apparatus in a reactionary way. But it can provide a basis for mass mobilization if this should happen.

We are for the purging of fascist elements in the army. We are for democratic rights for soldiers, because this can make it more difficult to use the military apparatus against the people and make it easier to mobilize for action against a Soviet attack.

We are for decentralization of mobilisation organization, strengthening of local defence and more training for operations in districts which the soldiers know well.

We are for reservists having weapons and personal equipment at home.

7.4) AKP(M-L) supports female conscription. When we advocate conscription it is necessary that we support women being included. Anything else would mean reducing women to something "inferior."

We are for the full liberation of women. To hold women outside conscription under capitalism means cutting half the population off from learning military skills and the use of weapons.

This would mean suggesting that women will be without importance in the revolution and that they will have secondary tasks if we are occupied.

It has been claimed that female conscription would "strengthen the bourgeoisie's military apparatus." The only logical conclusion to be drawn from such a point of view is to reject conscription. We communists do not do this because that would mean going in for a reformist policy.

It is not the soldiers' sex which will decide whether the army is used against the people or not. If we want to prevent such a thing, it is our policy inside the army and the work there which will be decisive.

AKP(M-L) considers that women, to as great an extent as possible, ought to exploit those arrangements already in existence in the defence forces to gain military training. But at the same time, we are against regulations against women being permitted to serve in fighting units and demand that they be abolished.

AKP(M-L) demands in addition that economic and social conditions be corrected so that it becomes possible for most women to acquire military training.

7.5) The 1976 Party Programme put forward the slogan, "not a penny for the bourgeois military apparatus." Lenin put this slogan forward as a tactical slogan during the First World War. On Lenin's part, this slogan did not embody any demand for "disarmament." It is not referenda on the military budget, but only an armed working class which can disarm the bourgeoisie. The slogan was first and foremost, a guideline on what position parliamentary representatives should take towards the military budget during the imperialist war. It followed a line of voting against so as to expose. It is also important to be clear on the fact that this slogan was put forward at a time when a revolutionary situation was developing in a number of European countries.

In the post-war era, this slogan has not been as vital, but first and foremost has been a means of exposing the class character of the Norwegian armed forces. Its most important function has been to demonstrate that the

armed forces are being prepared to be used against the working people in this country.

However, no slogan is correct regardless of time and place. What decides whether a policy is correct or not are investigations of the facts and not statements about "what Lenin said." This is in keeping with Lenin's approach when he analysed the First World War.

It is no longer a post-war era; now it is a pre-war era. We must therefore evaluate the slogan again. We must decide whether it is correct today.

AKP(M-L) considers that it is not correct today. We are under threat of Soviet occupation. The capability of the bourgeois defence forces to resist such an invasion is not without concern to us. It is not without concern because we demand that the bourgeois army should put up the greatest possible resistance. We criticise the bourgeoisie because they spiked their guns before 1940. We will also criticise the bourgeoisie if there aren't sufficient weapons when a new invasion occurs.

The previously correct slogan is today of help to social-imperialism. It is no co-incidence that the "not a penny..." line has a firm hold in the SV leadership.

Presented with the danger of war, we must drop the slogan of "not a penny..." and go over to supporting and struggling for provisions which are designed to increase the defensive capability against aggression. Such a policy makes it possible for us to produce a complete, comprehensive and concrete criticism of the present organization of defence. This is necessary for developing the struggle for a defence system which under present-day conditions strengthens the defence forces' capability to fight against Soviet aggression.

The military programme does not go in for such a comprehensive criticism of the present defence system. However, the concrete matters which are dealt with give direction to the continuing work.

Obviously we cannot consider supporting the military budget as a whole, as it contains much which we cannot accept. However, by taking a more flexible approach, we increase the possibilities of concretely criticising the bourgeoisie's military doctrines and plans. We can wage a better class struggle against the bourgeoisie's preparations for capitulation and increase pressure so as to avoid troops being put in the worst possible situation during an invasion. This will strengthen the authority and credibility of revolutionary politics amongst the troops.

7.6) AKP(M-L) demands alteration of the present defence plans which have practically no provision for the defence of South Norway. We demand that infantry is given priority. We demand that the army be equipped with considerably more anti-tank weapons than at present and that the troops in divisions are given proper training in the most effective possible anti-tank warfare. We demand also that army divisions are given effective air cover.

At the same time, we demand that Norwegian tactical thinking be re-directed from static air base defence to mobile warfare.

Norwegian towns are, to all intents and purposes, without effective air cover. This means that the civilian population is particularly vulnerable to terror bombing. We demand that this situation be changed, and that the task of building up such air protection is given priority.

The existing naval plans entail a major weakening of our defence capability in the strategically important waters around Norway. We therefore demand that priority be given to building up a navy which is designed for this sort of defence. In addition, the coastguard fleet must be built up to enable a more effective guard to be kept on Norwegian territorial waters, not least in the northern areas, than is the case today. We also demand priority for and building up of Norway's coastal artillery.

AKP(M-L) is for these and other demands which have as their aim the strengthening of the Norwegian forces capacity to fight a Soviet invasion.

7.7) Obviously, there is a danger that this force could be used against the working class. We take the chance that weapons which should be used against invasion will be turned against the working class.

However, the only guarantee we can develop against this is by strengthening the revolutionary workers' movement's influence amongst the troops and strengthening agitation against the weapons being used against the people.

It was not lack of weapons which resulted in the Tsar being defeated in 1917, but the fact that the troops united with the working class and peasantry and turned their weapons against the Tsar and the bourgeoisie!

Lack of the right weapons can, on the contrary, in fact mean a poor start for a just war against invasion.

7.8) We combine demands for certain measures with demands that there should be an end to unnecessary wastage and bureaucracy. We criticise the F-16 project, among other things, because it leads to a reduction in the priority of and in fact weakening of the other defence areas. Steps which mean an increased capacity to withstand Soviet aggression obviously cost money. It is for exactly this reason that Norwegian working people have the right to demand that resources are not wasted.

We are therefore against unnecessarily expensive systems which draw resources away from those measures which would really strengthen defence capability. We are against such waste because it puts an unnecessarily large financial burden on working people. And we oppose misplacement of resources which results from incorrect military thinking and poor defence organization.

8. NATO And The Defence Of Norway

8.1) We are, in principle, neither for nor against Norway entering alliances with other states. What decides our attitude towards an alliance is the sort of character it has.

A small country with powerful imperialist neighbours will always need to seek support abroad against attack. It will also be necessary for a socialist Norway to make alliances with other states.

The thing which is decisive for us is: what sort of alliance is being considered? Does it defend Norway's independence? Is it a one-sided alliance which is used by one imperialist power to control other countries? Or is it used to attack and oppress other countries?

We also believe that the defence of Norway's independence must in the main be built from our own forces. Support from other countries is welcome, but it must never take precedence over the mobilization of the people of Norway. It is therefore incorrect to make the question of alliances with other countries and support from them the most important thing. The country which relies on foreign allies to liberate it must also reckon with the same allies attempting to gain control once victory is achieved.

AKP(M-L) opposes the NATO alliance on a basis of principle. NATO is not an alliance entered into on equal terms by all its members. Inside NATO the other states are dominated by the imperialist superpower, the USA.

If in today's situation or any time under capitalism, it became possible to choose, then we communists would prefer a Norwegian defence force independent of the superpowers, to a NATO defence.

At the same time, our policy must be based on the fact that the greatest and most dangerous aggressor in the world today is the Soviet Union. It is the Soviet Union and not NATO which is now the greatest military threat to Norway and the greatest threat to Norwegian sovereignty.

It is therefore necessary to have tactics which both take account of the fact that the main danger is now posed by the Soviet Union, and which also takes account of the role NATO plays in the world today.

As the world situation has altered, so has the significance of NATO. It was originally started as an aggressive, imperialist military alliance directed against the Soviet Union and other countries which were then socialist. NATO was also directed against revolt and revolution in Western Europe and countries which were western colonies.

Today, NATO's role in relation to the Soviet Union is different. The Soviet Union is no longer socialist, but has itself become the more dangerous superpower. The US and western imperialist countries have weakened. The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact long ago overtook NATO in terms of military strength. NATO is therefore now in a defensive position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

It is also a fact that NATO today, to a certain extent, represents a deterrent to Soviet aggression and expansion. NATO represents an important military force. It is also of political importance that an attack on one NATO member can lead to war with the whole alliance. For this reason, the new Tsars in the Kremlin look on NATO as an important obstruction to their expansion in Europe.

This does not mean that NATO has lost its imperialist character. In recent years, it has been shown that NATO is still carrying on exercises directed against striking workers, students and progressive organizations in Norway. The USA and other western imperialist countries still try to use NATO to defend their imperialist interests in the Third World. However, NATO's ability to function as a powerful force in US imperialism's interests in particular is much less than previously.

Soviet propaganda places great emphasis on attacking NATO. It characterises NATO as an "enormously dangerous tool of imperialism" and as a "great threat to peace." The Soviet leaders come out with "demands" which are aimed at forcing Norway out of NATO. The reason for this is that the Soviet leaders want to get NATO out of the way as a part of their preparations for a march to the West.

When the Norwegian revisionists try to pump life into a campaign against NATO, which they themselves killed off in 1969, it is as a result of Soviet tactics aimed at easing their advance into Europe. The revisionists' propaganda exploits the fact that a number of people with anti-imperialist views do not fully understand the changes in the world and still consider US imperialism to be a greater or as great a danger as social-imperialism.

However, in reality, the revisionists' "anti-NATO" stand is not aimed at strengthening Norwegian independence or ability to stand up to Soviet pressure and attacks. This is shown clearly in the way their "fight against NATO" is inseparably linked with propaganda that "the Soviet Union represents no threat to Norway," that "the Soviet Union is peace-loving" that it is "giving assistance" when it is in reality invading other countries, etc.

With this background, it is clear that we must make quite definite demands together with the demand that Norway leaves NATO.

Norwegian withdrawal from NATO can, in fact, mean either an improvement, or a worsening of Norway's position, depending on the circumstances under which such a withdrawal occurs.

If Norway withdraws from NATO and at the same time expresses a clear political will to stand up to social-imperialist expansion, and re-direct its defence in a direction which makes it more capable of meeting a Soviet attack, then this will mean an improvement. Such a withdrawal would have our support.

However, if Norway's withdrawal from NATO should happen on the conditions the Soviet Union proposes, and also lead to a weakening of Norway's ability to stand up to military assault, then this would mean a definite worsening of the situation. It could lead to Norway rapidly being pressed into a situation like Finland's, and that will increase the danger of Soviet occupation. If that was the alternative, then we communists would say that to remain in NATO would be the lesser evil.

On this basis, we can state that "Norway out of NATO" in today's situation is unsuitable as a slogan. We are against NATO in principle and our long term aim is Norway out of NATO. However, because this policy must be inseparably linked to the demand that a withdrawal must not be to the advantage of Soviet expansionism, it is necessary to have more subtle tactics than those the slogan "Norway out of NATO" alone expresses.

8.2) In addition to being in breach of the principles of an equitable alliance, NATO also today hinders a re-organization of the Norwegian military which can strengthen Norwegian military resistance to a Soviet attack. Bourgeois politicians in Norway claim that NATO is capable of protecting Norway from such an attack. This is untrue.

NATO's strategy for Norway is built, militarily speaking, on an illusion. It is built on Norwegian troops, in the event of a Soviet invasion, holding a number of air-bases and bridgeheads in the Northern part of the

country to cover an American landing and the "relief" of NATO's contingency forces. Any defence of South Norway does not, in reality, exist.

The Soviet Union has the military power to cut Norway in two in considerable strength before the American "air-bridge" has started to function at all. The Soviet Union has superior air- and sea-forces on the northern flank. These make the "emerging corps" (?-Trans.) idea and the idea of moving large mobilisation forces from the south to north Norway into a thoroughly unrealistic project.

These plans are not only illusory. They are also reactionary, because the only logical consequence of such a strategy would be to set up American bases in Norway some time before a Soviet attack. This is to fight foreign rule with foreign rule.

8.3) A revisionist idea that has been put forward to oppose support for a just resistance by the bourgeois army in Norway against a Soviet attack, is the idea that such resistance is "unjust if there are NATO forces in Norway."

The communists reject such an idea. If Norwegian troops fight against Soviet aggression to defend Norwegian independence, then this fight is just, regardless of whether there are other countries' troops on Norwegian soil.

This is how it was in 1940 when Norwegian army divisions put up armed resistance to the German attacking forces. That there were British and French troops in Norway doesn't change it one bit.

To the extent that it was fought, it was also correct to concentrate the fight against the main enemy: German Nazi imperialism.

8.4) In connection with the steadily increasing danger of Soviet aggression, it is of great importance that the bourgeois Norwegian army's ability to withstand a Soviet attack is strengthened.

Both NATO's present strategy on the northern flank and the idea of building foreign bases in Norway conflict with the Norwegian people's interests.

The Norwegian defence forces are part of the integrated command system in NATO. This involves the Norwegian air force, being under foreign command today. In a war-time situation, the Norwegian army would be put in the same position. This constitutes a hindrance to the strengthening of Norwegian sovereignty and a hindrance to the strengthening of the ability of the Norwegian defence forces to withstand Soviet aggression. On this basis, AKP(M-L) demands that Norway must withdraw from NATO's command system.

9. The Party Must Prepare Itself And The Masses For War.

9.1) The working class and people of Norway must prepare themselves for people's war against a Soviet invasion and occupation.

It is a central task today to systematically expose the war preparations of the superpowers, and especially the Soviet Union's irresponsible policy of re-armament and aggression. It is especially important to develop the broadest possible unity of action around concrete issues which are aimed against Soviet aggression.

In this connection, it is a central task to mobilise for resistance to Soviet pressure on Norwegian sovereignty in the Northern areas. It is particularly important to mobilise on a broad basis against Soviet militarisation of Norwegian territory on Svalbard.

It is of crucial importance to develop solidarity work with all peoples and especially countries of the Third World in their struggle against the superpowers' policy of repression and hegemony.

9.2) AKP(M-L) must intensify and develop revolutionary work among the troops. A struggle for soldiers' social and economic interests must be launched, and one for soldiers' democratic rights. The struggle among the troops must have the aim of building the broadest possible united front among the troops for just demands.

Despite the fact that the government has systematically imposed limitations on the "rank and file representative" arrangements in the defence

forces, progressives must give most weight to working inside this organization. It is through work in the "rank and file representative" system that it is possible to reach the broad masses of soldiers.

The struggle among the troops cannot be limited to economic struggle, after the revisionists' fashion. A central theme of the struggle concerns the content of the service.

AKP(M-L) will work to mobilise as many soldiers as possible to:

- Demand more information on-and the right to discuss- the military-political and strategic situation.
- Demand proper training in shooting and "field training" to put the troops in the best possible position to meet a Soviet invasion army.
- Struggle against unthinking discipline, which is only fitted for weakening the soldiers' ability to struggle against foreign aggression. In its place there should be all-round instruction to teach the most possible military skill.
- Struggle against using weapons against the people.

9.3) AKP(M-L) supports-and will struggle for-arming the people.

We call on the greatest possible number of working people to take part in voluntary gun clubs and to participate in hunting and sports-shooting.

AKP(M-L) fights for the democratic right to have weapons. The Norwegian bourgeoisie, under the leadership of the social-democratic government have for decades been carrying on a campaign and have taken steps to limit this right. It is necessary to take up the struggle against this reactionary policy.

There are hundreds of thousands of Norwegian working people who in one way or another are today involved in shooting, either sports-shooting, hunting, or voluntary gun clubs. This is a positive development in sports. However, it also represents a significant resource in preparing resistance to aggression against Norwegian independence.

AKP(M-L) therefore supports all the just demands which are raised by the various shooting organizations for improving the opportunities for participation in hunting and sports-shooting.

Particularly important is the demand for proper conditions for shooting practice and training. There is a great lack of shooting-ranges in Norway today. This is the result of a conscious campaign to obstruct sports-shooting. This must be met with demands for increased expansion of shooting-ranges, not least in the cities, so that there are facilities for training close to where people work and live.

An armed people will be the most important guarantee for an effective resistance against, e.g., Soviet aggression against Norway.

9.4) There is a great danger that an aggressor such as the Soviet Union will use nuclear weapons in an attack on Norway. The Soviet army's military doctrine assumes the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

The Norwegian government has done very little to introduce measures designed to protect the civilian population against atomic weapons.

AKP(M-L) demands the comprehensive building up of civil defence against nuclear attack.

Altogether, civil defence is totally inadequate and must be given higher priority. It is important in this connection that the degree of Norwegian self-sufficiency is increased. Further, it is important that priority is given to the building of air-raid shelters, distribution of gas-masks and other civil defence equipment, establishment of food stores and building up of stores of strategic raw materials.

9.5) It is of crucial importance that the working class and progressives in Norway increase their understanding of military questions.

AKP(M-L) will therefore disseminate information on the superpower armies' structure, armaments, tactics, etc. We will spread material which is generally designed to increase knowledge of military skills.

It is particularly important to disseminate the writings of Mao Zedong and the other great Marxist teachers on the military question.

If the working class and the people are going to succeed in taking up

the leadership in a war of resistance against the Soviet Union, then they must study the experiences of revolutionary people's war.

9.6) The working people's health and constitution are of great importance for the Norwegian people's ability to put up armed resistance to aggression. For this reason, sport is most important. For this reason, among others, AKP(M-L) will work for the largest number possible participating in sport, and we support all just demands which improve conditions for taking part in sporting activities and physical training.

But it is not just sport in the narrow sense which is important. Open-air life in forests and mountains, hunting and fishing, etc. represent a significant recreational value. But it is also of great significance from a strategic point of view that the broad masses of working people are familiar with Norwegian nature, and terrain, and have experience and knowledge of how to manage in Norwegian tundra regions. It is therefore important to take a part in strengthening such activity.

9.7) The Communist Party will represent a decisive factor in leading armed resistance and building up a patriotic united front against aggression.

Soviet occupation will mean the setting up of a fascist occupation dictatorship in Norway. Already today, state power in the Soviet Union represents the most brutal, terroristic and bloody dictatorship in the world.

A situation of war and occupation will not make such a regime milder, but, on the contrary, more severe.

The social imperialist occupying force will in addition employ social-demagogy, project itself as "liberators," support "Norwegian workers' power," etc. It will describe the patriots as "terrorists," "agents of imperialism," etc. In this way it will try to lay the basis for terrorising the Norwegian civilian population and especially those actively fighting against slavery under the new Tsars.

Against this background, it is of crucial importance in preparing the party and the working people for war and occupation that AKP(M-L) rapidly strengthens its work in order to be in a position to work under conditions of illegality.

If the Norwegian working people and the communist party take the task of preparing themselves politically and organizationally seriously, then a Soviet occupying force will meet resistance which in the end will deal it a painful defeat.

The National Conference On The Military Programme

Comments on the conference and the most important resolutions.

The Background of the National Conference.

In Summer, 1978, the Central Committee of AKP(M-L) resolved to start a party discussion on military policy with a view to adopting a military political programme in 1979.

The reasons for this are partly explained in the introduction to the military programme (points 1.1 and 1.2.). In short, we can identify:

-changes in the world situation, particularly social imperialism's ever greater international offensive over the last few years.

-lack of clarity in the communist movement both in Norway and internationally on what this means in terms of preparations for a people's war, policy towards the bourgeois defence forces, towards the Western imperialists and the USA, towards NATO, etc.

The discussion on this has been going on for some years, but it has jumped about and been unsystematic. The Party leadership wanted AKP(M-L) to summarise its viewpoint in order to answer some of these questions and start a political offensive towards a communist military policy which relates to present conditions.

Rather less than a year ago, a proposal for a military political programme was sent out for discussion within the party. Internally in the

18.

the party, many contributions which expressed different viewpoints, including counterproposals to the programme, were distributed. These questions were also discussed, in part, publicly in the party paper, "Klassekampen" ("Class Struggle"-Trans). All levels had discussion meetings on the initial programme.

On the basis of this, delegates were chosen to the party conference in Spring 1979.

Party conferences have no institutional place in AKP(M-L)'s decisions. The Central Committee is the Party's highest authority between National Party Congresses. However, the Central Committee wanted a broader and more representative forum to adopt final resolutions on the military programme. The Central Committee therefore decided to delegate its right to decide the final resolution on the military programme to the national conference. While the national conference's resolutions are now AKP(M-L)'s official military programme, it is on the basis of decisions taken in the party's highest organ between congresses, the Central Committee.

The work of the national conference.

The national conference convened in late spring 1979. The main item on the agenda was the proposals for a military programme.

It also dealt with material on the financial crisis of the party paper "Klassekampen" and took resolutions advising the party leadership on this.

The conference opened with a report on the discussion within the party. It went through the proposals, counter-proposals and amendments submitted in detail. The conference delegates also made many proposals for amendments.

After going through the proposals, the national conference went on to pass resolutions.

The resolutions of the national conference.

The first questions which the conference considered were whether it was correct to adopt resolutions on a military programme, what status such a military programme in that case would have in the party, and how discussion should continue after the conference.

On the basis of this discussion, proposals were put forward under five headings:

Proposal 1a.

The National Conference considers that the treatment of the military programme has in the main been poor. It does not satisfy the minimum requirements we expect from party democracy.

Proposal 1b.

The National Conference considers that the treatment of the military programme has in the main been satisfactory. Proposals have been put forward in good time. All party members have had a chance to read them, discuss them and put forward their views. Also, many contributions and counter-proposals have been published. These preparations satisfy, in the main, the requirements we expect of party democracy.

The preparations have also had some weaknesses. This applies to, among other things, the discussion about NATO which only took up a central position in the debate too late in the day. The debate has also been limited by the fact that the party has, at the same time, had many and difficult tasks. All the same, this does not alter the conclusion that the preparations have been good enough.

Resolution:

1a. and 1b. were put in opposition to each other. The result was no votes for 1a., unanimous for 1b., no abstentions.

Proposal 2a.

The National Conference rejects taking a resolution on the military programme. The question should be put off till the Party's 3rd National Congress.

Proposal 2b.

It is both necessary and possible to consider the proposal of the

military programme now. The National Conference therefore rejects the proposal not to consider the resolution on the military programme.

Resolution:

2a. and 2b. were put in opposition to each other. The result was no votes for 2a., unanimous for 2b., no abstentions.

Proposal 3.

The adopted military programme is a document which is binding for AKP(M-L)'s policy and for communists who stand up as official representatives of the party.

Resolution:

Unanimously adopted, no votes against, no abstentions.

Proposal 4.

The discussion about military policy is not completed by this resolution. Defence policy needs further development and application. This applies, among other things, to what sort of defence system the party will fight for.

A large majority of party members have, through party discussion, given their acceptance to the proposals of the military programme. But there is still disagreement within the party on a number of points in the military programme. This applies, among other things, to the question of the military budget, female conscription and NATO. The discussion of these matters will continue in the party and in the party press, for the time being, up to the 3rd National Congress.

Resolution:

Unanimously adopted, no votes against, no abstentions.

Proposal 5.

The majority of comrades who have opposed the proposals of the programme, or opposed adopting a resolution now, have put forward their points of view in a comradely and correct manner. However, some have sharply opposed the party adopting a resolution on the subject and, in some cases, even talked about resignation.

We criticise individual comrades who try to put an ultimatum to the party majority and prevent it using its democratic right to adopt majority resolutions.

We appeal strongly to these comrades to stay within the party and use the possibility of putting forward their viewpoint through contributions and proposals.

Resolution:

Unanimously adopted, no votes against, no abstentions.

Following this, the national conference resolved to publish the proposals 1 to 5 and the defeated proposals 1a. and 2a.

After this, the national conference adopted resolutions on the text of the military programme. An editorial committee made proposals for the handling of the text and worked out many proposals for amendments to it. The resolutions were, for the most part, adopted point for point, and in some cases for even shorter parts of the programme. The majority of amendments were passed unanimously without any votes against or abstentions. On some individual points there was a vote between proposals for alternative formulations.

The whole text, with the exception of two small formulations has been adopted word for word from the national conference (The two exceptions related to short, purely grammatical alterations).

After the whole text had been adopted paragraph by paragraph it was proposed that the conference should vote on the finished programme as a whole. This was adopted unanimously, with no votes against or abstentions.

A comment on the handling of resolutions by the conference.

The working committee would like to comment on the background of the

to the resolutions and the importance they have for the party.

The most important reason for the resolution in five points is that there was still disagreement over the military programme within the party up to the national conference. A large majority of party members was in favour of the proposals. A minority amongst organized communists was against. This opposition was not of just one political form. Some of the most important questions on which contradictions arose are indicated in point 4 of the resolution. Some also felt that it would be best to defer passing the resolution as they wanted more time for party discussion.

The national conference therefore considered deferring or rejecting the putting of a resolution on the programme. It concluded that the handling of the matter had in the main been satisfactory, even if it hadn't been perfect. It therefore accepted the resolution that it is "... necessary and possible to consider the proposal...now." (point 2). Possible because the discussion had been good enough and a large majority of members supported the proposals. Necessary because it is damaging and unproductive to have major party discussions where a large majority take up a position only to then reject summing up the results of the discussion in clear resolutions. Even more necessary because the present political situation demands that AKP(M-L) publicly puts forward clear political views on questions which relate to the defence of the people of Norway. AKP(M-L) is responsible to the working class. The party cannot expect to be taken seriously by the working class if it has no policy on questions which can mean life or death for the working people. This must carry more weight than whether there were weaknesses in the party discussion before resolutions were passed. For these reasons, the national conference unanimously rejected not passing resolutions.

At the same time, the five-point resolution takes a position on some problems which remain unsolved after the adoption of the military programme.

In the party discussion, suggestions have been made that the military programme should contain detailed and concrete proposals on changes in the bourgeois Norwegian defences, which together could make up an alternative to the present defence arrangements. It is correct that the party needs such an alternative. It will be an important political weapon in the struggle to criticise the defeatist policy and subservience to the USA, which important bourgeois politicians and military leaders are now going in for, and mobilise patriots far outside the ranks of the communists to fight for changes. However, such a concrete and detailed proposal would be totally beyond the bounds of this military programme. The party must commence work towards a new programme in order to make the proposals and a new party discussion before it could be adopted.

The national conference therefore adopted a normal party line. The party proposes alterations in the present bourgeois Norwegian defence arrangements (this is discussed in Section 7 as a whole). At the same time, it has been established that the party has not completed a criticism of and formulation of an alternative to the defence arrangements, but is only proposing some steps which indicate the orientation for such a critique (See point 7.5). In addition, the national conference resolved that internal and external discussion must continue, among other things, to develop concrete alternatives to the defence system (resolution 4).

It was also, of course, a problem that there was not complete agreement within the party that the resolution should be put.

AKP(M-L) is a democratic-centralist party. Our task as a revolutionary workers' party is to find a defence policy which best serves the working class and adopt it. When a resolution is passed, the whole party must struggle to bring the policy out to the people. Different parts of the party cannot work publicly for different and contradictory military-political lines.

Now, there was in fact a minority who were in disagreement on some points. With support for the resolutions, the party could close the party discussion now that the resolutions have been passed. But would it be useful in this case? The National Conference thought not and it therefore chose another way out. It stated that the adopted military programme

is binding for AKP(M-L) and must be followed by the party and its official representatives (see resolution 3). In this way, people know that elected representatives of AKP(M-L) will work loyally for the line of the military programme. At the same time, the minority will be able to put forward their views in the continuing internal party discussion and in the party's public press. This discussion is at the same time part of preparations for the 3rd national Party Congress (according to the resolutions, this should take place in 1980). In the continuing party discussion, those who are in disagreement can get changes through if they can convince the majority. In any case, they can help the party to prepare its military policy by ensuring that the contradictions are made sharper inside the party and that nothing is accepted without criticism.

The national conference distinguished between most of the minority, who have handled the contradictions inside the party correctly, and those few who have handled them antagonistically. The national conference pointed out that it is not correct to leave when something is adopted which one doesn't like, but that one should remain in the party and try to win over the majority to one's view through democratic discussion.

After the text had been adopted heading by heading, the delegates voted unanimously for the military programme as a whole. In this way, those who had voted for alternative formulations on some points could show that they saw the programme as a good exposition of AKP(M-L)'s military-political line.

In the report, it is stated, "All those who spoke (on the points of order criticisms of the conference) were in agreement that the conference had good political discussions which brought us a good way forward. The leadership of the meeting was both efficient and good. The discussions were open and free with many contributions and lively debate."

This shows the high political level of the conference. There was political disagreement on some points, but this disagreement did not prevent resolutions being taken which all could support. The fact that more or less the whole text was adopted word for word and unanimously shows that the new military programme has strong support among the delegates and in the party.

Unity is good. At the same time, it is our (the working party's) view that it would have been a good thing if comrades who were against the whole military programme had been at the conference. The fact that they were not is neither the members' or the party leadership's fault. It is a result of the fact that they made up such a small minority that nowhere was there a majority to elect them as delegates.

The party leadership did not foresee this situation. In hindsight, we think that it would have been a good thing if the leadership had encouraged the party to elect some delegates who represented the minority's view (although the membership cannot of course be told to vote in a particular way from the top) or perhaps had invited someone from the minority to the conference with speaking and voting rights.

This weakness is, all the same, secondary. The main thing is that the conference was extremely good and that the military programme gives a good basis for wider discussion and practical work.

Continuing work with the military programme

The party is now presented with the task of putting the political lines in the military programme into political practice in Norway.

This means that we must spread the military programme and the line it contains to the working people. For it is only the working class and the working people who can be the main force in the defence of Norway.

Further, AKP(M-L) must actively seek discussions with other political forces, bourgeois military, etc, on how Norway can and should be defended. Such discussion must not be put in contradiction to spreading our military political line among the working people. A great public debate in which communists take part also increases the interest of the workers and makes it easier to explain our line. At the same time, it is a good thing for the working class if a more correct defence policy line wins support among some bourgeois politicians, officials and military leaders, as that can

22.

lead to some advantageous changes in bourgeois defence policy.

We must therefore develop the discussion on the military question both inside and outside the party. The working class cannot leave the military question to bourgeois generals. The military programme points out that the pre-condition for a people's war against an eventual Soviet attack is that working people learn military skills. AKP(M-L) must also get started in developing concrete alternative proposals to the bourgeois defence organization.

We should seek confrontation and discussion on military politics with revisionists, social democrats, conservatives, pacifists, the military, etc, where we defend the line of the military programme. People who disagree with AKP(M-L) should know that we will gladly have discussions with them. AKP(M-L)'s party press will gladly print contributions from opponents of our military programme if they can further develop the debate.

Let's get started using and spreading the military programme!

July 1979

Working party of AKP(M-L).