WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

April 1974, Vol. 17, No. 4 50¢

L'Humanité–70 years /127

Sources of the housing crisis /98

Whom does the army serve? /43

Collective security in Asia /9

Socialist competition /74

Palestinian question /88

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

April 1974, Vol. 17, No. 4

Features

3 Peace, revolution and the Communists' duty
G. Danelius

9 Collective security in Asia – dictate of the times
S. Luvsan

The Party

16 A democratic and socialist alternative for Austria
F. Muhri

24 Agrarian policy of SUPG
G. Grueneberg

31 The force cementing and transforming society
A. Dobieszewski

36 Fidelity to revolutionary principles
O. Sanchez

39 Party news

Theory

43 Whom does the army serve?
International research group

60 Historical materialism and the battle of ideas
V. Kelle

Political panorama

70 Building the new life in the liberated areas of South Vietnam
Nguyen Huu Tho

74 Socialist competition and development of the personality
K. Giaurov

82 An anti-dictatorial front in the making
P. Vasquez

88 The Palestinian aspect of the Middle East crisis
N. Ashhab

95 Call for solidarity

98 Sources of the housing crisis
P. Della Seta

105 Outlines of the new way
V. Shundeyev

113 Lost stake in anti-Soviet game
Jan Prazsky

Books and journals

123 Concentrated experience of proletarian struggle

(continued next page)

(cont'd)

127 Voice of honor and conscience
L. Benoit

131 Preparations for 10th Congress of Yugoslav League of Communists
M. Rakas

136 Straight talk
L. Dean

138 Books in brief

Data

140 Brief information on Communist and Workers' Parties: CP Ireland, CP Philippines

142 First World Peace Congress
V.P.

144 Diary

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is the North American edition of the monthly journal Problems of Peace and Socialism published in Prague.

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $5.00 a year, $9.00 for two years. Single copies 50 cents. Overseas: $8.50 a year.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Rumanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Subscriptions to these may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSRIPTION SERVICE, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto. M5V 1T4

Or, in USA from IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, 320 West Ohio St., Chicago, Ill. 60610

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published by PROGRESS BOOKS, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. M5V 1T4

Copyright © 1968 by Progress Books, Canada. All Rights Reserved.



Peace, revolution and the Communists' duty

Gerhard Danelius, Chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin answers our questions.

Question: The support of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the capitalist world has contributed palpably to the successful peace offensive of the soocialist countries. Could you tell us of the political impact of this support, and of the new factors in the effort to deepen the détente? What are the West Berlin Communists' tasks in this context?

Answer: The historical confrontation between the forces of progress and reaction has wrought new opportunities for promoting peace, democracy and socialism in Europe. Substantial progress has been made in assuring international security and expanding cooperation between socialist and capitalist countries. International relations are marked by a steady decline of tension, conversion from cold war to ever broader recognition and practice of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Safeguarding peace is the cardinal problem of our time. Socialism and peace are indivisible. There is a direct line from the Decree on Peace dating to the earliest days of Soviet power, to the Peace Program of the 24th Congress of the CPSU. This latter played a conspicuous role in affirming the ideas of peaceful coexistence, because at the back of it was the colossally expanding political, economic and defensive potential of the Soviet Union, the entire socialist community, and because the interests of the socialist countries coincide in the main points with those of all nations. It is safe to say that the coordinated foreign policy of the socialist countries paved the way to the successes of recent years, that the decisive part in this was played by the Soviet Union.

Communists in the capitalist countries wholeheartedly supported the peace offensive, because it is consonant with the interests of all humanity, notably those of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist parties.

The Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin actively supported the peace offensive. West Berlin was a kind of nerve center which the

imperialist forces cast as a peace violator, a cold-war 'front-line' city. It was the place of origin for ideological subversion against socialism, and was intended by the international monopoly bourgeoisie as the staging center for moves to contain socialism and wipe out socialist gains in the German Democratic Republic. But these designs fell through.

As we see it, the main new factor in deepening the détente is the opportunity to establish lasting peace in Europe and the rest of the world. The recent World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow showed once again that enduring peace and international cooperation are no longer a pipe dream, because powerful political and social forces oppose war and are determined to act in common. 'The people want a dependable and irreversible peace,' L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, stressed in his speech at that Congress.

It is also safe to say that by virtue of the changed situation in Europe we are now closer to some of our Party's important aims. We oppose the 'front-line city' and cold-war policy of the past 25 years, directed against our socialist neighbor and want West Berlin to become a factor of peace and European security. West Berlin, as our Party sees it, can now play a new role, setting the example and proving the practicability of good-neighbor relations with the GDR and other socialist countries.

In the past, we fought for the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin and ratification of the agreements between the GDR government and West Berlin Senate; now we are fighting for the consolidation of the New European situation and for the closest observance of the agreements – not least of all against attempts to falsify and emasculate the West Berlin accord and preserve remnants of the 'front-line city' ideology.

Question: Analyzing the foreign and home policy of some imperialist governments, it strikes the eye that while they take positive steps in international affairs, they are simultaneously intensifying the offensive against the democratic and social rights of their people. Their obvious purpose is to buttress the class domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This has caused some to contend that international détente is not beneficial for the class struggle. What is your opinion on this score, and what tactics should Communists employ?

Answer: It is not from a surfeit of goodwill and not because they recognize the error of their earlier policies that the capitalist governments have accepted peaceful coexistence and take a more realistic view of the crucial present-day issues. Simply, they are compelled to reckon with the growing might of the socialist community and the steadily rising anti-imperialist struggle. But peaceful coexistence does not mean that social and political relations in the capitalist countries must remain the same or that the ideological struggle can be eased up.

The peaceful coexistence policy hinders imperialist attempts to overcome intrinsic contradictions by stoking up international ten-

sion and creating seats of war. It facilitates the class struggle against imperialism on the national world scale, and is itself a form of that struggle.

Anti-imperialist mass actions are one of the essential conditions of the peaceful coexistence policy. Directed against warmongers, reaction and the war industries, it conforms with the general interests of the revolutionary struggle against oppression and exploitation, the interests of international friendship, and with the drive for greater economic, scientific, technical and other cooperation among countries with different social systems for the sake of social progress. Peaceful coexistence provides favorable conditions not only for building socialism and communism in the socialist countries, but also for the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism in the capitalist countries. The struggle for the social and political interests of the working class and the laboring masses in general, and the struggle to eliminate the danger of a new war, are inseparably linked.

Therefore, the claim that international détente is not beneficial for the class struggle, is groundless. Take this example: our Party strengthened its position precisely when the peaceful coexistence policy began to gain ground, more specifically, following the conclusion of the four-power agreement on West Berlin and those between the GDR government and the West Berlin Senate. As many as 80,000 workers, members of production councils and rank-and-file trade unionists, Social-Democrats, apprentices, school and university students, and members of the technical and creative intelligentsia, took part in the May 1973 demonstration held under our Party's auspices. In 1973 we enrolled 1,018 new members, of whom 70 per cent are workers and 80 per cent are in the 18-30 age group. The power of attraction of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, is steadily growing: attendance at our Marxist evening school went up from 370 in 1970 to 2,168 in 1973 (including 1,111 non-members). The influence of the existing socialism is going up: the attitude of the greater part of the working class and other working people toward the Soviet Union, the GDR and other countries of the socialist community, we are glad to note, is changing steadily.

West Berlin's democrats and socialists regard promotion of peaceful coexistence as their task of the day and appreciate the need for solidarity with peoples threatened by imperialism and militarism. This is borne out by the mass demonstrations in support of the heroic Vietnamese people, and the broad movement of solidarity with the Popular Unity block in Chile. Just recently, we collected DM 70,000 for the Vietnam Fund, and DM 200,000 for the patriots of Chile.

Admittedly, in some ways peaceful coexistence makes the struggle more difficult. To begin with, the ideological clash is much more acute. Anti-communism, from our ample experience in West Berlin, is becoming more refined. But this does not frighten us, and we certainly do not intend to evade the struggle between socialist and bourgeois ideology. Quite the contrary.

Strong groups in the FRG and West Berlin do not want any accords with the USSR, GDR, and other socialist countries. The West Berlin Senate and top politicians of the CDU, FDP and SDP would like nothing better than to renew the out-dated 'front-line city' policy against our socialist neighbors and erect barriers to détente, security and European cooperation. Following the conclusion of treaties between socialist and capitalist countries and the successful first phase of the All-European Security and Cooperation Conference, reactionaries of all strains are again showing their true face and seeking salvation in a revival of primitively bellicose anti-communism, slandering the socialist community and trying to pervert the four-power West Berlin and other agreements.

And they have an ally in the person of the Peking leadership, which has lined up with the reactionaries against the Soviet Union, trying to malign and discredit Lenin's peaceful coexistence policy in concert with the more aggressive sections of international monopoly capital. In league with the reactionaries, the Peking leaders attack the European Security and Cooperation Conference, extol NATO, and even plead for a closer military alliance of capitalist countries. This is tantamount to direct support of the enemies of peace, security and European cooperation.

The Peking leaders have cast off Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They portray the Soviet Union as their enemy number one, resort to ideological subversion, and try to split the Communist-led united anti-imperialist front. But since they have banded with the most reactionary section of world imperialism, the relation of forces steadily tilting in favor of peace and socialism is operating more and more against them. Maoism had had a certain amount of influence on part of the students and intellectuals in West Berlin, especially in the 60s. But now the Maoist groups are less and less visible.

United action by the working class, Communists and Social-Democrats, and the anti-imperialist solidarity of all peace-oriented forces, the SUP WB holds, are the guarantee of further progress in the class struggle. Unity is the source of the strength and invincibility of the working class, and the key to success in the anti-imperialist fight for radical social reconstruction, for the victory of socialism over capitalism.

By sharpening the class struggle 'from above,' the bourgeoisie hopes to "abolish' the class struggle of the working class and other sections of the masses. Hence our strategy and tactics of sharpening the class battles 'from below,' assuring joint action by the working class and other sections of the people for their vital aims.

To begin with, we must consolidate and develop what we have already gained. The treaties will be scraps of paper unless the forces of socialism and peace continue to build up the anti-imperialist struggle. This means that the laboring masses must defend their interests and work for greater political influence. The massive monopoly offensive on the living standard of workers and em-

ployees must be repulsed, the masses must fight for higher wages, against impingements on their social rights and wage reductions, for democratic rights in enterprises, in the economy and society, and likewise for eliminating the power of capital, and for socialism.

Question: Economic integration of Western Eruope is more marked. NATO, a political-military alliance, is aimed not only against the socialist world system, but also against the revolutionary movement of the working class. Readers have asked what concrete steps the Marxist-Leninist parties of various West-European countries are taking in this connection. They want to know if the working class can win power in one of the West-European countries in the foreseeable future, or if the process of capitalist integration has reached a point where simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution in all the West-European countries is the only realistic perspective. How does your Party answer these questions?

Answer: In recent years, concentration and centralization of capital has led to the appearance of giant international concerns and such associations as the European Economic Community. Yet modern capitalism has certain peculiarities, stemming largely from attempts to adapt to the new world situation. Their class interest is compelling imperialists to concert efforts against the socialist countries, and the working class in the capitalist lands. The capitalist states in the aggressive NATO bloc have mutual commitments to contain the revolutionary movement and obstruct the democratic forces.

The Marxist-Leninist parties in the capitalist countries should also therefore coordinate their actions. Isolated struggle against the international concerns and such capitalist alliances as the EEC or NATO cannot succeed.

Nor should we forget that all Communist and Workers' parties have common principles, common aims and ideas. The Document of the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties says: 'Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism, and dedicated and devoted service in the interests of their peoples and the common cause of socialism are a requisite for the efficacy and correct orientation of united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, a guarantee that they will achieve their historic goals.'

The 1969 Meeting has formulated many important tasks for Communists, the opponents of imperialism and fighters for peace, freedom and progress. The recent years have shown that socialism is determining the course of history and international affairs to an ever greater extent, that the might of the socialist countries and the anti-imperialist struggle for the peoples, is compelling imperialism to adapt to the new situation. U.S. imperialism, for example, had no choice but to pull its troops out of Vietnam. With the all-round aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries,

and the support of the worldwide solidarity movement, the heroic people of Vietnam defeated the aggressor.

Imperialism's cold war policy has collapsed. Favorable conditions are shaping – especially in Europe – for the further unfolding of peaceful coexistence, and for security and cooperation. Notable successes have been won in the struggle to safeguard peace, and against the spread of nuclear weapons. Likewise, despite some difficulties, even setbacks, the working people in the capitalist countries have scored important victories in the battle for their rights, and against the power of monopoly. Hasn't the time come to sum up achievements and formulate new tasks? It will be recalled that the 1969 Meeting emphasized the desirability of holding international forums of fraternal Parties whenever the need should arise.

Though all the imperialist states are links in the imperialist world system, each of them pursues its own aims. Neither integration nor common class interests can eliminate contradictions between imperialist countries. And that imperialism is adapting to the new conditions does not mean capitalism's stabilization as a system.

In his 'Concerning the Slogan of the United States of Europe,' V. I. Lenin formulated the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalist countries in the imperialist epoch. He showed that the conditions for socialist victory do not mature simultaneously in different countries. 'Economic development,' says the Document of the 1969 International Meeting, 'is becoming more uneven among the various imperialist powers and in the capitalist world as a whole. Life demonstrates the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of struggle between the imperialist powers and between the capitalist monopolies for spheres of influence. Industrial and commercial competition is growing sharper, and the financial and currency war is spreading. Competition is growing in Western Europe, including within the Common Market, and also between the capitalist countries of Europe and the USA. Japanese imperialism is energetically joining this struggle for markets and maximum profits.'

The developments of recent years have completely confirmed this. Take the growing contradictions among the EEC countries, and between them and the United States, which have resulted in the financial and monetary crisis, in clashes within the EEC between France, Britain and West Germany, and in differences over the energy crisis between Belgium and Holland, and between France and the other EEC states. These are very serious contradictions, and the Communist and Workers' Parties must lose no time in grasping and using them.

We are not fortune tellers and cannot say in advance whether one West-European country or several at the same time will embark on socialism. In the final analysis, this also depends on what external and internal factors are at work and on the scale

of the revolutionary working-class movement and the anti-imperialist struggle. In any case, together with the socialist countries the working class in capitalist lands makes a powerful and dynamic force. The growing might and unity of the world Communist movement, based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, will exercise a decisive influence on world development and provide favorable conditions for the further advance of socialism.

Collective security in Asia—a dictate of the times

Sonomyn Luvsan
CC PB Member, First
Deputy Prisidium Chairman,
Great People's Khural, MPR

Asian Communist and Workers' Parties have before them the momentous task of making their continent a zone of peace.

Marxist-Leninists fully appreciate all the difficulties involved: in the last quarter-century there were 47 local wars and armed conflicts; in the past 27 years, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has said, there was not a week without armed clashes in one or another part of the Asian continent. Most, if not all, at first started in reply to imperialism's refusal to give up its domination, and later in reply to its use of new forms of interference.

With its immense natural resources, Asia has always been a target of imperialist and colonialist aggression and ruthless exploitation. The imperialist powers were determined to maintain their stranglehold at any price. Hence, their military and political blocs, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, ASPAC, and hence, also, the bilaterial and multilateral military agreements and the hundreds of military bases sprawling across and around the continent. This whole system, the creation of Western strategy, was spearheaded against world socialism and certain contingents of the national-liberation movement. But it had another function too – it was the armed hand of neo-colonialism.

This led, first, to ceaseless imperialist intrigue against countries committed to social and economic change, with resultant military conflicts that endangered universal peace. Second, some Asian states were dragooned into imperialist military adventures against other Asian states. Third, imperialist-instigated territorial disputes and inflated national and religious issues often led to confrontations between Asian states.

In countries drawn into the orbit of imperialist policy the people

are learning from their own experience that this can have calamitous results. Realistic and far-seeing statesmen realize that continuation of this state of affairs is both hopeless and dangerous, and there is an intensive search for practical measures that would assure good-neighbor relations and all-round cooperation.

Proposed principles

Normalization in Asia is being helped by the socialist community's active, purposive policy of promoting and strengthening peace and security, with unswerving observance of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems and all-round support for the national-liberation movement.

The positive influence of the 24th CPSU Congress Peace Program, which has the support of the socialist community, can be seen in the widening struggle for enduring peace in Asia and in the closer cohesion of its peace forces.

A concentrated expression of this policy of promoting Asian peace is the Soviet proposal for a collective security system in Asia.

Addressing the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: 'The burning problems of the current international situation do not conceal from our view longer-term tasks, namely the creation of a system of collective security in areas of concentrated danger of another world war, of armed conflict. Such a system is the best replacement for the existing military-political groups. . . . We are of the opinion that the course of events is also putting on the agenda the task of creating a system of collective security in Asia.'

The Soviet proposal is, so far, the only concrete and constructive program of Asian peace through collective security.

A view often expressed in the imperialist camp is that 'Moscow's persistence . . . indicates that it wants to safeguard its interests.'* The anti-communists would have the Asian peoples believe that the Soviet Union is seeking advantages for itself.

That is effectively refuted by the principles of the collective security system the USSR proposes: renunciation of the use of force in international relations; settlement of all outstanding issues by peaceful means, without recourse to war; rejection of territorial aggrandisement through aggression; respect of sovereignty, territorial integrity and inviolability of frontiers; non-interference in internal affairs; broad economic, cultural and other cooperation based on complete equality and mutual advantage; sovereignty over natural resources; the sovereign right of all nations to implement social and economic change. *The Asian security system will be open to all Asian states without exception and will not be directed against any of them.*

These proposals largely coincide with ideas on peace and security enunciated by Asian leaders in the past. Thus, the concept

*E. Valkenier. *The USSR and the Third World.* 'Survey,' Summer 1973, Vol. 19, No. 3, p. 47.

of cooperation of all Asian states was endorsed by the 1955 Bandung Conference. Nehru urged all he Asian countries to 'advance together.' Furthermore, Asian collective security fully accords with the aims and principles of the United Nations and does not preclude bilateral agreements. In making its proposal, the Soviet Union announced its readiness to discuss any other initiative in the light of Asian realities.

Why, it is sometimes asked, has the proposal come from the Soviet Union?

Two-thirds of USSR territory is in Asia. And from its very inception the Soviet Union has attached exceptional importance to Asian problems, seeking solutions based on the equality and cooperation of all its peoples, regardless of their social and economic develoment level. Back in 1920 a U.S. correspondent asked Lenin what were Soviet policy aims in Asia. Lenin replied: 'They are the same as in Europe: peaceful coexistence with all peoples; with the workers and peasants of all nations awakening to a new life – a life without exploiters, without capitalists, without merchants' (*Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 365).

It is safe to say that the Soviet proposal is meeting with increasing acceptance. Delivering the Central Committee report to the 16th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, its First Secretary and Chairman of the Mongolian People's Republic Council of Ministers, Comrade Y. Tsedenbal, emphasized that 'the collective security system proposed by the Soviet Union . . . is meeting with support among the Asian peoples who see in it a reliable guarantee of peace on their continent.'

In fact, the principles of the Soviet-proposed security system are being applied in the Soviet Union's relations with Asian states. They are set out in its agreements with Iraq, India, Egypt, in India's agreement with Bangladesh, and also in joint statements and declarations of other Asian countries. All this is a contribution to Asian collective security.

The Mongolian People's Republic, a peaceful Asian socialist state, wholeheartedly supports every initiative and effort designed to bring our continent stable peace. Mongolia is doing everything to make collective security an Asian reality. Comrade Tsedenbal's visits to India and Iran last year were of special importance in this context. During these visits documents were signed formulating the principles the countries concerned would adhere to in their international relations. Thus, the joint Mongolian-Iranian declaration signed in Teheran last November says that the two sides 'are determined to facilitate realization of a collective security system in Asia embracing all countries of the continent.'

The importance and timeliness of the collective security idea has been approvingly commented upon by statesmen and public leaders in India, Japan, Thailand and a number of other countries. Collective security was approved by the international conference of 26 countries on Asian security and cooperation in Dacca last May.

Many Asian representatives at last October's World Congress of

Peace Forces in Moscow welcomed the idea of a collective security system for their continent, an idea, it was stressed, that is helping to overcome the estrangement, distrust and suspicions of the cold-war years. There was a proposal to set up an international Committee on Asian Peace and Security representative of political parties, trade unions, women's, youth, religious and other organizations.

Realistic program

A Marxist-Leninist analysis of Asian developments will conclusively show that only *collective* efforts by all the continent's peoples can prevent war and imperialist intervention and foil neo-colonialist intrigue. Only in conditions of peace can we rapidly advance to such goals as higher living standards for developing countries and an end to poverty, hunger and disease.

It is hardly necessary to prove that solution of Asia's economic problems will primarily benefit the developing countries and help them overcome many of the difficulties common to the Third World. Their dimensions were spelled out at the non-aligned nations' conference in Algiers: nearly one billion people suffering from malnutrition or hunger; average daily income of 900 million people less than $0.3; more than 800 million illiterate.

The imperialist policy of aggression, local conflicts and incitement, dooms the Asian peoples to immense losses, drains their economic resources, and holds up the fight against backwardness. Artificially stoked war hysteria, intimidation and suspicion, are impelling huge military spending. This is an unbearably heavy burden for the as yet feeble economies of the developing states, sidetracking their modest resources for ends that are often far removed from their true national interests.

A system of collective security would allow the Asian peoples to concentrate on the continent's vital problems.

Dependable and lasting peace is essential for independence, freedom and socio-economic progress. Asia's postwar history shows that the climate of hostile confrontation is exploited by imperialists and reactionaries for punitive assaults on the national-liberation movement.

Détente offers realistic opportunities for settling acute international conflicts in the interests of peace and in keeping with the rightful demands of the peoples.

It offers better conditions for the national-liberation struggle of the peoples and for the workers' class struggle in the capitalist countries.

These days the demands of the national-liberation movement are ever more frequently aimed against all forms of exploitation and for radical social reconstruction. The newly-independent Asian countries are buttressing their economic and political independence, and resisting imperialist blackmail and pressure. The forces of peace and social progress are taking the initiative and exercise an increasingly decisive influence on the political climate in Asia.

The ending of the Vietnam war was a great victory for the heroic

people of Vietnam backed by the consistent and all-round aid and support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the solidarity of all progressives. A most dangerous seat of war, which exacerbated the world situation, has been eliminated. The Paris Agreement was a triumph of political reason and realism. The accords on Vietnam and Laos hold out hope of stability and peace in Indochina.

A new situation is shaping in Korea. The well-known initiative of the Korean People's Democratic Republic is designed to further the country's peaceful and democratic unification. The move has impelled action to settle the Korean problem and, among other things, has given impulse to a North-South dialogue.

The situation on the Indian subcontinent is improving. India, Bangladesh and Pakistan are striving to settle their disputes. In 1972, India and Pakistan concluded the Simla Agreement, pledging to settle all problems by peaceful means. And in 1973, an accord was signed in Delhi on the repatriation of civilians and military personnel from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. This is paving the way to a conclusive improvement of relations between the countries of the subcontinent, to peace and stability in South Asia.

Following the proclamation of a republic in Afghanistan, the new government declared its intention of working for democracy, national development, and peace. Thailand's new government, set up following the overthrow of the reactionary military regime, has expressed hope for relations of trust and friendship with all countries, including the socialist states.

Noteworthy, too, is the search for partial solutions of the problem of Asian security, notably the appeals of the Lusaka and Algiers conferences of non-aligned states to turn the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. And the declaration on the neutralization of Southeast Asia issued in 1971 by the foreign ministers of the ASEAN countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines), which Indonesia's Foreign Minister, A. Malik, described as in many ways close to the Soviet plan of Asian collective security.

The new political climate in Europe wrought by the peace offensive of the socialist community, and the constructive changes in Soviet-U.S. relations are exercising an undeniably favorable influence on the situation in Asia and stimulating the drive of the Asian peoples and governments for an easing of tensions on the continent.

Cumulatively, these positive developments are a good foundation for an Asian collective security system, but must first be made irreversible.

Who blocks the way

The positive results in settling the continent's thorny problems are certainly welcome. The realistic trend in the policy of some of the big and small Asian states is one of the most auspicious signs of the times, showing that the imperialist doctrines, essentially designed for Asians to suppress the Asian national-liberation movement, are cracking up.

But imperialism has no intention of remaining on the defensive. The withdrawal of U.S. and Australian troops from South Vietnam and of British troops from a number of areas east of Suez, and the decision to pull out Australian units from Singapore were forced measures, taken under the pressure of the national-liberation forces and social, economic and political factors at home. They merely show that imperialism is trying to adapt to the new situation in the world, and should not blunt the Asian peoples' vigilance. Much ground remains to be covered before imperialism will lose its capacity to interfere in the internal affairs of Asian countries.

To begin with, all remaining seats of war, aggression and tension must be eliminated. The Indochina problem will not be conclusively settled until all the peoples of the region, including the Cambodian, are able to arrange their future without outside interference in keeping with their national interests. All parties must abide faithfully by the Paris Agreement on Vietnam. It is insufferable that the Saigon administration and the United States should violate some of its important provisions.

A rapid and just peaceful settlement in the Middle East, providing for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territory and respect for the rights and interests of the countries and peoples of the region, including the Arab people of Palestine, in conformance with the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, is of the utmost significance. The October 1973 resolutions of the Security Council should be implemented without further delay.

The Asian peoples denounce the designs of the imperialist powers and their agents in the Persian Gulf and Arabian Peninsula area. The arms race and build-up of tension there is fraught with great peril.

Many people have already understood that collective security is the sole alternative to the existing aggressive military blocs. It presupposes their dissolution as an everlasting source of tension, aggression and suspicion. It presupposes the dismantling of imperialist military bases in Asian countries and the removal of all foreign troops. SEATO, CENTO, ASPAC and other blocs, which owe their existence to the cold war and are tools of neo-colonialism and interference, have long been gripped by crisis. This is borne out by Pakistan's withdrawal from SEATO, Malaysia's from ASPAC, and by Australia's and New Zealand's withdrawal from active participation in SEATO. There is also the fact of Asian members of these blocs establishing mutually beneficial political, economic and cultural ties with socialist countries.

An Asian collective security system cannot be forged overnight. The process is complicated and slow. Many difficulties must still be overcome, stemming first and foremost from the imperialist policy of setting one people against another and interfering in their affairs.

But there are also other opponents: the Peking leaders, who are against any moves that tend to ease tension. In pursuance of their great-power chauvinist aims, they are maligning the idea of Asian collective security and, having consigned to oblivion their own calls

for collective security in Asia and Oceania,* they now advocate the preservation of imperialist military bases and the U.S. military presence in Asia to maintain the 'balance of power.' Like the Maoists' other adventurous actions, this policy has nothing in common with the interests of the Asian peoples, including those of the Chinese people.

Foes of the Soviet proposal contend that collective security would be directed against China. This is false. In his report on the 50th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: 'The Soviet Union has come forward with the idea of creating a system of collective security in Asia. It is contended in some capitals that our proposal is aimed at "containing" or "encircling" China. This notion is totally groundless. As we see things, the Chinese People's Republic would be a full and equal participant in such a system.'

Some maintain that it is still too early to speak of collective security in view of the many acute problems bedevilling Asia. But this contention, too, is false. The course of events shows that the very effort to promote the idea, the effort of Asian countries to implement principles that essentially pertain to the security system, have helped and will eventually facilitate an early and effective solution of the continent's most urgent problems.

The reality bears out the relevance of the Asian collective security idea. The general political tendency is favorable for the Asian countries, big and small, to work for peace, security and cooperation on a collective basis.

*It will be recalled that the joint Soviet-Chinese statement of January 18, 1957, contained the following lines: 'Both sides hold that all restricted military groupings must be replaced with a system of collective peace and collective security.' Between 1955 and 1960 the PRC government repeatedy advanced proposals of a peace pact between countries of Asia and the Pacific, including the United States, and also of a regional non-aggression pact.



Democratic and socialist alternative for Austria

Franz Muhri
Chairman, CP Austria

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 22ND CONGRESS OF THE CPA

The 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of Austria, held January 18-20, 1974, rang in a new stage in the Austrian Communists' struggle for their Party's further ideological, political and organizational consolidation, and for broader social and democratic rights, for the country's independence, for peace and socialism. It adopted two documents: Politico-Ideological Guidelines and the Action Program, the drafts of which had earlier been discussed at district conferences and in the Party press. Fifty-eight delegates spoke, while comrades who could not due to shortage of time, had their written speeches entered in the proceedings. No other party in Austria could claim such inner-party democracy.

The unanimously approved Central Committee Report analyzed international affairs and the political situation at home in the period since the 21st Congress (May 1970). It also defined the immediate objectives. To further the Lenin norms of Party life, the Congress ruled on several amendments to the Party Constitution. A new Central Committee was elected unanimously, including 17 new comrades, mostly young Party activists.

The international analysis recorded the far-reaching changes of the past several years, showing that the course of events is principally highlighted by the confrontation of the forces of socialism and imperialism and substantial progress toward peace and détente. The Soviet Union, the mainstay of the socialist community, it pointed out, is the international bulwark for all forces of peace, national independence and social progress. The existence of the socialist states and their growing political and economic potential creates favorable conditions for the struggle of the Austrian working class, its Communist Party, and all progressive forces. The Congress described this struggle as part of the world revolutionary process, the chief components of which are the socialist world system, the international working class and the national liberation movement.

The facts conclusively refute the anti-communist inventions of bourgeois ideologues and Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders. No longer can anyone deny the impressive economic successes and rising material and cultural standards of the socialist countries. They are especially striking against the background of instability and crisis in the capitalist world. The people in the socialist countries have many more democratic freedoms than any 'Western democracy.' By their peace policy, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community are performing a truly democratic and humane mission of worldwide implications. This is why the CPA's solidarity with the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, is in keeping with the interests of Austria's working class and national interests.

The 'democratic socialism' peddled by the Socialist Party of Austria (SPA) leadership as the 'alternative to communism' is a mere decoy and another futile attempt to further the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries. 'The main purpose of he SPA leaders' anti-communism,' the Guidelines say, 'is to prevent the Austrian working class from taking the road to socialism.'

The might of the Soviet Union, its peace policy, the consolidation of the socialist community, and the vigorous struggle of progressives in the capitalist world, have compelled aggressive U.S. and FRG quarters to yield ground, thus opening a new phase in world affairs. The GDR has been recognized in international law, the first steps have been taken toward a Eruopean security system, and the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people, backed by a worldwide solidarity movement, culminated in the Paris Agreement. A new chapter has opened in Soviet-American relations. 'A realistic opportunity has now arisen to prevent a third world war through the peoples' struggle,' the Guidelines say. 'Better conditions exist to prevent local wars. Yet the highest degree of vigilance is still necessary, because the essence of imperialism has not changed. . . . It is not possible to rid the world of the war danger once and for all until capitalism is eliminated.'

As before, imperialism will go to all lengths to suppress the working-class and liberation movement, as borne out by the fascist military putsch in Chile, performed with the support of U.S. reactionary forces.

The peaceful coexistence policy is part of the international class struggle. Détente is in keeping with the interests of the socialist states, and offers better conditions for the workers' struggle in the capitalist countries, and for the national-liberation movement. At the same time, all varieties of imperialist ideology, especially anti-communism and anti-sovietism, should be more strongly repulsed.

The Congress denounced the anti-Soviet policy of the Peking leadership, which outdoes imperialist propaganda in attacks on the Soviet Union and ranks among the bitterest foes of détente and security. Calculated to weaken the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement, Peking's policy is also contrary to the interests of the Chinese people.

In 1955, mindful of the new relation of world forces, the Austrian federal government proclaimed permanent neutrality. This was a progressive act, favoring peaceful coexistence and an easing of tensions. Since then, however, there has been a continuous contradiction between the Austrian bourgeoisie's class orientation on U.S. and West-European imperialism, particularly West-German monopoly capital, and the commitment to active neutrality and peace in harmony with the country's national interests. Yet the positive developments in world and European affairs, especially the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, and the FRG's recognition of the German Democratic Republic, have a beneficial effect on Austria's neutrality and peace policy.

To the government's one-sided orientation on the United States and the EEC, the Congress proposed the alternative of an independent foreign policy oriented on the interests of the Austrian people.

The CPA called on the government to contribute to a swift and successful conclusion of the All-European Security and Cooperation Conference, which would greatly benefit Austria's peaceful future. 'We are for the unity of the workers, of all working people, all democratic and peace-loving forces of Europe, and against the Europe of the monopolies, against U.S. imperialism's drive for supremacy,' says the Central Committee Report. The CPA supports effective measures toward disarmament, and calls for a peaceful Mid-East settlement based on the UN Security Council resolutions.

The Congress emphasized the Party's solidarity with all peoples fighting for national and social liberation, against fascist dictatorships and imperialist interference, and urged faithful fulfilment of the Paris Agreement on Vietnam. In a demonstration of solidarity with the people of Chile, delegates demanded the release of Comrade Luis Corvalan and all other political prisoners.

The CP of Austria acclaimed the decisions of the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, in which Austrian Social-Democrats, people of no political affiliations and Catholics participated alongside our comrades.

The 22nd CPA Congress analyzed present-day state-monopoly capitalism in Austria and defined the Party's internal policy objectives.

Austria's strong nationalized sector, characterized in the Guidelines, resulted from the postwar nationalization of German-owned key industries. At first, it tended to limit the power of local and foreign big capital, but in recent years gradually integrated with the capitalist state-monopoly system due to the revival and consolidation of the capitalist economy, intensive penetration of foreign, primarily West-German, monopoly capital, and the growth of the bourgeois state establishment with the Right Social-Democratic leaders' cooperation.

The fusion of monopoly and state power, has, among other things, produced a sweeping system of state-monopoly regulation. This regulation, say the Guidelines, 'has spilled over from the economic sphere and various protectionist and subsidy forms, from inter-

ference in the infrastructure and research, governmental wage and employment policies, the structural policy, the price, budget and tax policies, to manipulation and direction of education, science and public opinion . . .' Without government regulation and support, capitalism would not have survived in Austria, testifying to the total incompetence of 'private enterprise' extolled by bourgeois ideologues, on the one hand, and to capitalism's historical senility, on the other.

State-monopoly capitalism is stepping up exploitation of the workers. Apart from exploitation on the shop-floor level, involving intensified labor and an ever greater wage-to-profits lag, the monopolies are robbing the masses by pushing up market prices. Taxes are an ever greater burden. Women are subjected to a double degree of exploitation. And though there are many more small and medium-sized enterprises than in other developed capitalist countries, concentration and centralization of capital is fairly intensive, leading to the ruin of farmers, artisans, and shopkeepers. This refutes the bourgeois theories of 'preserving private property as the foundation of freedom.' The freedom of owning means of production and capital extends to a small and ever shrinking handful, who enjoy it precisely because it is denied to the overwhelming majority. And their drive to obtain the maximum profit at the expense of the working people and their material and cultural welfare, is one of the most typical features of the state-monopoly system, whose contradictions come out in bold relief despite all efforts to conceal them.

Anti-democratic and authoritarian tendencies are surfacing ever more strongly. The constitutionally formalized bourgeois democratic freedoms are being emasculated. Nothing has changed in this respect with the advent of the Socialist Party government. A small body of men – leaders of the SPA, of industrialists' associations, trade unions and government bodies – make all the important decisions, while parliamentary bodies are increasingly consigned to obscurity. Ever greater power is concentrated in a small group of technocrats controlling the commanding heights of the economy. Concentration and authoritarian control of the press, radio and television are curtailing the freedom of the press and expression. The mass information media are totally dedicated to preserving state-monopoly capitalism. A conservative spirit pervades the schools, especially the higher educational establishments, and educational privileges remain in force. Those who oppose the capitalist system are exposed to repression and discrimination, while the top functionaries and managers, those loyal servants of capitalism corrupted by handouts, enjoy all kinds of advantages.

The anti-democratic methods of Austria's state-monopoly capitalism may be largely traced to the 'social partnership' policy, which has struck far deeper root in Austria than in other developed capitalist states. It inhibits democratic working-class action, cuts back the right to strike, splits and alienates the people, and subordinates the trade unions, in which there is very little or no

democracy, to the interests of big capital. The 'partnership' ideology is calculated to confuse the workers' class consciousness, and to condone it is tantamount to abandoning the socialist perspective. It is the main factor deterring large-scale class battles in Austria.

The Congress gave a characterization of the other Austrian political parties and their functions in the state-monopoly capitalist system.

The Austrian People's Party (APP) is in composition and policy a traditional party of capitalists and landlords, which rejects socialist ideas and advocates the capitalist order. However, to mislead the public, it describes itself as a 'progressive center party.' The policy of its leadership is contrary to the interests of those hundreds of thousands of workers, clerks, small and medium peasants, and artisans who are either its members or vote for it in elections.

The much smaller Austrian Freedom Party (AFP), too, frankly stands for the preservation of capitalism. On many issues it is even more to the right than the APP. Its policy and ideology are pro-West German, nationalist and racist and tend to undermine Austria's neutral status. Yet the AFP would have public opinion believe that it is a party of 'freedom,' a 'liberal' party like West Germany's Free Democratic Party. One of its tasks is to recruit working people disillusioned with the policies of the People's and Socialist parties.

Unlike the two bourgeois parties, the SPA, whose influence on the working class is greatest, advocates socialization of the basic means of production and a classless society. However, its leaders' policy is designed to preserve and stabilize capitalism. The reforms they propose are merely meant to prevent the working class from fighting for a fundamental change of the social order and keep those favoring an anti-capitalist policy from rallying behind the Communist Party.

At present, The Guidelines note, 'most members of the top echelons of the SPA, having taken up high positions in the economy and in government, directly perform the functions of managers of the affairs of state-monopoly capitalism. The integration of leading Socialists into the system of state-monopoly domination has gone particularly far in Austria.'

In the Socialist International, the SPA leadership stands on the extreme Right. Though this is Austria's first Social-Democratic government, it has in no way changed the nature of the capitalist state or society.

It follows that in Austria today the CPA is the only Party to offer an alternative, to fight against state-monopoly capitalism, for a socialist society.

Analysis of state-monopoly capitalism in Austria is of fundamental importance in formulating our strategy and tactics.

The Congress Guidelines draw the important conclusion that the antagonisms between the working class and big capital are irreconcilable and can only grow more acute. More than ever before, the

historic mission of the working class is to achieve socialism in alliance with other oppressed and exploited sections of the people.

No matter how bourgeois and Social-Democratic ideologists try to embellish the situation, they cannot conceal the increasing antagonism and crisis trends in the economy and policy of state-monopoly capitalism, and throughout the system as a whole.

In this situation, some members of the younger generation of SPA functionaries are beginning to criticize the party leadership for its 'policy of preserving the system' and demand a 'reform of society.' To a degree, this is an attempt to sow illusions by means of Leftist-sounding talk about SPA policy, prevent the withdrawal of the discontented from the party and their joining the Communist Party, and enable the leadership to stick to its policy. On the other hand, we realize that there are many young Social-Democrats whose criticism is sincere. We can and should prevail on them to join in a common struggle for the democratic and socialist alternative.

The Right-wing leaders contend that there are irreconcilable contradictions between Social-Democrats and Communists ruling out all cooperation. 'In reality,' says the CC Report, 'Communist, Social-Democrat, Christian and unaffiliated workers, for all the diversity of their political views and general outlook, belong to one class having common fundamental interests.'

Congress resolutions stress that the SPA leaders' anti-Communist policy of division will not prevent the CPA from establishing closer links with Socialist workers or from holding more comradely discussions with them and taking joint action in support of specific demands.

Last year strikers at Boehler-Ybbstal, who fought for a pay raise and against infringements of democracy, showed that this is possible. A series of joint actions over municipal policy provided further evidence of it. The movement of solidarity with Vietnam and the formation of a united Socialist, Communist and Catholic front of solidarity with Chile invite a similar conclusion. The development of united action is inseparable from the fight against the policy and ideology of 'social partnership' and anti-communism. Accordingly, Austria's Communists insist that the trade unions should play a new role, be free from paralyzing links with the employers and government and operate as an independent, militant class organization of labor. This calls primarily for greater democracy in the unions.

The 22nd Congress adopted an Action Program which our Party proposes to the working class and ali democrats of Austria.

It cannot be analyzed in the limited space of this article, and we will deal only with some of its aspects. The Action Program contains proposals and demands aimed at combating inflation, pursuing an active wages and social services policy, effecting a democratic tax reform, providing people with decent housing in a healthy environment, ensuring a democratic municipal policy, promoting an educational reform and providing sports facilities. It outlines an economic policy which would safeguard jobs and

create new ones and protect small handicraftsmen and peasants.

The key task set by the Action Program and Guidelines is to promote full democracy in every sphere as the basis of an anti-monopoly democracy that would curb and undermine monopoly power and pave the way to socialism. Anti-monopoly democracy implies worker participation in economic management and control over the economy, nationalization of key enterprises, state ownership of banking, insurance and the multinationals, democratization of the mass media and, above all, struggle to establish a state of anti-monopoly democracy. Such deep-going democratic change can be brought about only through sustained, massive class struggle, against state-monopoly capitalism. This necessitates a qualitative change in the alignment of political forces in favor of the working class, a stronger Communist Party, and steps to curb and offset the impact of the policy of 'social partnership' and anti-communism, achieve united working-class action and form a broad anti-monopoly alliance.

Anti-monopoly democracy is a transitional phase: it is no longer capitalism but neither is it socialism, as yet. It is an important step towards creating favorable objective and subjective conditions for the socialist revolution.

The Guidelines state in brief our socialist objectives. There is no 'model' of socialism. A social system evolves according to general laws, with due regard to the national characteristics of the country concerned and in national form only. The general laws are: working-class power, which performs the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat while at the same time providing the greatest democracy for the working people; socialization of the basic means of production and democratic management of a planned national economy; leading role of the Marxist-Leninist Party on the basis of the closest possible links with the working class and all working people; solidarity with other socialist countries and the revolutionary and progressive forces of the world.

The existence of highly developed industry and agriculture, a powerful state sector of the economy and a developed cooperative system are national characteristics that will eventually facilitate Austria's transition to socialism. The Guidelines note that the CPA is working for socialism without civil war, but the possibilities for this will depend on how far the front of class struggle expands in Austria and the world. We deliberately avoid using the term 'peaceful road to socialism' because the Austrian Social-Democrats have been using it for decades, meaning the purely parliamentary road. The CPA would like to advance to socialism together with other parties, except that these parties must thoroughly differ in character and functions from the parties in today's three-party system of state-monopoly capitalism. Strengthening the Communist Party will, of course, be a key task in any case.

The problem of strengthening the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally received much attention at the Congress. The CPA has made progress in this respect in line with the decisions

of its previous Congress. The Right opportunist groups expelled from the Party tried to carry on their anti-Communist and anti-Soviet activity but failed completely. They found themselves in political isolation and today they cooperate with Maoist and Trotskyist sects. Some Right opportunists joined the SPA, others serve the bourgeoisie in the mass media. The elections, in which Right-wing opportunists tried, with help from the SPA leadership to run their candidates showed that they have no following among the working class.

The CPA concentrated on constructive effort to promote the interests of the workers and the people as a whole. This enabled it to score some advances. The Party's struggle was a factor in compelling the government and parliament to carry out certain reforms in the working people's interests, including a pay rise.

In elections to production councils and representative bodies of enterprise personnel, the Communist Party and the Trade Union Unity group linked with it increased their seats by 50 per cent. Municipal elections brought the Party a substantial increase in votes and seats. The Party improved its ideological and political work and its propaganda among the masses, and its public actions became more effective. Initial gains have been made in enlisting more young men and women as active members and functionaries of the Party.

On the other hand, the Congress pointed to many shortcomings and weak points, above all in organizing work. The main task is, as in the past, to bring more young people into the Party and help them to join in a common struggle for their interests. The Party's entire policy, the form and content of its activity, must be geared in greater measure to accomplishing this task. It is particularly important to improve Party work in the enterprises. The Congress outlined a number of specific steps to this end. To begin with, we must end the lag in the ideological and political work of Party factory branches (compared with their work in the production and trade union sphere). Problems of municipal policy should receive growing attention from all neighborhood Party organizations and should be tackled in closer connection with overall social and political problems. We must improve our Party press in regard to content and layout. This also applies to the content and form of our mass propaganda.

Our Party plans to put forward its candidates in the local elections to be held shortly and, in general, to participate actively in election campaigns. It aims at winning seats on the National Council in the 1975 general election. This is no easy task, all the more so because there are electoral provisions that discriminate against small parties. We do not see our eventual presence in parliament as an end in itself. We seek it because we want to inform and mobilize public opinion and uphold the working people's demands more effectively.

The 22nd Congress revealed once again the internationalist unity of the CPA with the Communist movement. This was seen

in both the content of Congress decisions and the presence of delegations from 15 parties, including a CPSU delegation, as well as in numerous messages of greetings from brother Parties. The positive outcome of the 1969 Meeting helped to strengthen world Communist unity and make further progress through joint struggle.

Our contacts and cooperation with the brother parties of socialist and capitalist countries have lately become closer. The CPA took an active part in the conference of Communist and Workers' parties of capitalist Europe held in Brussels in January.

'The Communist Party of Austria,' says the Central Committee Report to the 22nd Congress, 'declares for closer unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.'

Agrarian policy of SUPG

Gerhard Grueneberg
Member of PB,
Secretary, CC SUPG

CONTINUING OUR SERIES ON DEVELOPED SOCIALISM*

In line with the general strategy of the socialist community and the decisions of the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and with due regard to the social and economic achievements and prospects of the GDR, the Eighth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany formulated the guidelines for building a developed socialist society in our republic. Application of the Marxist-Leninist agrarian theory and Lenin's cooperation plan is a requisite of the development of the GDR as a socialist state, with the working class and its party playing the leading role. Today's socialist agricultural co-operatives are the best proof of the correctness of Lenin's plan. First formulated more than half a century ago, it is not an ossified dogma and it helps to chart the ways of further development in agriculture. In the socialist countries building and perfecting developed socialism, these paths are largely similar.

The Party's agrarian policy is a component of the program approved by its Eighth Congress. The main purpose of our economic effort is to raise the people's material and cultural standards by developing socialist production at a high rate, make it more efficient, advancing science and technology and increasing labor productivity.

*See *WMR*, January, March, June, July and October 1973, and January and February 1974.

The experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union and other countries, including the GDR, shows that the development of intensive agricultural production is part of the planned and proportional growth of the entire economy.

When the groundwork for socialism was being laid the Party strove primarily to convince the peasants of the need to go over to large-scale cooperative production. It was necessary to reshape the outdated social and economic structure of 880,000 small and medium holdings and allow scope for the growth of the productive forces and social progress in the countryside. By the spring of 1960 farming was based on 19,300 production cooperatives. This enabled us to set about building a developed socialist society.

We now have 7,649 agricultural cooperatives (their number was reduced through amalgamation), 334 fruit-growing cooperatives, 499 state farms and about 1,000 cooperative and state enterprises engaged in construction, repair and land reclamation. Some 770,000 cooperative members and 92,000 state farm workers cultivate 94 per cent of the nation's farmland. We owe it to their labor that total output, including that of forestry, increased from 12,100 million marks in 1950 to 30,800 million marks in 1972. The share of agriculture in the gross national product in 1972 made up 10.5 per cent and in the net social product, 12.7 per cent. Agriculture supplies 67.5 per cent of the country's raw materials, which are processed by more than 50 industries. Over 80 per cent of food products, or over 45 per cent of the marketable stock, comes from our own agriculture. Estimates show that whereas in 1970 one farmer fed 23 persons, last year he fed 28.

To develop farm production according to plan is not merely an economic necessity but a prerequisite of strengthening and extending the social basis of our state power, the worker-peasant alliance. Ever since the foundations of socialism were laid, the peasantry, the main ally of the working class, has been linked with it by common basic economic, political and ideological interests, with a say in government, economic management and public affairs generally.

The community of interests of the workers and peasants in building a developed socialist society expresses itself in a policy oriented on man's requirements. To meet these requirements was the Party's main task in the past as well, but now it is in a position to concern itself with them more directly and to spend more. Specifically, we plan to set up an intensive agriculture meeting the demands of a developed socialist society in output, labor productivity and other efficiency indicators. The Eighth Party Congress resolved 'to concentrate on further socialist intensification in agricultural production. Economically, it is more profitable to support our socialist agriculture by supplying it with more and better means of production than by importing food products which we can produce ourselves.'

Accordingly, the five-year plan provides for increasing output

of higher grade farm produce to 112.5 per cent by 1975 compared with 1970 and for achieving a productivity standard that will enable every farm worker to provide food staples for around 32 persons.

The working class greatly helps the peasantry at this stage as well, both politically and materially. This means that today foodstuffs are produced not by cooperative peasants and agricultural workers alone, but that their production virtually involves all ancillary industries. And this is the social meaning and purpose of the further socialist intensification of farming, which is also stimulated by the rapid development of food supplies as a whole through socialist economic integration.

The Party's agricultural policy is based on the objective development laws of the communist social formation and the scientific forecasts of the founders of Marxism-Leninism. To supply the population with food, Marx and Engels wrote in 'The German Ideology,' 'is an historical act, a fundamental condition of all history, which today, as thousands of years ago, must daily and hourly be fulfilled merely in order to sustain human life.'

Demand for high-grade food products is growing. At the same time, agriculture is getting more up-to-date machines. In 1972 the share of machinery and chemicals in the total expenditure of agriculture and the processing industry was 27 and 14 per cent respectively. The means of production supplied by industry bring about revolutionary changes in agricultural labor, which they help to make a variety of industrial labor.

As Marx pointed out in *Capital*, 'an agricultural labor productivity exceeding the individual requirements of the laborer is the basis of all societies.' As we build developed socialism this excess becomes so great that we can speak of a qualitatively new stage in farming. Step by step, it is becoming a branch of industry, working and living conditions in the countryside are becoming more and more like urban conditions, and class distinctions between workers and peasants are disappearing. This long process is inseparable from the planned development of production itself.

The Eighth Congress defined, along with strategic goals, the economic factors for intensifying agriculture: chemicalization, mechanization, reclamation and selection. This is an indication of the Party's effort to stimulate the growth of the productive forces according to plan and to Lenin's idea that 'large-scale machine industry and its extension to agriculture is the only possible economic basis for socialism' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 49).

Scientific and technological progress in the GDR is closely linked with full utilization of tht advantages of socialist relations of production. The Party directs this social process and organizes it on scientific lines. It saw that to develop the productive forces and socialism, it is indispensable to change the entire character of production according to the laws of social division of labor. 'It is important,' Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the CC SUPG,

told the 11th Peasant Congress of the GDR, 'always to remember that the objective economic laws of socialism also govern the development of agriculture. Progress in science and technology and a notable growth of the productive forces logically call for the further concentration and specialization of farming. Socialism can and must fully meet these requirements. . . . The question today is no longer whether to adopt industrial methods in agriculture – the focal question today is how to adopt them.'

Let us look at grain production. In the 50s grain crops in the GDR average about 24 metric centners and in 1972 it was as high as 36.6 centners. We succeeded in reducing average lobar expenditure per centner of grain from six or seven man-hours in the 50s to two or three in ordinary cooperatives in the 60s and to 0.5 or 0.6 where industrial technology was used. We make greater use of industrial methods of growing potatoes and sugar-beet, maintaining meadows and pastures, and so on. In animal husbandry, progressive concentration and specialization of production based on advanced technology and using entirely mechanized or automated equipment are another aspect of the intensification process. On dairy farms using industrial methods, every worker produces 126,000 marks' worth of gross output per year, with still higher figures for beef, 180,000 marks, pork, 219,000 marks and poultry, 199,000 marks.

The Party considers this experience to be of fundamental importance. It systematically analyzes and determines the policy of concentrated and effective investment. This helps it to cope with the fundamental social, economic, scientific, technological and other aspects of industrialized farming.

Socialist intensification and the steady introduction of industrial techniques also have far-reaching social implications. Viewing the process as a whole, we may single out the following main characteristics of industrialized agricultural production:

– Manual labor is being increasingly replaced by machines. The accent is on integrated systems of machines, which are becoming the technical basis of farming at all stages of production.

– Production is concentrated and specialized according to plan, and large specialized economic units are brought into being through cooperation, which makes for optimal use of new machine systems.

– Agricultural production gains in scope while firmly maintaining a high quality. Quantity and quality of output meet the demand.

– Cooperation helps integrate all stages of production, up to and including storage, canning and processing.

– Full use is made of the latest achievements of both natural science and social sciences – economics, education, psychology, sociology.

– More operations and ancillary services are transferred from the immediate process of agricultural production to autonomous specialized enterprises, such as agrochemical centers.

– Working and living conditions in the countryside are being

improved. Industrial methods are becoming the paramount prerequisite for bringing rural and urban living conditions ever closer.

One of the main political factors in carrying out Lenin's cooperation plan in the GDR is to determine in terms of science the ways of transition to industrial production methods. The SUPG, which follows the Marxist-Leninist teaching and the experience gained, considers that cooperatives are the most obvious and acceptable form for the peasants, and the best way of concentrating and specializing production throughout socialist society. This follows from the fact that the specialized and 'cooperative character of the labor process is . . . a technical necessity dictated by the instrument of labor itself' (Karl Marx. *Capital*).

Cooperation between socialist agricutural enterprises, as well as between them and processing and trading enterprises, makes it possible steadily to advance from simple to such advanced forms as crop-growing cooperative amalgamations or vertical cooperation in cooperative unions. This method of further socialization of labor makes it possible jointly to accumulate funds and undertake capital construction. In other words, it enables the working people to adjust to changing production conditions. As a result, scientific and technological achievements can be widely used in the interests of socialist society, the collective and the individual.

Cooperation naturally entails specialized production units. The further socialization of labor affords vast opportunities for the growth of the productive forces. It manifests itself as the principal trend in production organization and an important means of steadily perfecting socialist relations of production. The dynamism of socialism is also inherent in the cooperatives and state farms, enabling them to advance the productive forces by steadily improving production patterns and organization, and expanding economic relations between units. This, in turn, makes it possible to perfect socialist social relations and further the development of every member of the collective.

Tht Party's effort towards developing the productive forces, increasing production and perfecting social relations is a single dialectical process. The Party sees this comprehensive approach as an earnest of continuous progress in agriculture, which is also fostered by the economic integration of CMEA countries, in particular by the close cooperation of our economy wtih the Soviet economy.

Over 23 per cent of the tractors used in the GDR today are of Soviet make. About 60 per cent of the area under winter wheat is sown with high-grade Soviet varieties. The current technology of harvesting sugar-beet is also a product of multilateral cooperation. Important advances towards integration are taking place in the production of plant for processing industries.

The Party concentrates on finding effective solutions to key problems of intensification jointly formulated within the framework of cooperation with the Soviet Union and other CMEA coun-

tries. In the sphere of chemicalization, mechanization, reclamation and selection, we apply the most diverse forms of socialist economic integration ranging from joint research to the production of means of intensification on the basis of labor division. We benefit from the facilities provided by the Soviet Union for the training and refresher training of personnel. This helps us to study and effectively use the Soviet Union's vast experience and develop cooperation more fruitfully.

Our Party attaches special importance to wider cooperation in science. Under numerous bilateral and multilateral agreements, joint research is conducted on an increasing scale in biology, pedigree livestock breeding, plant selection and perfection and the physiology of feeding, as well as in industrial technologies of plant cultivation and animal husbandry. Exchange of scientific achievements and of experience in organizing social production is expanding. Joint centers coordinating work on various scientific problems have proved their value. This is designed to pool research facilities so as to achieve useful results all the more speedily and make better joint use of science as a productive force.

The Party is doing much to perfect the economy and organization of socialist enterprises. The working people must have an adequate knowledge of management, planning and organization in this period of increasing use of industrial methods and growing cooperation and division of labor. We must find the best forms of material and moral incentives for cooperative members and agricultural workers, as well as for workers engaged in the processing industry. We are working out principles for determining the ratio between accumulation and consumption to eliminate differences in efficiency.

Evolution of the socialist way of life in the countryside is determined by progress in production. It is primarily labor and collective effort that shape the man of the new world, and his new, socialist requirements. However, the changing conditions of labor and life should not be regarded as an automatic consequence of developing production. The Party does everything to influence social and economic processes in order to foster the all-round development of the socialist individual.

A noteworthy social result of agricultural progress in the GDR is that the vast difference in educational standards between town and country, a legacy of capitalism, has virtually been eliminated. To be specific, 72.5 per cent of farmers have received a complete specialized education: 60.7 per cent are skilled workers, 6.3 per cent foremen, 4.3 per cent with a secondary specialized education and 1.2 per cent graduates of higher schools. Whereas in 1960 the share of women farmers who had complete vocational training was a meager 1.1 per cent, today it is 66.3 per cent. There are 506 women members of cooperatives with a higher education, about 4,500 have finished technical schools, and some 4,000 hold foremen's diplomas.

The children of the cooperative farmers and agricultural workers

today have the same opportunities for education as the children of townspeople, and 90.8 per cent of all children of school age attend 10-grade polytechnical school. The state helps cooperatives to build schools, kindergartens, nurseries and various cultural institutions.

In case of illness or on reaching pension age, cooperative farmers are entitled to the same social insurance benefits as industrial workers. As production efficiency grows more cooperatives introduce regular paid holidays for their members.

The foregoing shows that the continuing socialist intensification of farming and the adoption of industrial methods constitute a deep-going revolutionary process reflecting a social need. The growing role of the working class finds concentrated expression in the fact that this process is under the political leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party. Objective conditions and social possibilities pose more strategic tasks, the most important of which were set by the Eighth Party Congress. The working class and cooperative farmers work more closely together in planning and managing production. The content of class alliance is determined by the common interests of the workers and cooperative farmers.

Notable changes are taking place also within the class of cooperative farmers, oriented on closer links with the working class. The share of cooperative members who contributed land to their cooperatives is diminishing and with it the role of distribution according to land contributed. At the same time there are now many more machine-and-tractor-station workers, tractor-drivers and agronomists who joined cooperatives in the course of the movement for the resettlement of urban working people to the countryside. While in 1960 workers in agricultural cooperatives made up about 29 per cent, in 1970 their proportion was almost 44 per cent.

The peasants working in cooperative industrial complexes today are people of a new type. They use industrial methods, have a high political and professional standard and are learning to manage, organize and control production processes unfamiliar to them in the past. They are developing the characteristics of industrial workers, and are becoming more organized as industrial methods are introduced and cooperation in labor expands. Conditions for influencing the rural population are becoming ever more favorable for the Party.

The subjective factor is gaining in importance as agriculture makes further progress. This is why our Party regards active ideological work as a means of raising the political awareness of the working people, promoting socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism and arming the working people against all bourgeois ideological influences. As they master Marxist-Leninist science, workers, cooperative farmers and intellectuals are acquiring a better knowledge of the laws of social life and progress.

This, then, is how Lenin's cooperation plan is being carried into practice in our agriculture as a component of building a developed socialist society for the good of the workers, cooperative farmers and other working people.

Marxist-Leninist Party of our epoch

Adolf Dobieszewski
Director of the Party Institute,
Higher School of Social Sciences,
Poland

Lenin's teaching on the Party is a dialectical unity of revolutionary theory, strategy and tactics, and structural and organizational principles. In the absence of a sufficiently dynamic organization a theoretical program becomes a dead letter, while, conversely, good organization in the absence of a program is merely a dormant potentiality. Likewise, a good program and good organization are meaningless unless laced with revolutionary strategy and tactics and, primarily, correct assessment and use of opportunities arising at any given historical period.

Yet all these closely connected elements do not exist by themselves, in isolation from the objectives of the proletarian revolution and the building of the new society. The Party's structure, the mechanics of its inner life, is based on revolutionary theory – a generalization of already ascertained regularities, of practice, determining the nature of the organization. Formulating the Party's structural and operational principles, Lenin stressed, is an endless striving towards the best type of organization more completely fitted for the revolutionary aim.

The necessity for the Party does not stem exclusively from the conditions of the struggle for power, but also from the substance and historical mission of the working class. Winning power only opens the period of revolutionary transformation. Building the material and technical basis of socialism, and moulding the new social relations and the new man, requires organized and purposively directed action by workers and all the laboring masses. This was complicated in practice by the fact that socialist construction was first started in countries which (at least in most cases) were economically and socially backward. In view of the vast variety of problems facing the new social formation it may be safely said that building socialism is much more difficult than winning popular power. And experience shows that for this reason the role of the Party does not decline. Quite the contrary.

The article opening the exchange of opinions on the Marxist-Leninist Party of our time* described the Party's revolutionary nature as its determining feature, but failed, as we see it, to show its essence fully enough in the conditions of socialist construction. This, therefore, we should like to try and do.

In general terms, the essence of the Marxist-Leninist party's

*See *WMR*, Feb. 1974.

revolutionary mission in the epoch of proletarian dictatorship is to build the new society, gradually elminate class distinctions, and ascertain and overcome everything tending to hold up this process.

In Poland's case, the objective premise for the integration of the principal classes and strata is the continuously more solid socio-economic system based on public ownership of the means of production and the continuously broader social base of political power – the dictatorship of the proletariat. The country's swift socio-economic growth, distribution of goods in accordance with quantity and quality of work, the higher living standard and cultural level, and participation of the masses in state and public affairs, conform with the aspirations shared by the working class, farmers and working intelligentsia.

Elimination of exploiting classes has precluded spontaneous escalation of contradictions and conflicts typical of capitalist society. Social processes are consciously controlled by fusing scientific knowledge and revolutionary practice in the activity of the Marxist-Leninist party.

The victory of the revolution has given impulse to the now far advanced radical transformation of the social structure and changes in the position of classes and strata, giving decisive supremacy to the socialist elements, that is, those associated with public ownership.

Socialist costruction saw a considerable growth of the working class, the chief motive force of the new system. Its decisive part in the economy, in creating the national income, has grown still more. And at all stages the Party has furthered this. Far-reaching changes have also taken place in the socio-economic condition of the farmers, the chief allies of the working class. The growth of multiple ties between small-scale farming and the planned socialist economy is in the interests of the farmers, and they are becoming ever more deeply aware of this thanks to the Party's social and political activity. Its increasing impact is a decisive factor in the farmers' transition to socialist agriculture. Our intelligentsia has grown, too, and the part that received its education in People's Poland is now numerically superior. Massive promotion of advanced workers to responsible posts has in many ways altered the intelligentsia; it is now more closely connected with the working class and its ideology.

Poland still has a sector of small-scale capitalism, though the influence of the social groups connected with it is negligible. Yet, despite its economic weakness, it will be a potential source of anti-socialist elements as long as it exists. And since it will probably exist for some time still to meet public need, the Party must control and direct it within the framework of the dominant socialist socio-economic system.

Socialist Poland's experience and Marxist-Leninist ideology has remoulded the consciousness of the laboring masses. 'This experience and ideology,' Edward Gierek said at the First All-Polish

PUWP Conference, 'have fully absorbed the progressive legacy of national tradition. They have fused universal internationalist values determining the main currents of world progress with the historically-shaped requirements and progressive aspirations of the Polish nation.'

Now, Poland has everything she needs to build developed socialist society. 'This society,' Gierek said in the same speech, 'will have all the advantages of the socialist system coupled with up-to-date technology, will make rational use of the country's resources, and will enhance its attractions. It will be an educated and productive society living in prosperity and culture, preserving and multiplying the legacy of past generations and, at the same time, joining its labor ever more closely with that of the fraternal socialist peoples.'

The socialist social system is in essence both the premise and result of the integration of the main classes and strata. However, each stage of socialist construction gives rise to new social requirements, necessitating new means and levers for rallying all citizens around common aims. The Party's main purpose is to find and correctly assess at each stage the resources for achieving the wishes of the working class, the laboring masses, and to formulate them in concrete directives as guidelines for action. This is indeed reflected in the program documents of the Sixth PUWP Congress and CC plenary meetings.

The Party's strategy, thinking and practice are epitomized in the motto, 'For and Through the People.' Certainly, society is quicker to understand the first part of the motto, 'For the People,' than the formula, 'Through the People.' The latter implies the operation and improvement of mechanisms forging conditions that encourage the initiative of individuals on the one hand, and presupposes greater activity by citizens, on the other. True, a consistently followed policy 'for the people' is itself a powerful stimulant of public activity. But it is important that the expectations of people should combine wih awareness of their own role, opportunities and obligations to multiply the visible gains made under the post-December Party leadership.

That the individual's role should expand in the battle for socialist aims is not merely a general slogan, but an objective necessity of socialist construction. And its impact redoubles when the rapid growth of civilization, urbanization, technology and organization redoubles the demand for material goods and the significance of ideological, moral and cultural humanitarian values. 'Ours is the only system,' Gierek said, 'that can create a model of life in which material prosperity associates with the flowering of man's and society's humanitarian values. Precisely this is its greatest potential, its progressiveness and world perspective.'

At the present stage of socialist construction in Poland, property relations and the resultant social stratification, people's definite place in the division of labor and diverse participation in creating and using the national income, and their different level of conscious-

ness, give rise to particular personal aspirations, creating grounds for social contradictions.

It is wrong to think that socialist society has no contradictions or that they are negligible, temporary, purely superficial. The distinguishing feature of the socialist formation is not absence of contradictions (because no society can develop without conflict), but that contradictions can be resolved within its framework by organized and conscious activity.

By its essence, socialism does not breed antagonistic contradictions. But this does not mean that acute social tensions are ruled out in a society building socialism. Conflict-type contradictions may arise from mistakes in handling urgent problems, from overlooking the laws of social development. And the situation may become doubly complicated if the reactionary elements at home are in some way connected with capitalist forces abroad, for then the contradictions may become antagonistic.

Social differentiation, which survives under socialism for a relatively long time, entails certain economic, ideological, political and cultural consequences. The party in power is obliged to consider the intricate pattern of the differing social interests of various sections of the working class, different strata, professional groups, and the like. These interests may be of the present day or of the future. Sometimes, they create social situations not entirely consonant with the Party's aims and plans. Also, especially if not effectively dealt with, they may have a negative influence on the Party, and first and foremost its strategy and tactics, the composition of its membership, its elective bodies, and other elements of the Party structure.

To avoid this, we must analyze the essence and forms of the social contradictions, and find dependable solutions aligned with the interests of the working class and the rest of society at the given stage. Furthermore, the materialization of these interests must be controlled, for the optimum harmony of the general, group and individual interests at different stages is one of our Party's basic socialist objectives.

Practice has shown that overestimating the unity of socialist society, like underestimating the integrational processes, can act as a brake on socialist construction. It may breathe life into conservative or hostile elements. And in a world of two social systems – capitalist and socialist – determining the antagonistic structural conflict of our time, these may imperil socialism.

Underestimating the progressive integrational processes in socialist society, on the other hand, may retard the materialization of urgent social requirements, resulting in incomplete use of existing opportunities for civic initiative, inhibiting effective ideological and moral incentives, and delaying the natural appearance of new types of socal bonds and new regulators of public life through different forms and institutions of socialist democracy.

The interests of classes, strata, groups and individuals are expressed first and foremost in a bid for advantageous distribution of

the national income. This is the field in which group and individual interests clash most frequently with the public interest (sometimes developing into a highly acute contradiction), and interests of the day with long-term interests.

In socialist society accumulation is not contraposed to consumption, just as the interests of one class are not opposed to the interests of others. It is in the common interest. All the same, contradictions between consumption and accumulation may arise, especially in the period of intensive industrialization. True, like the contradictions over the distribution of the national income, they dwindle away in the setting of a continuously rising income. But this does not mean that appropriate proportions between consumption and investment, or development rates in different economic fields or in different regions, are of secondary significance and that the contradictions cannot be resolved until some remote future date. Socialism's long-term aims will not be real and tangible, and desired by the masses, unless the present-day public requirements are met ever more fully and progress is continuous.

While working for this end, the Party also applies itself to developing public thinking, a sense of socialist responsibility, in every working man. The Fourth Congress drafted an action program to fortify the people's state and to further socialist social relations. Efficient government, democratism and justice in social relations, are important for the people. The Party improves the socialist state, extends its democratism, and at the same time strives to show that the best way to serve Poland is to observe the laws of the socialist state, enhance its prestige and increase its political, economic and defensive potential. There is no contradiction, Gierek stressed, between creative initiative and discipline in the performance of one's duty.

The Party's program and political line promoting the unity of socialist society are not a mere sum of the views and interests of all the people. As we have stressed, the point of departure and yardstick is the interest of the working class. It is the Party's job to see the workers' present and future interest in the right perspective and combat transient particular aspirations of some of the people.

However, and Lenin stressed this, though the Party is obliged to overcome the backward views of some groups, the groups in question cannot be left out of the reckoning. The Party must reckon with them, produce ideological arguments and, the main thing, set the right rates for some of the long-term objectives not yet understood by a part of the laboring masses though they are ultimately in their interest.

The socialist socio-economic system, experience shows, must have a mainspring – an ideological body continuously verifying its program with the mood and aspirations of the masses identifying its own interests with those of the people, but treating them in a historical perspective. The Marxist-Leninist Party, the organized vanguard of the working class, is just such a body. Proceeding in all its

activity from scientific analysis of the development of society, it expresses the aspirations of its class and is therefore able effectively to promote the long-term, as well as daily, interests of that class and, at the same time, the interests of all working people.

Let us emphasize in conclusion that objective assessment of the degree of integration of the society building socialism, and of the results of the Party's work in uniting and harmonizing the interests and actions of classes, strata, groups and individuals, is of immense theoretical and practical significance.

The idea of uniting the historical aspirations of the working class with those of the people is reflected in the theoretical thinking and political practice of the Polish United Workers' Party. The program of further socialist development in Poland adopted by its Sixth Congress links the long-term objectives of the working class with the interests of individual strata and collectives, and fortifies the people's unity in implementing the socialist aims. The practical achievement of this program shows that the public is deeply convinced in the necessity of the Party's leading role in the country. Its creative initiative, ability to generalize developments in society, to formulate new tasks in political terms, and its close bonds with the masses, multiply the strength and raise the prestige of the Party among the people.

The experience of the socialist countries shows, therefore, that the building of the new society also determines the features of the Marxist-Leninist party, which directs the constructive endeavors of the nation. The revolutionary nature of the popular effort predicates the necessity for a party of revolutionary action.

Fidelity to revolutionary principles

Otto Sanchez
Member, Ideological Commission,
CC Guatemalan Party of Labor

The epochal events of the 20th century that have radically changed the economic and social structure of many countries, delivered a large part of mankind from poverty, ignorance and social oppression and set the course for the development of world civilization, are directly associated with the transformatory activity and active struggle of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist revolutionary parties. And there is the proof of experience that the mass struggle against exploitation and oppression is doomed to full

or partial defeat if it relies solely on 'class instinct,' on the spontaneous urge to break out of unbearable conditions. The subjective factor in history, the Party as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, plays a progressively increasing role. Hence, the importance of in-depth analysis of the essential features of the Marxist-Leninist Party.*

The theoretical and practical experience of the Latin-American Communist Parties** convincingly corroborates Lenin's idea that the character of the Party, its distinctive features, are formed in struggle. The Latin-American revolutionary movement, for all the differences from country to country, is, in a way, a single whole and has certain essential common features. This should not be taken to mean that the revolution must triumph in all countries at one and the same time and in one and the same form – there is no universal model of revolution. But there are similarities in the revolutionary process, features common to many Communist and Workers' parties of our continent. For example, they have a common and long-standing tradition of organized political struggle, influence the active middle strata, notably intellectuals and students who play an important part in the liberation movement. However, the dominant features stem not from regional specificality, but from the main laws of social development, the main laws of revolutionary struggle.

It has been repeatedly emphasized, in the article opening this discussion and elsewhere, that consistent devotion to revolution is a salient feature of the Marxist-Leninist party. In our view this implies, above all, the Party's ability to relate its immediate to its ultimate goals. In our conditions this means relating the anti-imperialist struggle, the confrontation with Yankee imperialism, to the struggle for socialism.

Our own and international experience suggests that the following are the main conditions for the victory of the revolution (when the objective situation for it is ripe):

– correct political orientation, a realistic program combining essential short-term with ultimate aims:

– discipline, combat readiness, courage, ability critically to assess and assimilate national and international experience of the struggle, ability creatively to apply Marxism-Leninism to national conditions;

– constant and close contact with the people, for victory cannot be won without the support of the masses, without their readiness to fight, their acceptance of the Party's policy, and their determination to carry it out.

The struggle against the bourgeois-landlord oligarchy and North-American imperialism, in which our Party has had a dominant part, have convinced us that even the slightest retreat from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the working-class Party dooms the revolu-

*See February issue of *WMR*.

**Analyzed in *Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo. El camino de la revolucion guatemalteca*, (Ediciones de Cultura Popular, Mexico, D.F., 1972) and other of our Party statements.

tionary, democratic and progressive forces to serious setbacks and defeat. Even in the most favorable objective circumstances, weakening of the subjective factor makes it impossible to carry forward the revolutionary process. At our Fourth Party Congress (December 1969) we declared that despite the opportunities open to the revolutionary movement, it is growing at a relatively slower pace than before. Congress made a critical analysis of the mistakes committed by the Party and the revolutionary movement.

We know that, in an unfavorable alignment of forces (and in Guatemala it is unfavorable), Right and 'Left' deviations are especially pronounced. The first finds expression in fear of armed struggle and in demands for 'structural' reforms within the existing system; the second makes an absolute of armed action and exaggerates the role of the peasantry (some declare the Indians to be the only revolutionary force*).

The class roots of these trends are clear enough. In the first case it is the influence of the bourgeoisie, including the well-to-do petty-bourgeoisie, and in the second, the influence of the proverty-stricken petty-bourgeoisie impatient for change, and of the peasantry driven to despair by abject poverty.

In our own midst, too, we have had to deal with petty bourgeois influence, resulting from vacillation between extreme radicalism and fatalistic despair. In both cases there is lack of faith in the masses and in the efficacy of revolutionary work, inadequate understanding of our political line, and political immaturity. These trends will not vanish of themselves. One of our key tasks is to overcome them, both within the Party and in building a united front. What the Party needs is a deeper understanding of Guatemalan experience and a deeper knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and the ability to apply it creatively.

We believe that there is in Guatemala a potentially revolutionary situation, but the subjective conditions for revolution have not yet fully matured. This finds expression in the low organizational level of the popular forces, their inadequate understanding of the need for change, their hazy notions of what path to take, and slow progress in bringing the masses into the struggle. To all this should be added the shortcomings, mentioned above, within the Party itself. A careful study of these questions will enable the Party to substantiate its strategy and policy and determine the stages and possible course of the revolutionary process, work out a general tactic which, if creatively applied to concrete situations, will make it possible to overcome the present crisis. Our Party's revolutionary essence lies in its unswerving reolve to lead our people to final victory, in its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism.

*See Carlos Guzman-Boeckler, Jean-Loup Herbert. *Guatemala: una interpretacion historico-social*, Tercera edicion, corregida, Siglo veintiuno Editores, S.A. Mexico, D.F., 1972.
Indians make up about half of Guatemala's five million population.

COMMUNISTS IN MASS POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

William Kashtan
General Secretary, CP of Canada

The Canadian Communists, who are now politically much more active, are frequently the initiators and organizers of mass campaigns.

For example, we are now devoting a great deal of attention to the struggle against the results of inflation. The main task of our campaign is to avert the fall in the living standards of the working class, to hold back prices and unemployment, and to press Parliament and the government to undertake concrete steps to this end. While demanding increased wages we, at the same time, strive to protect pensioners from the ruinous effects of inflation. We proposed that pensions and family allowances be adjusted every three months according to the sharply rising prices spiral, and the government has, to some extent, made adjustments.

We Communists combine the defense of the interests of the people with political work, explaining to the working people that as long as capitalism exists there will be economic difficulties.

Our other major campaign has been on the question of energy. As is known, Canada has huge stocks of energy resources, gas and oil, uranium, hydro-power, coal. We have shown the Canadian people and emphasized that, rather than selling its national resources to the United States and getting back manufactured articles, Canada should be building secondary industries and extending trade with the world, particularly with the socialist world. We have related this campaign around the energy crisis to the need to control prices for oil and to the whole question of the redirection of Canadian policy. More specifically, our Party has campaigned for some time for public ownership under democratic control of energy resources.

Our Party has also taken the initiative in developing the solidarity of the Canadian working class with the people of Chile.

How do the Communists act when developing a given mass campaign? One of the ways is to send delegations to Parliament, to provincial government bodies and municipal authorities. We do all we can to ensure that the demands presented by the delegations and the replies of the authorities are made known to the population through public meetings up and down the country, through our Communist press, posters and leaflets and other forms.

We issued a special supplement of the *Canadian Tribune* of 100,000 copies in which we analyzed the reasons for inflation and the necessity for a struggle against it. I think it has had quite

an effect on the thinking of the working people, and undoubtedly had an effect on Parliament. This is all the more important for us because in the last period of time there has been a studied policy on the part of the mass media to blackout our Party completely, to ignore our position.

In all these campaigns, Communists strive to approach everybody, to strengthen our ties with the mass working class organizations, women, youth and other associations, explaining to them our attitude and the need for united action.

Some time ago we wrote to the New Democratic Party, to the Canadian Labor Congress, to the Confederation of National Trade Unions and the National Farmers' Union, urging them to act jointly with the Communist Party in order to roll back prices and help to raise the living standards of working people. And for the first time in the postwar period, I think, we received replies from all of them, generally taking a positive attitude to the necessity for action. We suggest that conditions are ripening for a broad anti-imperialist front.

In working for the formation of such a front we do not forget that a guarantee of its stability is a strong Communist Party. That is why the public mass work of the Party is being tied in closely with the fight to build the Party and the Young Communist League. 1974 is to be the year of the Party, YCL and Press building. There is the prospect that a federal election may take place this year in Canada. We have agreed that we will run between 50 and 60 candidates which will be a great effort for the Party, entailing considerable financial outlays and great activity. We see this as part of Party building, because having 50 or 60 Communists speaking in defense of the Party's program all over the country, irrespective of the vote we may get at this time, is of key importance in the Party struggle to defeat any efforts on the part of reacion to shift politics to the Right in Canadian political life, and in strengthening the Party's influence.

One month in 1974 will be set aside to campaign for building up the circulation of *World Marxist Review*. We see our main task to be establishing on a firm foundation the distribution of the Party press, including its organized distribution in the factories, as part of our campaign to strengthen the links of the Party with the organized working class, so that its influence becomes decisive.

It is interesting to note that changes have taken place in the trade union movement in relation to the attitude towards Communists and the Communist Party. A number of Communists have been elected to office in trade unions, labor councils and so on. We attribute this to the general public mass campaigning of the Party and, of course, to the overall changing international situation which has its impact on the thinking of working class people in Canada.

The mass campaigns of our Party help to bring political and socialist consciousness into the working class movement and mass organizations of the workers.

Much is happening which proves that the effort of reaction to isolate our Party from the working people and the youth is failing, and will increasingly fail, to achieve its objectives. The period we are entering is a period in which the links of the Party with the working people are strengthening in all provinces of the country. Changes are taking place which open up new opportunities for the growth of our Party's influence.

THE FIGHT AGAINST ANTI-SOVIETISM CONCERNS ONE AND ALL

FRANCE

That is the title of a statement issued by the French Communist Party Central Committee urging a resolute and sustained fight against anti-socialist ideological subversion.

The government and its underlings, the statement says, are conducting a rabid anti-Soviet campaign. They stoop to all manner of falsification and deliberate distortion of the facts. Their propaganda is full of contradictions. For example, to believe them the Soviet Union is staggering from one failure to another, but nonetheless is a very dangerous 'super-power.' The latest addition to this anti-Soviet campaign is Solzhenitsyn's 'Gulag Archipelago,' which the French reactionaries are boosting for all they're worth.

The purpose of the anti-Soviet campaign, the statement says, is to discredit the existing socialism in order to cast doubt on the possibility and value of socialism for France, undermine the faith of working people in changes that would improve their lot. All this is being done to induce people to rely on the present system for solution of their problems. There is also another purpose: divert attention from the disastrous consequences of the crisis and of monopoly policy for the majority of the French people, isolate the working class and its Party, frighten away the peasants, intellectuals, democrats, Catholics from alliance with the revolutionary working people.

Much is at stake in this battle of ideas, the Communist Party statement says. The fight is over the future. In the interests of the democratic struggle in France, in the interests of France itself, people must have a much better knowledge of the socialist countries. The truth about socialism, its experience and prospects, its advance to higher standards of prosperity and democracy – that truth is a great force for progress, a source of confidence in the future.

The French Communist Party, the statement says in conclusion, appeals to all working people, democrats and patriots to reject anti-Sovietism. That accords with the interests of all who want a firm alliance of the Left, of all who cherish social progress, freedom, the dignity of France, peace and socialism.

CONFERENCE OF NORTH EUROPEAN COMMUNISTS

At a conference in Stockholm leaders of the Communist Parties of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden discussed the Communist standpoint on their countries' cooperation in the energy field. They stressed the need to end dependence on the international oil monopolies.

In a program for joint action, the Communist Parties of the North European countries urge the establishment of energy research centers independent of private capital. The main accent, their communique stresses, should be on setting up government bodies for the import, export, and sale of oil and other fuel. Oil refineries operated by monopoly should be nationalized.

OFF THE PRESS

A Select Bibliography of

TIM BUCK

General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, 1929-1962

Compiled and annotated by Peter H. Weinrich

This bibliography, covering the period of 1924-1970, illustrates and reflects the extent of his published concern on behalf of the working class movement and the special problems confronting Canada in the transition to socialism.

PAPER—$2.95 **CLOTH—$8.95**

PROGRESS BOOKS

487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 133, Ont.

theory

Whom does the army serve?

POLITICAL ROLE OF THE ARMY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES[1]

This was the subject discussed by an international research group composed of M. Kossok, Professor of Karl Marx University, Leipzig, GDR; L. Padilla, CC member, CP Bolivia and its representative on *WMR;* L. Ribeiro, CC member, Brazilian CP; R. Sevortyan, Soviet historian; S. Sudiman, representative of CP Indonesia on *WMR,* and A. Khachadoor, CC member, Iraqi CP.

The army has become a major political factor in many developing countries, the decisive factor in progressive or reactionary actions. Hence, the importance for the Left and democratic forces to work in alliance with the patriotic section of the army and isolate its reactionary section. The army's role in developing countries needs closer examination for another reason: anti-Marxist views of its intervention in social affairs have to be countered by a scientific approach to the problem. It is receiving increasing attention from the Communist parties of developing countries. Their resolutions and statements provide theoretical interpretation and analyze revolutionary strategy and tactics. This helps to forecast the army's behavior in different situations.

The research group concentrated on aspects of the problem common to Afro-Asian and Latin American countries. That enabled it to single out similarities of social phenomena stemming from the common destinies of the national-liberation movement. Its development has been tangled and tortuous, with temporary setbacks and reverses, but it inevitably develops into a social movement directed against the very foundations of the exploitive system. The peoples of the three continents are united by the struggle against international imperialism and domestic reaction, its partner and helper. The patriotic elements in the army share the people's desire to end their domination.

The research group also noted that, in analyzing political action by the army in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the nature of regimes resulting from such action, it is important to assess the distinguishing features of each country. On the whole, Latin America is ahead of Asia and Africa in terms of social and economic development. Latin American states are 'older' and in most of them nations have taken a definite shape and form,

whereas in Asia and Africa they are, as a rule, still in the process of formation. All these differences must be taken into account in examining the army's political role in Afro-Asian and Latin American societies.

The army and society

'The whole history of the forms of civilian society is very strikingly epitomized in the history of the army,' Marx wrote in tracing the evolutionary processes in the armed forces and in society. The Marxist-Leninist classics regarded the armed forces mainly as a weapon of reactionary coercion and class domination in antagonistic societies. But they also noted that in revolutionary periods the army, or part of it, does not remain isolated from progressive social sentiments, but can be a vehicle of such sentiments. That is evidenced by the experience of many revolutions.

Marxists have always regarded democratically minded servicemen as a potential reserve of the revolution. During the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907, Lenin welcomed the fact that some units of the Tsarist army had sided with the people (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 8, p. 560 et seq., and Vol. 10, p. 54 et seq.).

The research group also noted the increasing influx into the armies of new social elements not associated with the bourgeois-landed oligarchy and ideologically alien to it. They can become a weighty factor in the anti-imperialist liberation struggle. But as the social implications of that struggle stand out more clearly, the reactionary elements in the army intensify their activity, become a tool of the exploiter classes, a weapon of counter-revolution. There is the experience of the Communist parties to show that the success of the anti-imperialist liberation movement depends on ability promptly to expose the plans of the reactionary military, scotch their usurping proclivities and win over the progressive forces, all the honest-minded and patriotic elements of the armed forces.

Padilla said that the evolution of Latin-American armies clearly demonstrated the interaction of social processes and processes at work within the army. The development of capitalism in Latin America, begun in the closing third of the 19th century, was attended by the rise and growth of new classes. Once it gained strength, the bourgeoisie set about restructuring political institutions and the army. Shorly before World War I the private armies of the various *caudillos* were replaced by professional armed forces. The officer corps was drawn mainly from the big landed interests, the latifundia, though in some armies – Brazil, for instance – there were also members of the bourgeoisie, including the urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie. Universal military service, introduced in a number of countries, widened the social base of the armed forces.

The growth of anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist trends, the

mounting working-class struggle and the expansion of other democractic movements combined to activize the progressive forces in the army. The between-the-wars period saw not only pro-imperialist coups instigated by the oligarchy and the big bourgeoisie, but also a new development: patriotic, anti-imperialist actions by the army, such as the armed struggle led by Gereral Sandino in Nicaragua, the Tenentist movement in Brazil[2] and similar actions in several other countries. The mood of the army was, in one or another degree, a reflection of the mounting mass struggle.

Social processes after World War II were bound to affect the army. In Bolivia and Guatemala, Ecuador and Salvador, the radical demands of servicemen coincided with the political aspirations of the industrial bourgeoisie, anxious to break the imperialist stranglehold on the home market. True, once the bourgeoisie sensed the danger of the revolution going beyond its aims, it immediately cut all ties with the officers who only yesterday were its allies.

Towards the close of the 60s, sharpening social antagonisms and the popular revolutionary struggle for fundamental change of the existing system visibly intensified progressive trends in the Latin American armies. Not in all of them, but considering the experience of Peru, Panama and Ecuador, where the imperialist position is being weakened and the privileges of the ruling classes impaired, we can speak of significant changes in the thinking and outlook of the officer corps.

Progressive changes in the political attitude of the military in several Latin-American countries, *Kossok* said, should be seen in the context of the continued deepening of the structural crisis. It extends to every sphere of the superstructure and to one of its key institutions, the army. On the other hand, the structural crisis has sharply increased the political aggressiveness of the military closely associated with the big bourgeoisie and the latifundists. Testimony to this are the events of 1971 in Bolivia, of 1973 in Uruguay, where President Bordaberry set up an anti-communist dictatorship with the help of Right-wing army circles, and finally, the experience of Chile. The military fascist coup there is a desperate attempt by reactionaries to brake the process of social revolution.

In all counter-revolutionary coups, the reactionary militarists act as a weapon of the exploiter classes. They have no scruples about dissolving political organizations and civil institutions – Chile is a case in point. Having overthrown the popular government, the fascist junta dissolved parliament, in which the reactionaries were in a majority. Having dissolved the Left parties, the junta turned its attention to the Right parties.[3] 'The military coup destroyed all state institutions, leaving only the old and pliant judiciary and a puppet, the Controller General. The state based on law and legality was demolished. Chile has become a police state where the constitution and law are trampled upon and all

power is in the hands of a gang of rabid militarists,' the Communist Party says in its Appeal to the People of Chile. And though the junta made short shrift of Parliament and, in the first months after the coup, banned bourgeois and latifundist parties, it is *directly* carrying out the will of these class forces: nationalized industries are being returned to their former owners and the land the Allende government gave the peasants is being returned to the latifundists.

In discussing the nature of the ties between the military and one or another class, *Sevortyan* remarked that the conduct of the military can be relatively independent of, say, such class organizations as political parties. This has led some admirers of 'strong-hand government' demagogically to maintain that the army is 'non-partisan,' its sole function being to stand guard over the 'supreme interests of the nation.'

That is not so, of course. Counter-revolutionary actions by the army in some Afro-Asian countries have made it perfectly clear that, though suppressing the political organizations of the propertied classes, the militarists are faithful servants of these classes and safeguard the economic and social foundations of their domination. Such was the role of the army in Pakistan and Sudan after the 1958 coups, and such is their role in Indonesia today.

The relatively independent actions of the patriotic army element have an entirely different social basis. In the national-liberation revolutions in the East they have not infrequently expressed the aspirations of unprivileged social groups and classes, the petty bourgeoisie, part of the national business community, the middle strata, though they are not directly associated with any single group or class. Such was the role of the Egyptian officers in the 1952 revolution.

At a time of revolutionary upsurge the army is strongly influenced by the mass movement. That is borne out by the evolution of the Afro-Asian armies formed in the course of anti-colonial wars, viz., the Algerian, Burmese and Indonesian armies. The political situation had its impact even on the bourgeois-landlord and feudal elements in the officer corps, *Sudiman* remarked. Made up of members of different classes, from the peasantry to the national bourgeoisie, the army was much closer to the people than ever before. For instance, in Indonesia, in the early days of the revolution, the Popular Guard, which was reformed into regular army units in 1947, played an appreciable role in promoting radical views among servicemen. Today, too, the predominantly petty-bourgeois element strongly influences the officer corps of many Afro-Asian armies.

The agrarian character of Eastern countries, the weakness of the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat, *Sevortyan* said, predetermined the considerable proportion of non-proletarian strata in the social structure – the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie, officialdom, intellectuals and intermediate social types and groups. This applies to the army as well, and the growing proportion of these elements over the past decades, coupled with the decline of the bour-

geois-landlord element, has fostered the spread of revolutionary sentiments among servicemen. Most servicemen involved in patriotic actions in the Middle East come from the unprivileged strata, often from low-income groups. Most of them are officers, for the soldiers are usually illiterate or semi-literate. The radicalism of these officers often extends beyond the breakup of the more conservative feudal and bourgeois institutions, and is directly linked with the idea of social revolution.

In the Latin American armies, *Ribeiro* remarked, there is a continuing process of expanding the social composition of the officer corps. There are these indicative figures of a selective survey: in 1941-1943, 19.8 per cent of students at the Brazilian higher military school came from latifundist and big bourgeois families; in the first half of the 60s the figure was down to nearly six per cent. At the same time there has been a steadily increasing influx of men from the middle and lower classes, and, as in other Latin American countries, they react sharply to social issues, demanding their immediate solution and are receptive to democratic views.

We should not discount the general tendency toward differentiation of the petty-bourgeoisie, *Khachadoor* emphasized. Officers from low-income families might well break with their social milieu and betray the ideals of the revolution, go into business and adopt a pro-bourgeois outlook. In Burma, to cite one example, these middle-strata elements were at the head of the Burmese monopoly, the Burmese Economic Development Corporation, founded in the late 50s and closely linked with the army.

There have been similar processes in the Indonesian army, *Sudiman* pointed out. After the revolution part of the officers with peasant or petty-bourgeois backgrounds threw in their lot with the conservative forces, some marrying into 'good' families. These erstwhile petty bourgeois became part of the very influential military and civilian bureaucracy which has worked hand in glove with the propertied classes. Some officers became rich and joined what we in Indonesia call the capitalist-bureaucrat class.

In Latin America, *Kossok* said, the process of bringing bourgeois elements into the officer corps has been going on for a number of years, with the latifundist element steadily declining. This is due to the relative maturity of capitalism in a number of Latin-American countries. In Brazil, for example, even officers with latifundist and many with petty-bourgeois backgrounds have adopted a bourgeois outlook.

There is also the fact that in some countries the military have penetrated the state sector and through it (and other means) are closely linked with the oligarchy.

The contradictory process of changing the social composition of the armed forces, *Padilla* said, is accompanied by a still more complex process, the evolution of the military mentality and outlook.

Revolutionary nationalism, that ideology of the non-proletarian strata (part of the petty bourgeoisie, students, democratically-

minded clergy) is steadily gaining influence in Latin-American armies. But we should not overlook the fact that, in definite circumstances, the patriotism of the officers can degenerate into rank reformism, a tendency which the bourgeoisie actively stimulates, for reform, it believes, offers a way out of the structural crisis. The military might even accept petty-bourgeois concepts of the revolution. But the Marxist-Leninist outlook can win support among part of the servicemen and they can be brought closer to the workers' movement.

Bourgeois nationalism has a powerful impact on army officers. In Bolivia it finds expression in reformist ideology. The militarists use reformist theories to justify bourgeois domination, mislead and dupe the more politically backward sections of the population and keep alive the illusion that the regime is concerned for the interests of 'the entire nation.' Reactionary nationalism is the ideological basis for the rapprochement of the Brazilian and Bolivian dictatorships, both of which subscribe to anti-communism, national exclusiveness, anti-Sovietism and reactionary policies.

Reactionary nationalist and anti-communist sentiment, *Sudiman* said, is deliberately cultivated by the ruling element among the officers of many Asian armies. In Indonesia, this inculcation of reactionary ideology is coupled with references to the 'social' role of the military. For many decades, Rightist army politicians have been propagating the so-called dual military and socio-political function of the military establishment. This concept, rooted in the local variant of the totalitarian idea once advocated by bourgeois and feudal ideologists, is designed to perpetuate the supremacy of the militarist caste in Indonesian society. But it is no novel concept, for when exposing the Bonapartist regime Karl Marx described the military cult as a means of aggrandizing anti-people's power.

But national-patriotic ideas do reach the army through the middle strata that have been pouring into the Afro-Asian armies in the past several decades. The novel element is that army officers espouse the revolutionary-democratic and socialist ideology, as evidenced by the views of army progressives in Burma, Syria, Iraq, Somalia and the Congo.

With or against the people

The class criterion, which reveals the essential resemblance or difference of the regimes installed by forcible army action, is central in any analysis of military dictatorships and of their evolution, the research group stressed. Who is the army with? – That is the key to the social nature of a military dictatorship. But we must also consider the forms and methods of the political administration. These are subject to the influence of specific national peculiarities, and can be highly varied.

In the developing countries, the research group showed, patriotic military elements are capable of progressive reconstruction only if they establish links with the people and work together with Left and other patriotic forces. No matter how noble and lofty their in-

tentions, army officers achieve nothing if they act in isolation. And Left and democratic unity, encompassing the progressive part of the army, is, conversely, an essential condition of success in fighting against reactionary military dictatorships.

To establish the reasons behind the rise of a military regime, whether reactionary or progressive, *Ribeiro* said, we must first examine the alignment of forces in the army and the concrete situation before the coup. And it would be important to bear in mind that the different army services in most Latin American countries rarely operate as one whole. If they do, as a special caste, they usually seek to promote the interests of the big bourgeoisie and the estate owners. The latest example is the fascist putsch in Chile, directed by the commanders of the ground forces, air force, navy and carabinieri, who have imposed a terrorist dictatorship.

An essentially different variety of military regime arises when the national-patriotic part of the army isolates the reactionary officers, and establishes a progressive anti-imperialist administration of, say, the Peruvian type.

A few words about Peru. Her armed forces consist mainly of personnel with a middle-class background. Before the 1968 coup they were deployed against the movement of predominantly peasant guerrillas. Gradually, the patriotic section of army officers realized that Belaunde Terry's reactionary regime was doomed. The ruling classes, that is the bourgeoisie and the estate owners, offered no alternative to the pressing problems, such as an agrarian reform, recovery of imperialist-appropriated national wealth, etc. In a situation where the forces fighting for socialism presented no immediate threats to the ruling classes, the revolutionary process followed a peculiar course: patriotic officers hoisted the banner of anti-imperialist progress.[4] Making radical changes in the country, it leans for support on the anti-imperialist forces. And this anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic and anti-capitalist process, the Peruvian CP noted at its Sixth National Congress last year, is making good headway.

The division of military regimes into two large groups – progressive and reactionary – may be amplified by a more detailed classification, said *Kossok*. In the case of Latin America, for example, we may, tentatively, suggest four types of regimes: the traditional dictatorship, military-oligarchic dictatorship, national-progressive military regime, and, last but not least, a regime headed by Left army officers.

The regimes in Paraguay and Nicaragua are traditional dictatorships. They represent the most conservative forces – the oligarchy, the military caste, and the top-level bureaucracy. Power is exercised with direct reliance on the repressive machinery. In Paraguay, for example, the structure of the military establishment has been adapted to administrative and governmental functions, and the government is organized along caudillist lines.[5]

The Haitian dictatorship is another traditional type of regime, though it has a distinctive power set-up: the repressive function is

here 'shared' by the army and the punitive forces known as the 'leopards' and 'Tontons Macoutes.' To maintain their grip, the governing elements use terror and exploit religious beliefs and voodoo superstitions.[6]

The pro-imperialist military-oligarchic dictatorships spring up under the impact of the basic antagonism, that between labor and capital, in an environment of intensive class struggle. The present regime in Brazil is one example, and the Argentine regime of 1966-1973 is another. It represents rule by the big bourgeoisie and the latifundian elements, both closely connected with U.S. imperialism. Brazil's economic expansion into other Latin American countries, even into Africa, speaks of the imperialistic tendencies implicit in the development of some regimes of this type.

The Brazilian dictatorship (like all military regimes) displays elements of bonapartism – a 'propensity for maneuver' (between classes) which, despite the entirely definite class option of the ruling element, implies a certain amount of 'independence' of political action.

In Peru, as in Panama and Ecuador, there is a national-progressive regime, with the progressive tendency prevailing in the armed forces. The Left military regime in the Dominican Republic and the actions of patriotic officers in Venezuela and Guatemala at the beginning of the 60s also come under the head of this progressive tendency.

The so-called ceasarian regimes, such as those of Odria in Peru, Rojas Pinilla in Colombia and Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, said *Padilla,* are a variety of traditional dictatorship. Representative of the pro-U.S. militaristic trend, they embodied the power of semi-feudal and oligarchic groups. True, some of them were no longer exclusively latifundian dictatorships. Perez Jimenez, for example, was also supported by the new social group of bourgeois bureaucrats connected with U.S. imperialism.

The political systems of personal dictatorships had such common features as personalism and authoritarianism, total reliance on the army, and brutal repression of the masses. To fortify its positions the ruling clique handed out sinecures and privileges, top posts in the economic machinery, and membership on boards of large private companies.

Another typical feature were the government-sponsored populist-type movements brandishing a gaudy assortment of nationalist, anti-oligarchic and anti-Communist slogans, designed to support the dictator, with total contempt for political parties.

Uninhibited social demagogy was another common feature of 'ceasarian' dictatorships. They tried winning the people with strident rhetoric and the plea of defending national sovereignty. However, in the late 50s they proved totally bankrupt and were abandoned even by their own armed forces.

The power pattern and methods, *Sevortyan* said, are reminiscent of the Rightist military regimes in Asian and African countries. They practise the essentially bonapartist methods referred to by

Marx, Engels and Lenin. In some of the countries of the modern East, the dictatorships of reactionary army officers connected with the big bourgeoisie and the estate owners rely, first and foremost, on the army, police and bureaucracy, and in many cases also on official pseudo-political organizations imitating mass support. The latter are usually used as a counterweight to the existing political parties. Sekber Golkar in Indonesia, the 'civilian' instrument of the military caste, is a typical example.

The economic and social policy of the Rightist army men is shot through with bonapartist features. In the period following the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907, Lenin referred to the 'agrarian bonapartism' of the Stolypin reform,[7] implying an agrarian policy promoting capitalism in agriculture and producing 'a stratum of consciously counter-revolutionary, Octobrist peasants' (Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 245), the mainstay of the tsarist monarchy. We may probably also speak of an agrarian bonapartism in some of the Asian military dictatorships, such as the Ayub Khan regime in Pakistan. His half-hearted agrarian reform nurtured a rural bourgeoisie, a conversion by semi-feudal landowners to capitalist forms of farming. Bonapartist methods are extensively applied in Iran. Their quintessence is a 'white revolution': dictatorial instruments – the army and the repressive apparatus – transformed the feudal monarchy into a bonapartist one, i.e., essentially a bourgeois monarchy.

The policy of all-out capitalist development, *Sudiman* said, is typical of all reactionary military regimes. It was forcibly imposed on Indonesia by the army-compradore hierarchy, the military-bureaucratic bourgeoisie. It is promoting anti-national forms of enterprise and has given its blessing to the de-nationalization of part of the state enterprises. State property is being sold to private capitalists for a song.

In most cases the purchasers are high-ranking, and sometimes even less highly placed, officers. All too often, too, the state treasury is a source of income for these elements. Corruption, which has assumed vast proportions, has been a means of 'primitive accumulation' for a certain section of army officers. The army has penetrated deep into the state apparatus, and officers use their administrative status to obtain economic privileges.

The South-Korean and South-Vietnamese puppet military regimes are the most reactionary of all, embodying the rule of U.S. imperialism, international capital, and the extreme reactionary section of the local propertied classes.

The degradation, and eventually the collapse, of reactionary dictatorships in Pakistan, Argentina, and more recently in Thailand, *Sevortyan* said, is evidence of the inevitable doom of all bonapartism. Dictatorial regimes parading in sham democratic garb (like the 'representative' system in Pakistan with its presidential form of government in the 60s), as well as the most authoritatian varieties, have proved to be short-lived. In Argentina, the pressure of popular forces was so strong, that the ruling reactionary military

dictatorship was compelled to hold a general election, in which it was defeated. But the Rightist military has not abandoned its anti-democratic designs.[8]

The certainty of their collapse is a built-in feature of reactionary dictatorships, which represent rule by the exploiting upper stratum, the privileged military and civilian bureaucracy, oppressing all the other classes and social groups. Its narrow social base, the crisis of governmental institutions (including the army), and failures in either home or foreign policy, are usually the immediate reasons for the disintegration of military rule. The regime that professes to stand 'above society' is ultimately overthrown by society.

One of the principal reasons for the collapse of reactionary military dictatorships, *Khachadoor* said, is the anti-democratic policy of the exploiters, who use the military-bureaucratic government to promote their interests and the army as the sole pillar of power. The problem of democracy under an anti-imperialist regime arising as the result of an army coup, lies on an entirely different class plane.

The history of Iraq of the past several decades abounds in military coups. The 1936 and 1941 plots were of an anti-imperialist complexion. The revolutionary coup of 1958 opened a new chapter. But 1963 saw a counter-revolutionary takeover by reactionary Baathist leaders. Eight months later they were assaulted by Right nationalist army generals. Three abortive coups occurred in 1966, and in 1968 there was a patriotic changeover by the Baathists, supported by the army.

A definite radicalization may be seen among army officers from coup to coup. Yet even anti-imperialist army takeovers were performed without reliance on the people. More often than not, the army balanced between different political trends, laboring under the delusion that it would solve the problems of the workers and peasants by itself.

It is foolish to expect Rightist officers to introduce progressive changes. Their alliance with anti-people's parties usually produces an extreme anti-democratic military regime. The regimes founded by patriotic officers, on the other hand, have an objective stake in democratization and in involving workers and peasants, and other radical forces, more extensively in social affairs. Those are the only conditions on which an alliance, like say, the National Progressive Front[9] formed in Iraq in 1973, can be forged between Communists and the patriotic element that takes power through a military action. The prospects of democratization, our experience shows, depend chiefly on the scale of the mass movement and on the strength of the Left organizations, principally the Communist Party.

The necessity of democratization, *Sudiman* said, is keenly felt by revolutionary military regimes, wherever the army has been deeply involved in political, administrative and economic functions for some years.

Following the progressive coup that put an end to bourgeois rule in Burma, army officers took over at national and local levels. The

commander of the military garrison in the district became head of the local branch of the Burman Socialist Program Party, and also the head of the civilian administration. However, this system, which consolidated the power of revolutionary democrats, limits the activity of the masses, the workers and peasants.

At present the ruling element has set out to democratize the regime. A progressive constitution has been adopted, elections have been held, and measures have been taken to convert the Socialist Program Party from a narrow body of cadres with a military nucleus into a mass party. An important step in this direction was the second congress of the SPP in 1973.

The experience of a number of Latin American countries shows that the national-progressive army elements can pave the way for revolutionary transformations, *Kossok* stressed. But a revolution cannot be carried forward successfully under military auspices. The key issue nowadays is the relation to the popular movement, the strength of the direct links with it. Many army leaders, however, betray a tendency to direct the revolution by administrative fiat, from 'above.'

It should also be borne in mind that the heterogeneous, prodominantly petty-bourgeois, basis of the regime of patriotic officers gives rise to instability and sharp changes in social orientation. Inconsistencies are also seen in the doctrines of the national-progressive army groups. Their ideological credo may be described as 'neither capitalism nor socialism – our own way.' But there is no third way. Everything really depends on whether the progressive military regimes merge organically with the popular revolution or succumb to rightist pressure and espouse 'democratic' capitalism. This latter tendency, by the way, is actively encouraged by imperialist quarters.

Imperialism and the armies of developing countries

For a while after the war imperialism regarded Asian, African and Latin American armies as no more than appendages of its own war machine with the largely professional job of defending the frontiers of the so-called 'free world' from the aggressive encroachments of 'international communism.' Towards the end of the 50s, U.S. politicians and ideologists began to view political involvement of the Right-wing military as a new 'stabilizing' factor in underdeveloped countries. The army was proclaimed a tool for 'modernizing' the social and economic order.

The research group noted: given the crisis of reactionary economic and social institutions, and faced with the direct threat of social revolution imperialism has an ever bigger stake in imposing anti-popular military dictatorships on Latin American, Asian and African countries. The latest example is the fascist coup engineered by the Chilean junta, self-proclaimed 'saviour' of the exploiter classes from the 'communist yoke.'

U.S. interest in military regimes in Latin America, said *Kossok*, has increased over the last decade in proportion to the failure of the reformist plans of the Alliance for Progress. Strategists and

ideologues concentrate on two diametrically opposed 'military behavior models,' the Brazilian and the Peruvian. Theoreticians close to the Pentagon, not surprisingly, give preference to the Brazilian 'model.' The 1964 coup in Brazil, they declare, offers an example of the best way of upholding North American interests in Latin America, and other countries would do well to follow it.[10] But those same theoreticians also advise the State Department and the military to take a more flexible approach towards the regime in Peru in view of the 'hypertrophic nationalism' of the anti-imperialist-oriented ruling circles and the need to avoid direct confrontations with them. It is better, they say, to help right-wing elements among the military get stronger and then steer the country along the capitalist road. The U.S. government heeds this advice.

The policy of U.S. imperialism, said *Padilla*, includes quests for ways and means of overcoming the structural crisis in Latin America. As often as not, reactionary ideas are clothed in 'revolutionary' garb. Thus, one American expert on Latin American affairs standing close to the ruling circles, E. Lieuwen, claims that the tendency for some military men in Latin America to assume 'non-military functions' is a tradition going back to the struggle for independence from Spanish rule. But this is no more than a subterfuge needed to justify reactionary dictatorships. Indeed, what is there in common between O'Higgins, commander-in-chief of the 19th-century Chilean patriotic armies that fought against foreign oppression, and the fascist turncoat Pinochet, strangler of Chile's freedom?

U.S. policy-makers, said *Ribeiro*, resort to a variety of ways and means in their efforts to implant suitable views and ideas among local officers: inter-American military agencies, bilateral military treaties, military missions, a U.S.-sponsored system of training command personnel for local armies, Latin American military schools, etc.[11] A good example is the Brazilian Higher Military School with its Pentagon-oriented curriculum. In the heyday of the Alliance for Progress Latin American anti-communist army ideologists joined their U.S. colleagues to laud the 'new' military man, the advocate of 'modernization' and social reform.

This, noted *Khachadoor*, was the type of military leader that American politologists with State Department connections advocated for Middle East countries in the latter 50s and early 60s. The more farsighted among them realized that the age of the aristocracy and feudal-landlord oligarchy was passing. At the same time, however, the revolution against them threatened not only the conservative way of life but the exploiter regime itself. To prevent its collapse imperialist specialists advised the U.S. government to give greater attention than before to 'dynamic' anti-communist elements among the military, regarding them as a 'modernization' force capable of ensuring the 'stable' – i.e., bourgeois – evolution of countries in our area.

The orientation towards military elites in Afro-Asian countries, said *Sevortyan*, was motivated by purely practical requirements of international imperialism. In the latter 50s and early 60s the crisis

of parliamentary regimes deepened in Burma, Indonesia, Pakistan and other countries. The bourgeoisie and feudals proved incapable of running their countries. The only hope was that open dictatorship could help stabilize the system. With class struggles on the upsurge, alliance with the local military was the best course for imperialism, and it pursues it to this day.

According to imperialist theoreticians, the ideal model of a military regime is a 'modernizing dictatorship' capable, hopefully, of ensuring stable bourgeois development. Practical implementation of this idea is seen in the military-bureaucratic regimes of Pakistan (1958-71), Indonesia and Ghana (1966-69) and the openly pro-imperialist regimes of Saigon and Seoul.

Imperialism has inevitably resorted to two modes of action, direct and indirect, to induce Afro-Asian armies to set up 'modernizing dictatorships.' In countries under direct imperialist domination (South Korea, South Vietnam) the U.S. not only supported the actions of the local military but helped to train 'dictator personnel.' Indirect pressure was brought to bear on the military of countries where the positions of imperialism were not so strong.

The new forms imperialism has been forced to employ to camouflage subversive activity in the army, *Sudiman* emphasized, have not affected its substance. When, in the early 60s, Indonesian-American relations deteriorated and the U.S. drastically cut down its so-called assistance, including military aid, American ruling circles concentrated on other, seemingly harmless methods of subversion of Indonesia's armed forces, such as officer training in the civilian mission[12] framework. At the preparatory courses American instructors did their best to court Indonesian officers. Rand Corporation officials sought to make friends among highly placed military men. In short, the U.S. found various ways of penetrating the army.

U.S. imperialism staked heavily on the reactionary military on the eve of the counter-revolutionary putsch in Chile. The bourgeois press concedes that the U.S. while refusing the Allende government financial support, never ceased its 'aid' to the Chilean armed forces, with which the Pentagon maintained close contacts. North Americans inspired the coup and acted as liaison agents.[13]

In all developing countries imperialism's policy with regard to local armies is aimed at imposing its influence and preventing the penetration of progressive, socialist ideas into the military milieu.

The fight for the army

Communists have always attached tremendous significance to work in the army. During the preparations for socialist revolution in Russia, Lenin repeatedly emphasized the importance of propaganda and agitation among soldiers and officers, of establishing connections in the military milieu with the aim of training conscious revolutionaries among members of the armed services. 'In the armed forces, too,' he wrote, 'the Bolsheviks already had a *political "striking force,"* by November 1917, which ensured them an overwhelming superiority of forces at the decisive point at the decisive moment' (Vol. 30, p. 262). Recognizing the importance of Party work among

the troops, Lenin warned that propaganda alone was not enough: 'At a time of uprising there must also be a physical struggle for the troops' (Vol. 11, p. 175). The proletariat cannot embark on that struggle unarmed.

In present-day conditions an important field is the struggle for the democratization of the army and progressive reforms within it.[14] They would be in the interests of the broad masses, the bulk of the servicemen and overwhelming majority of the nation. 'If the people want to be masters of their fate they must in all circumstances work for the vitally necessary *democratization of the armed forces*,' writes Volodia Teitelboim, member of the Political Commission of the CC CP Chile in November 1973 issue of *WMR*. The view of armies in the developing countries as fixtures performing purely professional functions in a constitutional framework overlooks the main point: the class character of the army.

The participants in the research group noted that Communist Party experience in developing countries confirms the truth of the Marxist position that a revolutionary movement must fight for the army. As a rule, victory for the revolution is impossible in the face of opposing monolithic armed forces. For success it is essential to win over progressive and patriotic officers and men.

What should the Communist stand be vis-a-vis military men active in the anti-imperialist movement? asked *Khachadoor*. An important task is to give them the right social and political orientation. In this context agreed action of Left forces and patriotic officers is essential. In Iraq we concluded an alliance to this end during the July 1958 revolution. Similar opportunities can appear in other countries. Communists should always bear in mind Lenin's words that 'discontent alone in the armed forces is not enough to achieve success for the movement, that there is also a need for direct agreement with the organized revolutionary-democratic elements in the armed forces' (Vol. 10, p.153).

However, even after the success of the liberation revolution, reactionary influence in the armed forces can remain extremely powerful. Reaction aims at isolating the army from politics and purging it of radical elements and Communist supporters. With a patriotic regime, as in Iraq, the fight for the democratization of the army is an important task of the Left forces. The problems involved include permission for army personnel to take part in public life, respect for the rights of lower ranks, higher pay, democratic relations between the ranks and the officers, reinstatement of patriots forced out of the army for political reasons. The national and religious composition of many Afro-Asian armies is heterogeneous, which makes necessary active opposition to racist or chauvinistic tendencies. The interests of the anti-imperialist struggle also call for arms modernization and better training.

Our conditions are entirely different, said *Sudiman*. In Indonesia a reactionary military regime is in power and it fiercely persecutes the Left and all democrats. Communists are striving to set up a national unity front which would include, along with workers, pea-

sants, the middle sections and progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie, patriotic soldiers and officers. The creation of such a front would make it possible to launch a struggle against anti-popular elements in the armed forces.

Joint Left and democratic action could have a considerable impact on the armed forces. During the period of counter-revolutionary revolts headed by ultra-Rightist officers (1956-1961), the Indonesian Communist Party and progressive organizations not only managed to extend their influence in the army but even to induce some Right-wing and moderate officers to come out against the separatist rebels.[15] But then, when the CPI veered to Right- and then to Left-wing opportunism and fell under Maoist influence, the effectiveness of Communist activity in the armed forces deteriorated and our enemies gradually strengthened their positions.

We realize that the present regime will not relinquish power of its own free will. However, the CPI flatly opposes immediate armed struggle as advocated by the Maoists, for it must be preceded by thorough preparation. The struggle can be successful only in conditions of an open political crisis heading towards a revolutionary situation.

In formulating Communist policy with regard to the armies of Latin America, said *Ribeiro*, we should remember the deep-rooted traditions of the revolutionary and Communist movements of our countries. Many representatives of the armed forces are fully aware of the Communist Parties' political stand, the slogans of the trade union movement and our struggle for national interests and the rights of the working people. Communists regard it as entirely feasible for patriotic and democratically minded officers and enlisted men to participate in a broad anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic front. And the Communist Parties of the continent are doing much to win over adherents among the military. Their daily, persevering work is aimed at winning the more radical elements in the army over to the side of the working class, or at least isolating the reactionary elements.

It is not an easy job. The depth of revolutionary spirit in the army should not be overrated, even with a military regime that favors reforms. Reactionary officers may make a temporary show of accepting a progressive government, as has happened in Chile. But as long as radical tendencies remain weak in most Latin American armies, which are controlled by reactionaries in military uniform, they will be opposed to progressive trends. On the eve of the fascist coup in Chile it was the reactionary generals who murdered patriotically-minded servicemen and are now carrying out a bloody purge of the army.

We should never forget Lenin's words: 'The sooner the proletariat succeeds in arming . . . the sooner will the army begin to waver; more and more soldiers will at last begin to realize what they are doing and they will join sides with the people against the fiends, against the tyrant, against the murderers of defenseless workers and of their wives and children' (Vol. 8, p. 99).

An important aspect of ideological work, said *Kossok*, is opposi-

tion to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois interpretations of army involvement in political life. What we have, have always had, is a kind of anti-military fatalism which treats any kind of political involvement of the military as out-and-out reactionary. In Latin America this is known as 'civilianism,' i.e., advocacy of civilian methods of government. Its exponents among the Right-wing bourgeoisie deliberately ignore the class aspect of the power problem and absolutize its form. But there is also the other extreme, when some petty-bourgeois ideologists, among them neo-Trotskyites, speak in terms of a 'military revolution,' declaring that nationalistic military action is the only way revolution can win. The advocates of 'military revolution' fail to take into account the stratification of the officers' corps, viewing the army as a kind of supra-class force designed to radically change the existing system regardless of the people.

Of great danger for the revolutionary movement, noted *Padilla*, are the views of those on the 'Left' who advocate diametrically opposed positions. They are most fully reflected in the ideas of Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano, who declares that military involvement in Latin America *inevitably* results in the capitalist modernization of the society.

Quijano is echoed by the Maoists. When the anti-imperialist democratic Torrez government was in power in Bolivia they denied that there was the slightest possibility of the military launching any progressive undertakings and called for the destruction of the existing army. The Leftists branded all officers as reactionaries and exploiters against whom a 'people's war' had to be waged. This demagogy was extremely damaging for the patriotic forces in the army and the society, preventing them from coming together and enabling the Right-wing military to carry on a provocational campaign of slander among the troops, inciting them against Communists and all popular organizations.

In Asia, said *Sevortyan*, 'Left-wing' opportunists and Maoists approach the problem of political involvement of patriotic army circles from dogmatic, sectarian positions. Thus, from the outset the pro-Maoist leadership of the Communist Party of Burma branded the country's progressive regime as an 'anti-Communist reactionary military dictatorship.' Later, after radical social and economic reforms were carried out, the Party leadership proved incapable of seeing the revolutionary-democratic character of the military government. More, following Maoist instructions, the CP advocated 'armed revolutionary struggle,' which, objectively, landed it in the same camp as the conservative feudal, separatist and Right-wing bourgeois forces fighting against the government.

The participants in the research group agreed that the problem of the army's political role in developing countries is of tremendous interest to Marxist scholars. It is especially important for the struggle against imperialism and internal reaction developing on the political, military and ideological fronts. It is most important, in this connection, to study the rich theoretical heritage of the classics of

Marxism on problems of the army, the victorious experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the socialist revolutions in other countries, notably Cuba; the relevance of analyses by Marx, Engels and Lenin of Bonapartism and its various manifestations was also noted.

Communists have no illusions that the old state – the exploiter classes' machine of oppression and its repressive appendage – would give up their positions without a fight. The coups in 1964 in Brazil, in 1965 in Indonesia, in 1971 in Bolivia, the fascist putsch in Chile, as well as other military actions against the people in developing countries are indicative of the aggressiveness and perfidy of reactionary army circles. Temporary defeats are quite possible in the fierce battles waged by the peoples of the three continents against imperialism, for national and social emancipation. But whatever the zigzags of history, the future does not belong to the gorillas and oligarchies. The new worldwide balance of forces favors socialism and the international worker and national-liberation movements. This is an important factor in the deepening crisis and decay of the system of oppression and exploitation bred by that system and its main institution, the army. The seeds of social protest are germinating within them. Revolutionary ferment in the developing countries is increasingly involving the army. That is why it need not necessarily, under all circumstances, be the 'guardian of order' and the tool of counter-revolutionary oppression that it was in all antagonistic systems. The social mission of the military can also be progressive.

1. This study is based mainly on political developments in Asia, North Africa and Latin America.

2. See article by Luis Carlos Prestes, 'How I Became a Communist,' in *WMR*, January 1973.

3. Several months afterwards, finding itself in total isolation, the junta decreed restricted 'legislation' of Right-wing parties.

4. See Jorge del Prado in *WMR*, January 1973.

5. A system of authoritarian dictatorship typical of Latin America, with a leader – the caudillo – backed by the bureaucratic and military apparatus, 'close followers,' and a ramified ideological machine.

6. Voodooism – a primitive politheist religion of African origin. It is used by the authorities to support the 'God-given' character and immutability of the reactionary dictatorship.

7. The Stolypin agrarian reform (named after tsarist minister P. Stolypin) was an attempt to repattern the semi-feudal agrarian system in Russia by police methods to suit the interests of the landowners and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

8. See O. Ghioldi, 'Whither Argentina?' *WMR*, December 1973.

9. It includes the ruling Baath Party and the Iraqi Communist Party.

10. See L. C. Prestes. 'The Threat to Democracy in Latin America.' *WMR*, November 1973.

11. See L. Padilla, J. Laborde, E. Sousa, 'Latin America: The Anti-imperialist Struggle and the Armed Forces.' *WMR*, March 1971.

12. Army participation in certain civilian projects.

13. See V. Teitelboim. 'For a Victorious Revolution, With Account of the Tragic Experience.' *WMR*, November 1973.

14. See, for example, the appeal of the French CP to the armed forces published in *L'Humanité*, July 24, 1973.

15. See T. Sinuraja. 'The Struggle for Unity. A Few Lessons from the History of the CP of Indonesia.' *WMR*, September 1973.

Historical materialism and the battle of ideas

Vladislav Kelle
Dr. Phil. (USSR)

Dominique Urbany's article in our February issue on Marxism-Leninism as the scientific theory of the working class and its role in the ideological struggle, was the first in a series on the components of Marxism-Leninism – its philosophy, political economy, theory of scientific communism.

This article, on the theory and methodology of historical materialism, examines some of the key problems of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

The complexity, multiformity and multi-quality of socio-economic, political and ideological processes and phenomena in the world of today stress the need to conceptualize major changes in all areas of social practice from an integral philosophical standpoint. This is dictated not only by cognitive and theoretical considerations, but also by the requirements of mankind's present and future practical activity. For we cannot negotiate the tempestuous stream of social change without knowing its main course, where it is leading us. Marxism-Leninism provides the Communists, the working class and the international revolutionary movement with a reliable guide for that. And in this context an outstanding part is played by one of its inalienable components, namely, historical materialism, i.e., the theory and methodology of analyzing social reality and predicting social development.

The materialist interpretation of history; the relation of the objective to the subjective, the material to the non-material within the framework of a single social organism; the theory of socio-economic formations – such are the three main problems treated in this article. They do not, of course, cover all aspects of Marxist-Leninist sociology. But they are importantly related to a philosophical understanding of the nature of society and its development and are, therefore, the focal point of the ideological struggle.

The great discovery of Marx and Engels, embodied in the theory of historical materialism, was their disclosure, analysis and explanation of the real dependence of social consciousness and the entire social structure on the character of relations formed in the production of material values, on the development of material production. 'The mode of production of material life,' Marx wrote, 'conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.' Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on

what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge a period of revolutionary transformation by its own consciousness; 'on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production' (Preface to *The Critique of Political Economy*).

History was thus shown to be a process subject to the operation of definite laws, i.e., a natural process proceeding in complex dialectical interaction of the different components of a social whole. This made it possible to relate the activity of the masses to an understanding of the laws and motive forces of history. And by applying the theory and methodology of historical materialism in analyzing the development of the capitalist formation, Marx was able to prove the need and possibility of mankind's advance to new, communist forms of social life that would assure social equality, freedom and all-round development of the personality. It was on this basis that Marx defined, with scientific precision, the goals of the proletarian class struggle and the ways of their attainment.

Lenin said that the application of materialism to sociology was an idea of genius. And like every brilliant idea, it does not age with time; on the contrary, time only brings out its greatness more fully.

Marxism had to wage many a hard battle against avowedly idealist conceptions which regarded social life either as the result of actions of outstanding individuals, the self-expression of some absolute spirit, or an eclectic conglomeration of diverse factors. That historical materialism emerged victorious from these battles is evidenced by the major revolutions of the 20th century, carried out by the working class and working people under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. They radically changed the social and political image of the world. The theory of historical materialism was thus put to the test of practice and passed it with flying colors.

The triumph of the Marxist-Leninist materialist philosophy of history is, in its own way, indirectly reaffirmed in our day by the fact that more and more of its critics are abandoning the traditional idealist theories of social development. The past few decades have seen a remarkable metamorphosis of the authors of pseudo-scientific apologia of capitalism. The time is past – and probably never to return – when the very word 'materialism' was a term of abuse with these gentry, who regarded theoretical concessions to 'economic materialism' as the greatest of all sins. Now many of them call themselves realists and materialists; some even claim to be 'more consistent' materialists than the Marxists themselves. In fact many bourgeois theoreticians, anxious to evolve comprehensive theories of social development, argue that they are following in the footsteps of Marx. 'We have become post-Marxist,' American sociologist Daniel Bell says.*

What is behind this 'change of heart' by ideologists hostile to socialism and the revolutionary working class? Can it really be that their understanding of social development, of past, present and

*Daniel Bell, 'The Post-Industrial Society: the Evolution of an Idea.' *Survey*, Spring, 1973.

future history, is more 'materialist' than that of the Marxist materialists?

The revival of bourgeois sociological and historical thought in the past few decades has produced a variety of schools and trends – 'micro-sociology,' 'social engineering,' 'social technology,' and many more. And the unparalleled interest in social prognostication has produced the so-called futurological explosion. Ambitious concepts claiming to provide a universal explanation of historical and social processes are being assiduously boosted. Again, the list is a long one: the theories advanced in the U.S. by Walt Rostow, Peterim Sorokin, Daniel Bell, J. K. Galbraith, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and in France, by Raymond Aron, in Britain, A. J. Toynbee, in Canada, by M. McLuhan, etc. If one were to ask: what is the pervading trend in this eruption of bourgeois theoretical thought, materialist or idealist, the first, superficial impression might lead to the conclusion that it is materialist. For in most of these theories there is a deliberate emphasis on material conditions, on the economy, production, which are often given priority over, say, the spiritual aspects of social life.

We might recall, for instance, Rostow's 'stages of growth,' which he presents as rungs of ascendant social development determined entirely by the level of productive forces and complexity of the economic mechanism. Bell and Brzezinski see the socio-political and spiritual image of society as deriving from the purely material factor of technical progress.

However, a closer look at these and similar concepts will reveal that at best they are mechanistic and have no relation to scientific materialism. For, essentially, they are based on one and the same, albeit material, factor to which they attribute the magic of refashioning society.

In this day and age, bourgeois theorists are inclined – for understandable reasons – to ascribe this magic to scientific and technological progress. It is blamed for all the social maladies of capitalist society, but is also supposed to contain the cures. The 'convergence' theory or the 'post-industrial society' concept are both predicated on the premise that science and technology can remove the deep-seated class contradictions of our era, and, in the final analysis, obliterate class differences and resolve the world conflict between socialism and imperialism.

Marxism-Leninism long ago showed that fetishization of the products of human labor was a typical and logical product of the inbred capitalist social psychology: relations between men are seen as relations between things, and commodities acquire a mystical power over their producers. To find an analogy, Marx wrote 'we must have recourse to the mist-enveloped regions of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life and entering into relation both with one another and the human race' (*Capital*, Vol. 1, Chapter 1, Section 4).

Today bourgeois theorists make a fetish of science and technology, oblivious, it seems, to the fact that they are the product and tool

of man's physical and mental labor; are but one component of a system of productive forces which, in turn, is part of a much wider complex, the material basis of society with its complicated combinations of socio-economic relations. Over a century ago Marx trenchantly criticized the apologists for bourgeois society who attributed 'false importance' to the products of labor in order to denigrate labor itself and thereby 'provide technological justification for the specific form, i.e. the capitalist form, in which the interrelations of labor and conditions of labor are turned topsy-turvey.' These words of Marx are trenchant criticism also of present-day technological determinism.

The technicist interpretation of social processes is not only antidialectical (mechanistic) and not only anti-historical (an apologia intended to perpetuate exploitation and private property) but also idealistic, notwithstanding all is materialist dressing. Glossing over the fundamental distinctions between the different socio-economic modes of production, negating the class struggle as the motive force of the revolutionary restructuring of society, taking a one-sided view of social practice, denigrating the working class and extolling the 'critical' contribution of the intelligentsia to the creation of spiritual values, the present-day technicist and scientist sociologists are prone to see the causes of social collisions and antagonisms in the human spirit, in processes at work within the consciousness of the 'man of industrial society.' And basic to these processes, according to Aron, is 'hunger . . . more spiritual, probably, than material.'* And often enough the way out of crises of bourgeois society, they suggest, is to 'survive,' 'morally rearm,' 'adapt.' Idealism stands out more glaringly in other trends of bourgeois sociology and social psychology (the works of Fromm, Sorokin, Toynbee).

Consequently, historical materialism is the only truly materialist philosophy of history. And not because it neglects the non-material aspects of social being or minimizes their importance. But rather because it analyzes their link and *interaction* with the material basis of the historical process.

In the closing years of his life, Engels had to explain time and again that, with idealistic views predominating, he and Marx were obliged to concentrate on the economic factors of social life, the basis of legal, political and ideological forms. They were not, therefore, always able to devote adequate attention to how these superstructural forms react on the economic basis. This was necessary for those who accepted Marxism but did not understand its spirit, could not penetrate the Marxist dialectical method of cognition, and were inclined to reduce the richness of historical materialism to mere 'economic determinism.'

To Lenin belongs the achievement of upholding Marxism against such distortions and, at the new stage of world development and using new socio-historical evidence, of comprehensively developing the materialist understanding of history. At the dawn of his theo-

* R. Aron, Les désillusions du progrès. Essai sur la dialectique de la modernité. Paris, 1969, p. VIII.

retical and political work Lenin emphasized the absolute requirement, implicit in Marxism, 'to analyze all aspects of social life, and not only the economic.' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 161-62). And in his own writings, Lenin profoundly analyzed the complexity and multiformity of direct and reverse contacts between basis and superstructure forms of social being, objective and subjective factors of historical progress.

Developed and enriched by Lenin, the theory of historical materialism, Marxist-Leninist sociology, became part of the ideological and theoretical arsenal of the revolutionary working class, stimulating its social and political activity. It eliminated the metaphysical contraposition in science and practice of the objectivity and materiality of the historical process to the creativity and independence of its subject.

This fundamental point of historical materialism leads to far-reaching conclusions.

Firstly, it is a profoundly scientific conception of the laws of history, of their knowability and use in man's social activity. From the disparity of aims and results in man's social activity Hegel once drew the correct conclusion that in history there were forces and laws independent of human volition. This naturally implied that knowledge of these laws would enable society to direct its development consciously. And it is precisely the theory of historical materialism that furnishes people with such knowledge, enabling them consciously to be makers of history.

Secondly, by defining class struggle as the principal motive force of history, the Marxist-Leninist concept of social development determined the main sphere and direction of man's activity aimed at transforming the world. Marxism, it may be appropriate to note, gave the concept of class struggle, known before Marx, a definite historical orientation. Elaborating on this idea, Lenin wrote: 'Those who recognize *only* the class struggle are not yet Marxists . . . A Marxist is solely someone who *extends* the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*,' i.e., the necessity of overthrowing the bourgeois system, fighting for socialism, and establishing working people's power (Vol. 25, pp. 411-412.).

The class approach to analyzing society is consonant with the basic requirements of social science, which must necessarily proceed from socially significant categories, presupposing an accentuation of the individual principle in group and class conceptions. Our critics take this to mean that Marxism 'ignores the individual.' But since, to use Marx's phrase, 'the essence of man is the aggregate of all social relations' ('Theses on Feuerbach'), the Marxist method does not, in fact, scorn the interests of the individual. On the contrary, it serves these interests, and, of course, first of all the interests of the working man, member of the class fighting for liberation and a society without exploitation or social inequality. It is in the interests of the individual to understand that, in his aspirations to a better life he has to deal, as historical materialism asserts, not

with other individuals, bearers of evil, but with the exploiting system of social relations. It is in his interests to understand, consequently, that man's liberation, the affirmation of the rights and dignity of the individual, is not achieved by moral improvement, propagation of moral virtues or universal enlightenment, but by revolutionary demolition of the exploiting system. By this token, historical materialism places the lofty ideals of humanism on a dependable scientific foundation.

Thirdly, by formulating criteria that enable us to separate basic from superstructural processes in social development, the historico-materialist concept joins the two in a single system. This means that its attention is focused not on separate phenomena or sets of social items, but on the complex mechanism of social links and inter-relations as an *integrity*. This enables us to assess correctly the multiple role of every factor in social development, on the one hand, and find the most effective ways of influencing the social body as a whole, on the other. Thereby Marxist-Leninist theory provides a good scientific basis for working out the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement against the exploitive social system. Thus, it constitutes a theoretico-cognitive foundation for the scientific administration of society in socialist conditions.

In recent decades, bourgeois theorists have advanced concepts of structural or systemic approach to the study of society (the 'structuralism' of the Frenchmen Levi-Strauss and Foucault, the 'structuro-functional analysis' of the American Parsons, and the 'general system theory' of the Austrian von Vertalanffy). Certainly, from the standpoint of bourgeois thought this may be regarded as a definite advance, as an expression of legitimate discontent with the vulgar evolutionist schemes of social development that had long dominated the more 'authoritative' doctrines of modern capitalism. But in fact, these dressed up structural and systemic conceptions, though they possess some positive features well worth developing, fall far short of the conclusively developed scientific principles of social analysis offered by dialectical and historical materialism. All of them gravitate toward mechanistic views and anti-historicism, treating their object of study in isolation from larger processes and complexes, in relation to which that object is really no more than a sub-system.

This may be seen from the bourgeois theorists' rejection of the concept of socio-economic formation as a system that most fully represents the characteristic features and principal regularities of the social-historical reality.

The theory of socio-economic formations is at the center of the historico-materialist conception of the social process. This follows from the fundamental idea of historical materialism, because, Lenin pointed out, analysis of the 'material and social relations at once made it possible to observe the recurrence and regularity and to generalize the systems of the various countries in the single fundamental: *social formation*' (Vol. 1, p. 140).

Its fundamental and topical importance is that it permits us to

define the present epoch as the epoch of transition from the capitalist to the communist formation on a world scale. Small wonder, therefore, that it is the main target of frenzied bourgeois attacks on historical materialism. In the final analysis, bourgeois criticism is based on the contention that the Marxist concept of social development is 'one-dimensional' and overlooks the diversity of human history.

In fact, however, the idea of the unity of the historical process, which also encompasses the concept of the succession of formations, presupposes determination and study of the factors of diversity. The theory of historical materialism reposes on scientific analysis of the essential causes and circumstances behind the process of world history, and considers all the shades of its multi-colored canvas. It reckons with the fact that in each segment of time there are peoples, countries and social entities that by level of social development and the main social indicators represent different formations. Neither does Marxist-Leninist sociology overlook those features of historical diversity that stem from differences in geographical environment or national tradition, or from the coexistence and mutual enrichment of cultures. The dialectics of historical materialism is that it sees diversity behind the unity of history, and unity behind the diversity.

Marx objected to the use of his theory as a cut-and-dried scheme superimposed on history, ruling out enrichment with the new material continuously created by the social practice of humanity and the discoveries of specific sciences. And Engels wrote that 'our conception of history is above all a guide to study, not a lever for construction after the manner of the Hegelians' (letter to Conrad Schmidt, Aug. 5, 1890). Lenin's works are a model of truly scientific and creative development of the Marxist theory of historical materialism. They define the new general laws of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, and also the concrete national peculiarities – principally in Russia where, under Lenin's leadership and for the first time in history, the working class took over and retained state power.

Denial of the unity of the historical process presupposing a regular succession of formations is the leit-motif of the bourgeois concepts of 'historic cycles' and 'local civilizations' (e.g., Toynbee): 'social and cultural dynamics' (e.g., Sorokin), and 'social and value paradigms' (e.g., H. Kahn and Anthony Wiener). The purpose of these and similar theorists is to prove the absence in history of a general direction and thereby preclude the conclusion that the downfall of the capitalist socio-economic system is inevitable. Here, scientific search is supplanted by search of arguments in support of the dogma of faith propagated by the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, historical materialism is accused of allegedly gravitating towards 'teleology' and subordinating its interpretation of history to predetermined aims.

The above is sufficient to show that the question of the unity and diversity of history, including the question of formations, is any-

thing but purely academic. The correct philosophico-historical evaluation of the relation of unity to diversity in social development is at the center of the political practice of the Marxist-Leninist parties and other revolutionary and democratic forces. It is the key to the connection between the basic principles of revolutionary theory and their special application in the concrete conditions of separate countries and in special historical periods. At their 1969 International Meeting, the Communist and Workers' parties noted that they 'are conducting their activity in diverse, specific conditions, requiring an appropriate approach to the solution of concrete problems. They also stressed, however, that 'the international working class has common long-term objectives and interests' and that every party strives 'to find a solution to existing problems which would meet both national and international interests and those of the Communists' revolutionary mission.'

In the 20th century, the unity of the world historical process is more forcefully seen than before. Social development is centred around the main contradiction of the epoch, between socialism and capitalism, and socialism's steadily rising influence on international development.

The differences in form and degree of diversity of social progress have also increased to unprecedented proportions. Victorious socialist revolutions have enriched the practice of building the communist formation. Imperialism's uneven economic and political development is objectively introducing specific elements into the struggle of the national detachments of the working class. The collapse of the colonial system has put peoples and countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the path of independent history-making. It is therefore doubly important to see behind all this diversity the common regularities of our epoch, the main content of which is transition from capitalism to socialism. 'Anybody who tackles partial problems,' Lenin said, 'will inevitably and at every step "come up against" those general problems without himself realizing it. To come up against them in every individual case means to doom one's politics to the worst vacillation and lack of principle' (Vol. 12, p. 489).

Modern revisionism, both Right and 'Left,' ignores the dialectics of the general and particular. That, in fact, is its epistemological foundation. Dogmatic worship of the general divorces it from life, dooming policy to either passivity or unjustified adventurism. Conversely, the plea of historical and regional peculiarities in denying the general (e.g., constructing variants of 'national communism' or revisionist 'models' of socialism) implies a loss of the historical perspective and emasculation of the revolutionary content of the struggle of the progressive classes.

Marxist-Leninist scholars are elaborating fruitfully on the theory of formations, using the rich material provided by the social practice of socialism. Among their achievements is the elimination of the earlier notions of socialism as a short stage in the making of communist society or, conversely, as a special and independent

socio-economic formation. The regularities of socialism as a world system, the consolidation of the all-round cooperation of socialist states, their economic integration, have become objects of profound study. The criteria of developed socialist society and the problems related to the fusion of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism have become a topical subject in Marxist discussions.

Such theoretical study helps enrich the practice of administering the new society, and provides fraternal parties in countries of the socialist community with strictly scientific guidelines for building the communist formation.

In the light of Lenin's theory of imperialism, analysis of state-monopoly capitalism helps pinpoint new features and peculiarities of the capitalist formation and shows their ties and relations with its unchanging basis – the exploitive subordination of labor to capital. Studies based on the theory and methodology of historical materialism fully encompass the changes in the social structures of the capitalist countries, and in particular those wrought by the scientific and technical revolution, define the objective interests of the antagonistic classes and various population groups, and also the trends in their social thinking. Applied to modern capitalism, the theory of formations shows its main social contradiction to be labor-capital antagonism, leading to the one and only conclusion that the principal role in the revolutionary movement belongs to the working class. Clearly, this has an essential bearing on the strategy and tactics of Communist parties operating in the conditions of bourgeois society.

The non-capitalist way for peoples that have thrown off colonialism is another highly significant problem. Frequently, critics of historical materialism contend that this very formula implies a renunciation of the theory of formations, inasmuch as, they say, it obviously 'violates' the order of succession. But this is only an inept attempt to ascribe to Marxism-Leninism the dogmatic schematism which it eschews. The complexity of the problems created by the inclusion of the Third World in active socio-political and international life requires not revision of the theory of formations, but its further elaboration.

Marxist-Leninist scholars have of late shown a visible interest in the peculiarities and historical fate of the 'Asian mode of production.' This is clearly necessary because archaic pre-capitalist structures and relations still survive in many Asian and African countries. These surviving elements of the past interweave, as a rule, with somewhat later social-class, political and ideological phenomena that came into being under capitalist influence, and, latterly, also with trends of a socialist complexion. In their struggle for social progress, the peoples of the developing countries benefit greatly from the example and support of the socialist countries. On the other hand, however, the capitalist world also offers 'models,' hoping to keep them within its orbit. Furthermore, there are nationalist conceptions that make an absolute of the historical pecu-

liarity of their countries and advocate indigenous ways of development. It should be clear, therefore, that analysis of the problems and perspectives of the Third World in the context of the theory of formations is not purely academic, and carries tremendous ideological and political relevance.

In sum, by virtue of the greater diversity of the historical reality of our time, the theory of formations is central to the clash of ideas over the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism, over the ways and regularities leading to communist society .The successes of the world Communist movement in the anti-imperialist struggle, like those of the socialist countries building the new society, leave no doubt as to the correctness of the historico-materialist conclusion about the inevitable collapse of the capitalist formation, and communism as the future of all mankind.

new from the ussr...

EVERYTHING BUT LOVE (Science- Fiction) paper. **$1.95**

LENINGRAD: ART AND ARCHITECTURE by G. Schwarz. cloth. **$6.95**

MATERIALISM MILITANT: Reply to Mr. Bogdanov by G. V. Plekhanov. paper. **$1.25**

ON LITERATURE AND ART by A. Lunacharsky a new edition. cloth. **$3.95**

PHYSIOLOGY FOR EVERYONE by B. F. Sergeev. paper. **$2.50**

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM: AN OUTLINE OF MARXIST THEORY OF SOCIETY by V. Kelle, M. Kovalson. cloth. **$3.50**

THE PROFESSION OF THE STAGE DIRECTOR by G.Tovstonogov. cloth. **$4.95**

Order from:

PROGRESS BOOKS, 487 Adelaide Street West, Toronto, Ontario. M5V 1T4

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... **PROV./STATE**..... **ZONE or ZIP**.....

Add 25 cents exchange for U.S. cheques.

political panorama

Building the new life in the liberated areas of South Vietnam

Interview with **Dr. Nguyen Huu Tho,** Presidium President, Central Committee of the South Vietnam Liberation Front, and Chairman of the Consultative Council, Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam.

Question: Progressives throughout the world are following with keen interest the building of the new life in the liberated parts of South Vietnam. How did popular rule originate in South Vietnam? What problems does it have to cope with today?

Answer: The first organs of popular government came into being during the 1959-60 patriotic rising, which overthrew the local rulers imposed on the people by the U.S. neo-colonialists. The 1968 spring general armed campaign enlarged the liberated areas, where revolutionary government expressing the interests and aspirations of the South Vietnamese people was established. The foundation was thus laid for our country's independence, freedom and genuine democracy.

A congress of people's representatives from all parts of South Vietnam was held in June 1969 on the initiative of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (NLFSV) and the Union of National, Democratic and Peace Forces (UNDPF).* It drew up a program for the fight against U.S. aggression and for salvation of the homeland. Considering that in many parts of South Vietnam people's revolutionary committees were functioning as local government, and that the NLFSV had been recognized by many governments and international organizations, the Congress proclaimed, in the name of the people, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam (PRGRSV) and set up a Consultative Council. This was the logical sequel to the growing influence of the NLF and the upsurge of the struggle for the basic national rights set out in the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina.

The bulk of South Vietnam is now controlled by the Provisional Revolutionary Government. Areas adjacent to the larger towns and many densely populated communities, near the borders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the liberated parts of Cambodia and Laos have been freed. The main task now is to safeguard strengthen and rebuild these areas.

*Founded in April 1968 by representatives of South Vietnam intellectuals, petty and middle national bourgeoisie, students and former Saigon servicemen. It supports the basic demands of the National Liberation Front and cooperates with it in the struggle. – *Ed.*

The Paris agreement on Vietnam recognizes the existence of two governments, two armies and two zones of control in South Vietnam. It is being grossly violated by the U.S. and Saigon administration, which are using the Nixon doctrine in an attempt to keep neo-colonialism alive. Attempts are being made to win back the liberated areas by force of arms, and where Saigon is still in control, there are punitive operations to 'pacify' the population. The purpose is to try to show that there are not two governments, two armies and two zones of control.

That being the situation, we have to resolutely fight for stringent and unswerving observance of the Paris agreement, so that the people of South Vietnam can achieve their cherished goal of an independent and democratic state based on national reconciliation, concord and peace. The Provisional Revolutionary Government has cosistently, scrupulously and stringently abided by the provisions of the Paris agreement and coutinues the struggle to have the U.S. and Saigon authorities do the same.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government is working towards these aims:

– a socio-political structure that will guarantee the people independence, genuine democracy and the right to self-determination;

– postwar rehabilitation to stabilize and gradually raise living standards, rebuild and extend the economy to make it independent and comprehenssive;

– a national democratic, progressive culture and educational system with a developing science and technology;

– normal relations between South and North Vietnam, progress towards reunification;

– mutual assistance of the three Indochina peoples, a peaceful independent, neutral foreign policy, with constantly expanding and strengthening diplomatic relations with the socialist and other countries on the basis of respect for independence, sovereignty and equality.

These aims follow from the policy of the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government, and we shall achieve them together with our people, thereby advancing the revolution and building the new life in the liberated areas.

Question: The experience of your National Liberation Front is being closely studied by national liberation movements in different parts of the world. What are the specific features of NLF activity since the 1973 Paris agreement?

Answer: The Paris agreement opened a new chapter. The U.S. and its allies were compelled to withdraw their troops from South Vietnam and American neo-colonialist domination has been eliminated in a large part of the country. The alignment of forces has changed in favor of the revolution.

Defeated, the U.S. promised to respect our people's basic national rights and desist from interference in their internal affairs. But the U.S. imperialists have not abandoned their policy of aggres-

sion and continue to use the puppet regime and the Saigon army as weapons of neo-colonialism. Before the Paris agreement the U.S. tried to further its aims by 'Vietnamization,' supplying the puppet army with weapons and ammunition in a bid to keep the country under its control. After the agreement the U.S. stationed more than 20,000 military advisers in South Vietnam and they are secretly supervising military operations. The U.S. continues to bring in large quantities of arms; in fact, in 1973 military assistance to the Saigon regime amounted to more than $1 billion.

The new U.S. plan is to shore up the Saigon administration and try to destroy revolutionary government in the liberated areas.

The South Vietnam people, the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government are faithfully and stringently carrying out the Paris agreement and are administering a devastating rebuff to all who violate that agreement and encroach on the liberated areas.

The battle for revolutionary democratic ideals is being fought in a more favorable situation. We are scoring more victories, strengthening the liberated areas, cementing the unity of our people, who are inspired by our policy of independence, peace and national reconciliation. We are working for the triumph of our revolutionary cause. Supported and assisted by the peoples of the world, the Vietnamese people will emerge victorious in their just struggle.

Question: At last September's non-alignment summit in Algiers, the Provisional Revolutionary Government was recognized as the only legitimate government of South Vietnam. How did the people of the liberated areas react to this? What importance do you attach to participation in non-alignment?

Answer: From its very inception the Provisional Revolutionary Government has been the only legitimate spokesman of the South Vietnamese people; it has given voice to their aspirations, has fought for their national interests and the right to self-determination.

In the past four years, the Provisional Revolutionary Government has won wide recognition – in the Paris agreement, in the statement of the International Conference on Vietnam, by many countries who see in it the only legitimate representative of the Vietnamese people and have established diplomatic relations with it. Its recognition at the Algiers non-aligned summit is an important development and a major diplomatic achievement and, at the same time, a telling blow at the Saigon administration, which U.S. imperialism is using to further its neo-colonialist plans. The people of South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government highly prize this recognition as a manifestation of the non-aligned countries' anti-imperialist and anti-colonial orientation. And we express our sincere gratitude to all the members of this great family of non-aligned nations for their valuable support of our cause.

Non-alignment is a movement that brings the peoples together

in the fight against aggression and imperialist intervention, against colonialism and neo-colonialism for the winning and consolidation of national independence. These are the aims also of the South Vietnamese people led by the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government. The Provisional Revolutionary Government, which has an active part in the non-alignment movement, believes that strengthening the movement will help to enhance the role of Third World countries in resolving international issues.

Relying on their own achievements, on solidarity with the socialist countries and organizations committed to peace and democracy, the non-aligned nations can become a major political force, an important factor in the fight for peace, independence, democracy and social progress.

In conclusion, I wish to convey my best wishes to *World Marxist Review* and my deep gratitude to the Editors for this opportunity to discuss the problems facing my country.

In June, the Provisional Revolutionary Government will be celebrating its fifth anniversary. Its founding five years ago coincided with the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, and on June 12, 1969 there was this telegram from Moscow: 'The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties convened in Moscow, warmly welcomes the creation of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam. The 75 Parties represented at the Meeting regard this event as a new and important stage of the heroic struggle for liberation waged by the Vietnamese people. They assure the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam and the entire Vietnamese people of their invariable support for their struggle for final victory.'

Today the world can see the splendid results of this support. Relying on it, the South Vietnamese revolutionary forces scored a convincing victory over imperialist aggression, a victory that made it possible to begin building the new life in the liberated areas despite all the attempts of the Saigon administration to block the development of the revolution. Today the Provisional Government and National Liberation Front enjoy even more support from the socialist world system, the international Communist movement and progressives the world over.

Socialist competition and development of the personality

Kostadin Giaurov
Alternate PB Member,
CC Bulgarian CP, Chairman
of Bulgarian Central Trades-
Union Council.

The Marxist-Leninist classics saw in socialist competition a basic means of building the new society, developing its economy, bringing the creative activity of the working people to bear and cultivating a Communist attitude to work. 'Now that a socialist government is in power,' Lenin wrote, "our task is to organize competition' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 404). And in amplifying this Lenin remarked that competition makes it possible to find the most correct and economical way of reorganizing Russia's economy.

In other words, scientific communism regards competition as a factor in the triumph of the new production relations and as a form of cooperation of the working people based on these relations. The founders of that theory demonstrated that competition is a production category and as such depends on the mode of production. Is it necessary, Marx asked, for production competition always to be competition for profit, i.e., rivalry? And he replied that in socialism the direct object of production competition would be the product, not profit.

Lenin drew a distinction between competition and market competition, emphasizing that under capitalism 'competition means the incredibly brutal suppression of the enterprise, energy and bold initiative of the *mass* of the population, of its overwhelming majority, of 99 out of every 100 toilers; it also means that competition is replaced by financial fraud, nepotism, servility on the upper rungs of the social ladder.' Abolishing market competition, Lenin emphasized, does not mean abolishing competition as such. On the contrary, 'socialism for the first time creates the opportunity for employing it on a really *wide* and on a really *mass* scale, for actually drawing the majority of the working people into a field of labor in which they can display their abilities, develop their capacities and reveal those talents, so abundant among the people whom capitalism crushed, suppressed and strangled in thousands and millions' (ibid).

Socialist competition is a complex and multiform socio-economic phenomenon. Essentially, it implies promoting a conscious movement of the masses to solve, according to Lenin's ideas, the inter-

connected questions involved in the socialist organization of labor and development of the personality, and merging the political initiative of the citizen in managing the affairs of state with the economic initiative of the worker in the production process.

That Lenin approach is fully valid today too. The building of a developed socialist society, our 10th Party Congress (1971) declared, will be attended by 'mounting social activity of the individual, with conscious work becoming the main content of life, with a more pronounced striving to master the best achievements of science and the arts, and with the development of high moral qualities.' The building of mature socialism, Todor Zhikov, First Secretary of our Party's Central Committee has remarked, is the 'material foundation for the rise and development of a harmonious, strong and richly endowed personality.'

The socialist system has once and for all put an end to private ownership of the means of production and to the exploitation of man by man. It converted the socially oppressed, politically rightless and morally humiliated worker into the full-fledged master of social production and of all the values it creates, into the builder of his own life, the genuine maker of history. And not only the nature of work has changed, but also the attitude to it. Today work is not merely a means of subsistence, not merely an economic category; it is increasingly becoming a moral category, a manifestation of our society's ethics and philosophy.

It is in this broad context that we regard the significance of socialist competition at the present stage in solving the cardinal problem of our economic policy, raising the social productivity of labor and the technical standard of production to world levels. Socialist competition has become the predominant form of labor activity in Bulgaria. And the most characteristic feature of this competition, one that is expressive of its very essence, is worker enthusiasm, the striving to do a better job, increase one's personal contribution to the common effort, of building the new world.

Bulgaria made impressive progress with its fifth five-year plan (1966-70). The sixth plan (1971-1975) opens still greater vistas. It envisages a 50 per cent increase over 1970 in national income. Industrial output will increase by 55-60 per cent, foreign trade by 60-65 per cent or more and retail trade by approximately 39 per cent. Intensification of production is a distinguishing feature of our economic development, the aim being a steep rise in social productivity, which will account for practically the entire increase of national income. The three years of the present five-year period have carried the country a long way forward. And they were also years in which socialist competition (both in substance and form) has been adapted to attainment of the goals set out in our program of building developed socialism.

Organized and directed by the trade unions, socialist competition is helping build the material and technical basis of the new system and, at the same time, is educating our people in a spirit

of socialism. The two aims are inseparably linked. For competition between individual workers and collectives for higher achievement is not only an expression of better performance on the job, of a creative attitude to one's work, but also a very eloquent expression of the new morality, the new pattern of comradely relations. That is why socialist competition is becoming the most effective form of training the new man, of raising the culture of work and cultivating genuine humanism in relations between people.

Comrade Todor Zhivkov's speeches at a meeting of front-rank workers, holders of government decorations, Party and economic executives at Pernik, our main mining center, in December 1971, and at the national rally of front-rank workers in April 1972, have played an enormous role in developing the nationwide socialist competition for fulfillment of the aims set by the 10th Party Congress. In these speeches Comrade Zhivkov comprehensively explained the concept of the further perfection of socialist competition in adaptation to our present tasks, showing how competition can become a component of our economic policy and a method of state leadership. Drawing on the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and with due account to the specifics of Bulgaria's development in building mature socialism, Comrade Todor Zhivkov formulated the essence of this concept in the following words: 'The Struggle for higher labor productivity, the rapid advance to world levels in quality and technology, in expenditure of materials and labor power, must be the very axis, the main content of competition in every district, every economic amalgamation, every factory, every institute, and every collective.' Accordingly, Todor Zhivkov pointed to the need to improve the organization of competition, its criteria and indicators, tying them more closely to advanced organization of production and to the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution.

Responding to the appeal of the Pernik rally, workers throughout the country started a mass movement to bring latent reserves to bear. Collectives have put forward 'counter-plans' which are discussed and adopted and which fit into the state economic development plan and the principles of planning and economic incentives. These 'counter-plans' call for higher use of untapped reserves. And here the main task is to introduce more effective technology, improve work organization, streamline production. Work collectives assume additional obligations, pledging more output than provided for by the state plan and higher economic indicators in such matters as expenditure of raw materials, energy and labor power.

Top officials of our ministries, economic amalgamations, research centers, etc. have an active share in drawing up these 'counter-plans.' They help to disclose available reserves and our economic agencies provide the necessary material and financial backing for the 'counter-plans.' Their fulfillment and over-fulfillment is tied in with the system of additional material and moral incentives, with

a program of social development of our work collectives. These too are elements of the 'counter-plans.'

And these plans are increasingly becoming the most effective form of bringing millions of people into the management of production and the affairs of society. They help to shape Party and government policy. What we have, in short, is a very promising form of giving full scope to the initiative of workers and specialists, of all men of labor, a form also of developing the socialist man capable of thinking in terms of the common interests and merging into an integral whole one's dedication, one's feeling of responsibility for one's job, with responsibility for the management of one's place of work and the community as a whole.

The 10th Party Congress program for building developed socialism in Bulgaria has won the hearts and minds of workers in town and country. It has given them fresh strength, has stimulated their creative effort, their search for new and better methods. The stupendous aims set out in this program have given rise to a new approach to competition, to new forms of initiative by industries, factories, communities, and every such initiative leads to some improvement. Many have deep social implications, a big economic potential and a strong emotional charge. They determine the character of the nation-wide competition drive.

Three years ago, Hero of Socialist Labor Peter Braikov of Varna started a movement to accomplish six days' work in five. This entailed a number of integrated measures: no rejects, quality control, substantial savings in use of machinery, passing on one's experience to others, and training young workers. The important thing is that attention is concentrated on one's concrete contribution to making maximum use of production reserves by the worker, the work team and the factory as a whole. Braikov's appeal met with wide response and now many workers and technicians have gone over to fulfilling the six-day assignment in five days. In fact more than 4,000 collectives are now doing so. The 42.5 hour five-day week was introduced at the close of 1973. Now Braikov has undertaken to fulfill his weekly assignment in 40 hours. All this, I think, is a visible manifestation of the positive traits of the socialist personality and of the growing Communist attitude to one's work.

Another expression of socialist collectivism and cooperation is the initiative of the workers of Gabrovo. Their slogan is: Our work must create conditions for higher productivity at other factories too. The objective basis of this initiative is the dominant trend toward expansion of productive forces and development of socialist production relations. Closer technical and economic cooperation and specialization make for closer interdependence of factories and individual workers, increasingly converting their labor into direct social labor and facilitating the continued progress of socalist production relations.

A streamlined, uniform system of production ties between specialized factories is needed to ensure timely, uinterrupted supplies of high-quality products to and from the enterprises

involved in production cooperation. Greater mutual responsibility and synchronization of specialized enterprises provides a considerable reserve for increasing labor productivity, utilization of which is the key idea of the Gabrovo factories' drive. Its political value consists in that it provides the opportunity to bring out the advantages of the socialist system; its socio-economic significance is that it provides even more favorable conditions for the fulfillment of the 'counter-plans.'

The mechanism for spreading the Gabrovo initiative is closely linked with the new criteria and indicators accepted in socialist competition: factory collectives pledge to keep strictly within the production schedule, ensure rhythmic work at team, section, shop and factory level, meet production deadlines, and satisfy consumer demand with regard to production range, assortment and quality. Some 900 collectives have taken up the Gabrovo initiative, and the Party and trade unions attach great importance to its spread on a mass scale.

The enthusiasm and creativity of young workers has found expression in the motto: 'Master skills and achieve foremost results in work and studies.' This initiative launched by young workers at the Kremikovsty metallurgical works, has expanded into a nationwide movement. It is the urge to study and emulate the experience of foremost workers that lies at the root of the continued advance to the top achievements of the working class, farmers and intellectuals. Mention should also be made of the work methods introduced by miners in the town of Smolyan to boost output by bringing new technologies and machines into the production process. At present 39 per cent of the country's miners employ this method.

In the course of carrying out their 'counter-plans' industrial collectives constantly improve their work methods, promote the spirit of innovation and realize many initiatives of value to individual industries and trades: maintenance of optimum regimes in the chemical industry, transport safety, multi-loom operation at textile mills, reducing commissioning schedules for new capacities.

Scientific and technological creativity, the prime mover of progress, occupies a special place in the present changes in the methods of socialist competition. Accordingly, the Party and the state are concerned with making material and organizational conditions for it as favorable as possible. In 1972, the economic effect deriving from the introduction of inventions and rationalization proposals increased 26.5 per cent over 1971, and the number of rationalizers increased by 11,000. The field is led by the chemical and engineering industries, the factories of Sofia and the Ruse district.

In December 1972, the Central Committee of the BCP held a plenary meeting which emphatically reaffirmed that concern for the man was the essence of the Party's social policy. It adopted a national program for enhancing the people's material and cultural standards. It is a comprehensive, integrated, scientifically con-

ceived program in keeping with the spirit of the 10th Party Congress and the principle of unity of social, collective and personal interests under socialism. Its strength lies in the concrete nature and realism of the envisaged tasks, in the vital concern of all the people for their implementation. The program is expressive of the concern of the Party and the socialist state for enhancing the standard of living. Its main idea is the realization of the principal task of Marxist-Leninists: 'the wide expansion of social production and distribution on scientific lines and their actual subordination to the aim of easing the lives of the working people and improving their welfare as much as possible' (V. I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 411). The more active the participation of the working people in developing the material and technical base, accelerating scientific and technological progress and raising labor productivity, the faster will this task be accomplished.

The content and aim of the integrated program of raising the people's material and cultural standard is diametrically opposed to the bourgeois 'consumer society' ideal. For the Marxist-Leninist ideal of popular consumption includes not only a high level of material consumption, as emphasized in 'consumer society' theories: it also envisages a high level of spiritual consumption, which presumes the triumph of communist ideology and full blossoming of socialist culture, which has nothing in common with the bourgeois spiritual surrogate known as 'pop culture.'

Important steps have been taken since the December plenum: the CC Political Bureau passed a decision on enhancing women's role in building developed socialist society; wages have been raised for some categories of workers; a decree on the gradual introduction of a five-day working week has been published, etc. Therein lies the proof of the Party's creative realism and consistent policy aimed at raising the standard of living. The Party's links with the working class, farmers and intellectuals are stronger than ever.

The December plenum decisions evoked responses from several leading enterprises of the town of Silven under the motto: 'From each work collective a maximum contribution towards a higher living standard on the basis of higher labor productivity.' They called for a socialist competition drive for the fulfiillment of 'counter-plans,' including both production and social targets.

Life itself confirms the inexhaustible creative forces and possibilities of the masses and the tremendous significance of socialist competition, which has acquired truly national scope. We never forget that, while enhancing the economic content of socialist competition, it is essential to enrich its ideological and ethical aspects, its moral basis. Rapid economic expansion and the scientific and technological revolution make the results of people's labor increasingly dependent on the concerted efforts of whole work collectives. Comradeship, mutual assistance and conscious discipline are objective necessities, imperatives of the normal functioning of industry and well-organized socialist competition.

Thus, the development of the personality is one of the decisive conditions for the further progress of the socialist economy and the society as a whole.

An extremely valuable initiative in this context was taken at the Vasil Kolarov works in Sofia, where a system of moral and material incentives for participants in the drive for conscious discipline was worked out and its basic principles formulated. The example was followed by tens and hundreds of collectives, which discussed and adopted codes of labor and social discipline.

The BCP Program adopted at the 10th Party Congress stresses the need to improve the trade union structure 'in line with social change and the new tasks of socialist construction, enhance the union's involvement in social and labor legislation and its enforcement, and in regulating social and public problems, more fully combine activities designed to promote the implementation of national tasks and fulfillment of national economic plans with work aimed at upholding the collective and individual interests of the working people.'

Enhancement of the role of the trade unions follows from the trend towards strengthening the leading position of the working class in socialist society as the creator of the material wealth and master and organizer of production. Our experience at the present stage in the building of socialism shows that the working class is the only force capable of linking the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system. Intensification in a planned economy is inseparably linked with the growing creative and organizational initiative of the working class. The progress of the productive forces and development of socialist relations of production in Bulgaria create favorable conditions for efftctive worker participation in running industry, for the better fulfillment by trade unions of their tasks as a school of management, a school of communism. There is no more effective way for the trade unions to influence socialist production relations or educate the working people than nationwide socialist competition.

The Seventh Trade Union Congress, held in 1972, set the guidelines for enhancing the unions' role in the society and turning them into a more effective factor of socialist development. Socialist competition is being reshaped in the light of these decisions, the aim being to make it into a nationwide movement for the fulfillment and over-fulfillment of 'counter-plans.'

With the active participation of the Central Trades-Union Council, the Council of Ministers adopted provisional indicators for socialist competition and to judge its results. It sets the basic criteria for determining social labor productivity and achieving production standards compatible with those of economically developed countries. The industrial unions and ministries used the indicators as a basis for drawing up their own systems of integrated assessment of socialist competition results. Important changes have been made in the Invention and Rationalization Law

and Rules, a number of new documents have been approved which regulate the character and contents of competition agreements. Measures have been taken to enhance the workers' economic knowledge. As a result socialist competition has become more effective and conditions have been created for the correct utilization of material and moral incentives.

On the order of the day is the introduction of a unified system of moral incentives. This will help create a favorable atmosphere for making the principles of socialist civic and moral responsibility part of every worker's mentality, for combining personal with public interests.

Bulgaria's trade unions give great attention to the unresolved problems of socialist competition. Their efforts are aimed at ensuring publicity of competition results, at improving the methods of analyzing and disseminating advanced experience, at elaborating a mechanism for the swift introduction of important initiatives on a national scale, at enhancing the effectiveness of the system of material and moral incentives, at expanding the involvement in the socialist competition of collectives in the non-productive sphere, at raising the level of joint efforts by management and unions to restructure the socialist competition movement in the spirit of the requirements of the 10th Party Congress.

We constantly turn to the treasure-trove of experience of the Soviet working class and trade unions, and apply it creatively. This has helped us in the past, when we were building the foundations of socialism, it helps us now to build a developed socialist society.

The efforts of the working class and the whole Bulgarian people, their successes and victories, the tasks that have been set, are doubtlessly of international as well as national import. They are our contribution to the strengthening of the economic and political might, the unity and cohesion of the socialist community, that major gain of the international working class, the decisive force of the anti-imperialist front, stronghold of peace and democracy, the hope of the peoples. It is an expression of our solidarity with the struggle of the world working class against monopoly exploitation, for social progress, for the triumph of the great ideals of communism.

An anti-dictatorial front in the making

Pedro Vasquez
Member, Political Commission
and Secretariat,
CC Paraguayan CP

When Ian Duncan Martin, manager of a British firm in Paraguay, was kidnapped last summer, the authorities immediately blamed Left extremists. A detective from London had little difficulty in establishing that the whole thing had been master-minded by Pastor Coronel, chief of the police investigation division. It was also established that several members of the ruling Colorado Party – three of them relatives of Interior Minister Sabino Augusto Montanaro – were involved. Coronel had brought them in to compromise the Minister, who shortly before the kidnapping had told journalists that Coronel was mixed up with an international narcotics ring. To avoid a scandal the government made short shrift of all eye-witnesses, and the English detective, fearing for his life, hastily left the country. But the evidence was there for all to see: the ruling camarilla was shot through with corruption and had degenerated into an in-fighting gang.

Twenty years ago, on May 4, 1954, a gendarme of Bavarian origin, one Alfredo Stroessner Matiauda, carried out a coup d'état. With this CIA and Pentagon placeman installed in the Presidential Palace, there began the most reactionary, treasonous and criminal regime in Paraguay's history. To keep in power the bourgeois-landlord oligarchy and the imperialist monopolies, Stroessner plunged the country into the darkness of the Middle Ages.

Adding insult to injury, the government paper, *Patria*, describes the Stroessner years as 'an era of peace and progress.' It cites these figures in substantiation: gross national product increased 5.3 per cent in 1972 and about 6 per cent in 1973; foreign exchange reserves have risen to $45 million.

But what is behind the figures? Paraguay is an underdeveloped and dependent country, with over half of the active population in agriculture. Practically all the arable land, forests and cattle are in the hands of a small group of latifundists. Paraguay is one of Latin America's least industrialized countries.

The leader of the Second Renaissance, as Stroessner is called by his servile ministers, is selling the country to the imperialist, chiefly U.S. monopolies. They have the oil of Chaco, are securely entrenched in the economy, control meat packing, forestry, the plantations, foreign trade and international communications.

Paraguay's dependence on other countries has been further aggravated by Brazilian expansion. Last year Brazilian monopolies

were given the Guayra and Itaipu areas on the Parana river to build a power plant and exploit natural resources. The Brazilian capitalist press described the Itaipu agreement between Medici and Stroessner as a 'typical victory for Brazilian diplomacy.' Actually, it was one more step in imperialist integration, which would turn Paraguay into an 'associated' state and, eventually, into a province of Brazil.*

The Paraguayan dictatorship cannot lay a single brick without obtaining a foreign loan, and what it has built are mainly infrastructure elements (roads, ports, warehouses, etc.) to suit Pentagon plans and the monopoly and landed interests. The result has been economic development at the pace of a one-horse cart and a foreign debt increasing with the speed of a supersonic jet.

Growth of GNP in recent years is due mainly to favorable conditions on foreign markets. This has meant more exports and rapid growth of the service industries (up 49 per cent in 1964 as compared with a 45 per cent growth in 1962-1965).** But prosperity, such as it is, has not touched the bulk of the population, whose living standard is being steadily depressed as prices outpace wages. Thus, according to the *Frente* newspaper, a worker's family of four averages 8,000 guarani a month against an estimated cost-of-living minimum of 20,000 guarani. The farm laborer is worse off still. Unemployment now stands at 37 per cent.

More and more people are coming to see that their country's tragedy is due to the triple evil of latifundism, imperialism and dictatorship. And not for a moment do our people relax the struggle to rid the country of it. Following in the footsteps of his spiritual forebear, Adolph Hitler, Stroessner claps down on every manifestation of resistance. The regime has been able to hold on only by keeping the country under martial law and waging an unending war against the people. This is neo-fascism. Dozens of police stations have been turned into torture dungeons. Communists and representatives of all the democratic parties are being kept in jail without trial or investigation. This has been the fate of our Party's Chairman, Antonio Maidana, and of Central Committee members Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta. They have been in prison now for more than 15 years, though the court ordered their release 10 years ago.

Once a haven for Latin American patriots and liberation fighters, Paraguay has become a refuge for international criminals trying to escape just retribution.*** So much for 'peace and progress' in Paraguay.

*The Paraguayan Communists have denounced the agreement as an act of outright betrayal. It is detrimental to the vital interests and rights of our and other peoples of the La Plata basin and to peace in South America. The struggle for its annulment is an integral part of the struggle to overthrow the autocratic Stroessner regime and bring our people national and social emancipation.

**In an underdeveloped country, the growth of this unproductive sector does not indicate progress (though it contributes to a higher GNP). On the contrary, it can accentuate economic imbalance.

***Among these is Josef Mengele, the Nazi responsible for the death of thousands. Dozens of other Gestapo men are now 'consultants' of the dictatorship. Paraguay has become a center of the drug traffic and the home of one of the biggest drug traffickers, Auguste Ricord.

There is not a social group in Paraguay today that has not come out against the dictatorship in one way or another. First the working class and peasantry who suffer most from the oppression. Second, the petty and middle bourgeoisie being ruined by foreign monopoly competition and local oligarchy. Third, the students, intellectuals, white-collar workers, all of them keenly and painfully aware of the Stroessner oppression. There is also change in the army, the Church and the Colorado party, those pillars of the dictatorship. Rebellious sentiments are growing within the official opposition, notably among members of the Liberal-Radical Party, the country's biggest.

The Communist Party believes that the deep and irreconcilable contradictions of Paraguay's obsolescent social, economic and political system, combined with radicalization of the masses and all sections of society, is bound to produce a serious national political crisis fraught with revolution, a crisis that will be much more profound than all preceding ones.

But no matter how rotten the Stroessner regime is, it will not collapse of its own. It has to be overthrown by the joint effort of the masses. The objective conditions for that have matured. What we need now are the subjective conditions. We must build up a force capable of organizing and uniting the masses and of overthrowing the dictatorship – a national anti-dictatorial front.

The first signs of popular anti-dictatorial unity appeared during the election farce staged in February 1973: a 'blank votes front' came into being to protest the dictator's 're-election.' The Febrerista and Christian-Democratic parties* formed coordinating commissions, and the youth bodies of various political parties also set up a coordinating center. But they did not succeed in rallying efforts on a nationwide scale. Their tactics were not always right. The dictator was 're-elected.'

Then came the events in Chile. On the day of the putsch the PCP issued a statement that evoked a broad response across the country. A students' meeting in Asuncion marking Students' Dignity Day on September 12, paid tribute to Salvador Allende and denounced the fascist mutiny. The student press, particularly the newspaper *Frente*, published reports of crimes committed by the Pinochet gang and the CIA.

The Liberal-Radical, Democratic and Febrerista parties, the liberal Alon Club, and various other organizations came out publicly against the Chilean putsch, the president's assassination and overthrow of the constitutional democratic sysem. The opposition within the Colorado Party denounced the coup in its paper, *Emancipacion paraguaia*, and expressed its sympathy for the people of Chile.

*The revolutionary Febrerista Party, formed in 1936, represents a section of urban middle strata, army officers and national bourgeoisie, is working for some democratic reforms.

The Christian-Democratic Party, established in 1960, but not yet recognized by the government, advocates the interests of the urban and petty bourgeoisie, seeks democratic reconstruction and is working for anti-dictatorial unity.

A militant demonstration in Asuncion removed the fraternal country's coat-of-arms and flag from the Chilean Embassy to protect them from being sullied by the traitors. The symbols will be returned to the people of Chile as soon as they regain their freedom. This action by different political forces is doubly significant, because it was performed in the teeth of police persecution, tight censorship and a ban on displays of solidarity with Chile's Popular Unity, and is evidence that the people's movement is potentially much stronger than the Stroessner autocracy and that the outlines of an anti-dictatorial front are crystallizing.

The Communists must play a decisive part in building that front. In our propaganda we stress that unity can be won only on the basis of a minimum program of democratization. The front will fail if it adopts bourgeois-nationalist or anti-communist postures, because these will at best lead to bourgeois reformism and at worst to outright counter-revolution.

Anti-communism and its most dangerous variety, anti-Sovietism, are a weapon of bellicose reaction and imperialist agents to Right and 'Left,' and are certainly not the means to combat oppression and poverty. Marxism-Leninism, the Communists and first of all the CPSU, are showing the way to reconstruct society and resolve issues that no one else is capable of solving.

The popular forces should drop all their faulty tactical conceptions. The events in Chile have revived the debate over the ways and forms of revolutionary struggle, but, says Angel Solar in his book, as frequently before 'the attempts to determine which forms, ways and means are revolutionary and which are not, have all too often obscured or left undetermined, the ultimate aim of the struggle – the winning of power by the revolutionary classes, the basic issue of any revolution.*

In the Political Theses of its Third Congress (1971), our Party said that any form of mass struggle that furthers the organization and unity of the masses and promotes their demands and political education, helps isolate the enemy, gather strength and build up the revolútionary movement, may be regarded as revolutionary. But when the hour of decision strikes none but the most effective forms of struggle for working-class and popular power are revolutionary.

Our policy of alliances (in particular with the national bourggeoisie) is tactically flexible but firm in principle. There are all too many instances in history when ideologues of the liberal bourgeoisie betrayed democracy and sided with fascism, as was the case with Eduardo Frei in Chile.

The Communists will support the national bourgeoisie if it really fights against the Stroessner autocracy, for it is politically unforgivable to neglect opportunities for expanding the national antidictatorial front, giving added impulse to the revolutionary process and, consequently, winning political freedoms at less pain.

*M. Angel Solar. 'Lenin y algunas cuestiones programaticas y tacticas,' *Bases*, No. 1, 1973.

We are not giving the workers and peasants any wrong ideas about these alliances. Communists, Lenin said, "will always emphasize the independent class identity of the proletariat who tomorrow may find themselves in opposition to their allies of today.' He amplified: 'We shall be told that "such action will *weaken* all the fighters for political liberty at the present time." We shall reply that such action will *strengthen* all the fighters for political liberty. Only those fighters are strong who rely on *the consciously recognized* real interests of certain *classes*, and any attempt to obscure these class interests, which already play a predominant role in contemporary society, will only weaken the fighters,' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 334-335). It only remains to be added that quite a few revolutions were defeated because this point had been neglected.

Speaking of defeats, we refer principally to our own setbacks, and particularly to an episode in Paraguayan history distorted by the apologists of the regime.

Following the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition in the Second World War, a wave of working-class and popular actions swept across Latin America. The ideological, political and organizational influence of the Communist parties went up steeply. In the summer of 1946, the Paraguayan CP became legal, democratization began in the country. But it was interrupted by a coup on January 13, 1947.

In March, responding to our Party's call, the nation and part of the army launched an armed struggle against the putschists. It lasted five months. Following bitter fighting, the rising was suppressed. The butchery that followed is only comparable to that loosened by the Pinochet clique in Chile.

Examining our 1947 defeat, we pinpointed a number of objective and subjective faults, notably the lack of unity among the insurrectionists and the vacillation of their bourgeois leaders. There had been opportunism in policy and tactics, and political oversights, that are, of course, no novelty in the history of revolutions. Disposed exploiting classes, Marxism-Leninism has shown conclusively, will not shrink from violence. The slightest concession to counter-revolution leads to bloodshed.

Despite its faults and errors, however, the 1947 rising is a heroic chapter in the history of the nation, its working class, and the workers' vanguard – the Paraguayan Communist Party.

There have been other painful blows since then. But we carried on, clearing our ranks of opportunists and traitors. Following the inner-Party crisis of the 60s the Committee for the Protection and Reorganization of the Party convened an emergency national conference in April 1967, which adopted 'The Basic Principles for the Reorganization of the PCP,' discussed a report on the hostile activity of D. Creydt and the 'Conclusions,' and drafted a new Party Constitution. Provocateur Creydt was expelled, and a Central Committee was elected to operate until the convocation of the Third Congress. The Congress, in April 1971, adopted a new Program, approved the Political Theses and the Party Constitution,

and elected a new Central Committee. Antonio Maidana, who is in prison, was appointed Party Chairman.

This brought about a big change. We mounted a sharp ideological and political offensive against Right-opportunist and liberal conceptions, and against Left-sectarian and adventurist views contiguous with bourgeois-nationalist and anti-Soviet postures. The Party fought back against the foes of the principle of democratic centralism who urged unlimited democracy, and also against those who negated all democracy and gave precedence to the leader's will. Lenin's principles and norms of Party life triumphed. Therein lies the historical significance of our Third Congress, which saw a rapid strengthening of our ranks.

Though compelled to work deep underground in extremely difficult conditions, the Party leadership operates from within the country. After a 10-year interruption, our monthly, *Adelante*, is published inside Paraguay. Between June 1972 and October 1973 the PCP membership increased six-fold, and the good results of our money-raising campaigns are evidence of the trust and support of Paraguay's working people.

The moral and political prestige of our Central Committee is clearly rising. Conscious Party discipline is taking root in the primary organizations. An entirely new attitude has shaped among Party cadres and the rank-and-file towards questions of theory and political problems. To eliminate deficiencies in our educational work, we are now studying the question of schools for Party cadres, even though on a modest scale for a start.

In sum, we have succeeded in protecting the Party in line with Lenin's view that 'the basis of unity is class discipline, recognition of the will of the majority, and concerted activities in the ranks of, and in step with, that majority' (Vol. 20, p. 232). Those with a dual view in matters of unity, are only the weaker for it. In the ideological and political struggle, Lenin said, '. . . the workers want clarity, and they will get it, for they want to build up the unity of their organization, not on the basis of diplomacy and equivocation, but on the basis of a precise appraisal of the political signficance of the different "trends." People who have two or even more opinions on this question are poor counsellors' (Vol. 20, p. 547).

Cohesion, common outlook, unity of organization and action, and not the slightest concession to factionalism – those are the guidelines for our Fourth Congress now in preparation. In accordance with our Constitution it will be convened by the Central Committee elected at the preceding congress, and if a special preparatory commission is formed, it will consist of only those who have shown firmness in defending the Party's Marxist-Leninist principles and have proved their loyalty to the Program, Constitution, Political Theses and other documents of the Third Congress.

We are working to make the PCP a mass party to cement the broad and anti-dictatorial front. The end of the regime is not far distant. The light of freedom and democracy will replace the darkness of dictatorship.

The Palestinian aspect of the Middle East crisis

Naim Ashhab
CC Member, Jordanian CP

The Palestinian problem is like a festering wound. And for all of a quarter of a century it has been methodically lacerated by the imperialists and Israel's Zionist rulers with plots against the Arab liberation movement. The problem is in the epicenter of the Middle East crisis. Its settlement must inevitably include a just accommodation for the national destiny of the Palestinian Arab people and assure it the right of self-determination. This was emphasized yet again by the fourth Arab-Israeli war, one of whose features, in contrast to the preceding three, was that the relevant Security Council cease-fire resolution was tied in with a political solution of the conflict and required fulfillment of the November 22, 1967 resolution. The worldwide concern for ending the Middle East crisis combines these days with unprecentedly broad recognition of the need to ensure the lawful rights of the Palestinian Arab people. Behind this recognition is a chapter of history abounding in sacrifice and heroic struggle.

Ever since the turn of the century the Palestinian Arab people have been fighting ceaselessly against national oppression and foreign domination. And it may be recalled in this connection that it was chiefly Palestinians who were the founders of the League of Young Arabs in Paris in 1911, established to direct a movement against the Turkish yoke in the eastern part of the Arab world.

National resistance entered a new stage following the notorious Balfour Declaration (1917), which envisaged a 'Jewish national home' in the area, and the establishment of the British mandate over Palestine (1922). The British colonial authorities deliberately set out to ruin the peasants and thereby facilitate the transfer of their land to Zionist settlers. A series of armed actions and uprisings against British domination occurred in the 20s and 30s,[1] with thousands of Arab Palestinians falling in combat against the punitive forces. This was a struggle for national indepedence, and against plans of Jewish immigration and the mushrooming of Zionist settlements.

At that time, the heroic resistance did not succeed, in spite of the support of the brother Arab peoples and world progressive forces headed by the Soviet Union. The main reasons were: the balance of forces in the region and the rest of the world had not yet tilted in favor of the world revolutionary movement; the

military superiority of British imperialism and world Zionism in the Middle East; absence of a democratic leadership connected with the people;[2] Arab reaction, which predominated in countries bordering on Palestine, had come to terms with imperialism and Zionism and gave no real aid to the national movement of the Palestinian Arab people.

The next stage of the struggle began after 1947, when the imperialists and Zionists in collusion with Arab reaction denied to the Palestinian Arab people its lawful right of creating an independent democratic state thus violating the November 1947 resolution of the UN General Assembly.[3] Palestinians were driven from their motherland, with Israel seizing more than half of the territory delineated to them by the UN resolution., The remainder, known as the West Bank of the River Jordan, was annexed in 1950 by Jordan, then a vassal of Britain.

The rulers of Israel displayed a profoundly hostile attitude towards the Arab people of Palestine, not short at times of physical annihilation. And to this day they continue to deny the very existence of the Palestinian Arab people. When the Israeli rulers launched their 1967 aggression one of the aims was to 'liquidate' the Palestinian problem by totally wiping out the rights of the Palestinian Arab people. To this end, following the occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the Israeli authorities began to set up puppet political and administrative bodies in an attempt to distort the will of Palestinian Arabs and convert the captured territory into a protectorate.

But these attempts failed to achieve their objective. The Palestinian Arabs' national movement, whose resistance did not falter, could not be destroyed. On the contrary, it erupted with fresh force, touching off a mass struggle against the Israeli occupation, imperialism and Zionism, for the existence of the Palestinian Arab people and the restoration of its legitimate rights, including the right of self-determination. The Palestinian patriots did not spare their lives and energy in this fight.[4] The resistance movement drew the full support of the population of other Arab countries, as demonstrated during the clash of the Palestine Resistance with the rulers of Jordan and Lebanon.

The anti-imperialist and liberative complexion of the Palestinian Arabs' national movement, the very fact that it exists, is now broadly recognized throughout the world. It has acquired such scope that now even U.S. President Richard Nixon is compelled to recognize it. The joint Soviet-American communique (1973) says, for example, that any Mid-East settlement 'should be in accordance with the interests of all states in the area, be consistent with their independence and sovereignty, and should take into due account the *legitimate interests of the Palestinian people*' (my italics – *N.A.*)

The worldwide recognition of the legitimate demands of the Palestinian national movement is clear evidence of the bankruptcy of Zionist and imperialist attempts, and those of certain

sections of Arab reaction, to ignore, formally or actually, the just Palestinian cause.

The Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), is the sole lawful representative of the Palestinian Arab people.[5] Desipte its flaws and errors, it has won the support of the masses, is determined to restore their legitimate rights, and follows an anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist and patriotic line.

The Jordanian Communists have supported the PLO since its inception, and have expressed readiness to cooperate with it. Yet our Party has not hesitated to point out the harmful adventurist tendencies in the PLO and to criticize the chauvinist demagogy of some of its leaders, especially during the period of Ahmed Shukeiry.[6] This demagogy has only been grist to the Israeli aggressors' mill.

Important changes began after the September 1970 massacre launched by the Jordanian rulers against the Palestinian Resistance,[7] new and important tendencies have surfaced; crystallizing essentially in 1973.

First, with the majority of the Arab countries involved in the confiict gravitating toward a peaceful Mid-East settlement based on Security Council resolution No. 242 of November 22, 1967, and recognition of the rights of the Palestinian Arab people, a realistic standpoint began to gain ground in the PLO. Even before the October war more attention was paid to the UN resolutions concerning the Middle East crisis and the Palestinian question by certain influential circles in the PLO. This position was the beginning of the departure from the 'all or nothing' principle that has been harmful to our just struggle.

Second, the influence of Maoist and Trotskyist ideas and slogans, such as 'everything comes from the barrel of a gun,' is visibly waning in the Palestinian Resistance; there is a disaffection with adventurous actions that so strongly harmed its reputation, confused world opinion, and diverted attention from the crimes of the Israeli occupation authorities. The latter made the most of the situation as an excuse for new repressions against the population of the occupied territories and aggressive sorties against neighboring Arab countries and Palestinian refugee camps there.

A large-scale terrorist action was mounted at the end of 1973,[8] at the very time when Tel-Aviv, Washington, and certain Arab reactionary quarters made a fresh attempt to prevent the PLO from representing Palestinians in the international arena. Official Tel-Aviv went to the length of saying that the organization did not personify a people, but 'guerrilla gangs.'

But let the Israeli rulers cling to their lies. What we are concerned about is the PLO's attitude towards the Rome incident, and to previous adventurist acts. And its attitude leaves no room for doubt. 'The Palestinian fighters could not commit such a terrorist act,' says a PLO statement on this score, 'because it is essentially aimed against the interests of the Palestinian people and suits the designs of its enemies.'

There is a growing understanding of the value of political struggle, a growing interest in it, spurred by the striving to define its specific weight in the general strategy of the Palestinian movement. The PLO is giving heed to world opinion and appreciates its support. Its delegation participated in the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, the latest World Festival of Youth and Students in Berlin, and many other international actions. It pays attention to the struggle of democratic forces in Israel and appreciates it.

Third, though unity has not yet been forged between the main sections of the Palestine resistance movement, a number of joint steps have already been taken in such fields as propaganda and the matter of improving general relations between Palestinian organizations. There have been instances of them coordinating their activities. This led to clearly positive results during the savage clash between the Palestine Resistance and the Lebanese authorities last year and during the fourth Arab-Israeli war.

After more than six years since the June 1967 war, a Palestine National front was formed in Israeli-occupied territories on August 15, 1973. Its program says: 'The Palestine National Front is an inseparable part of the Palestinian national movement as represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, a composite section of the All-Arab liberation movement.'

The Front was a direct result of the consolidation of different contingents of the liberation movement in the occupied territories. Communists, representatives of different resistance organizations, other bodies, and prominent public leaders took part in the negotiations preceding its foundation. These forces drew up a program of struggle based on the real situation in the region, the correlation of world forces, and the demands of the liberation movement. The program recognizes the necessity of uniting broad masses of the population in the occupied areas for struggle against the invaders in different forms – political, military, etc. During the latest war in the Middle East and after it the Palestine National Front proved its mettle.[9]

Fourth, the PLO firmly defends Arab-Soviet friendship against the stepped-up activity of Arab reaction and the Right-wing of the liberation movement, which are eager to sow doubts about this friendship. Understandably so, for it has seen the decisive role and significance of the friendship of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the liberation struggle.

Nowadays, the Palestine Liberation Organization is fully equipped to represent the Palestinian Arab people, whose support it enjoys in full. The PLO has been accepted as the lawful representative of that people by all Arab summit conferences. It has won the sympathy of progressive and anti-imperialist forces in the Arab Front Aiding the Palestine Revolution,[10] and has been recognized by various international and regional organizations.

The communique of the November 1973 Conference of the Communist parties of Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan, says: 'Viewing

the right of the (Palestinian – *N.A.*) people as inalienable and holding that any imposition of guardians or artificial representatives is intolerable, our parties regard the Palestinian Liberation Organization as its lawful representative.' None but the PLO can speak on behalf of the Palestinian Arab people, whose right to self-determination is supported by all UN resolutions, beginning with that of 1947. The prestige of the Palestinian Liberation Organization and its ability to represent the Arab people of Palestine more effectively and to have its legitimate rights respected in any settlement of the Mideast conflict will grow as the various contingents of the PLO draw closer together, favorable changes come about in the national liberation movement (which, in particular, would enable the PLO to reflect the role and impact of individual resistance forces more objectively), realistic trends gain ground in PLO policy and the PLO establishes closer links with the Arab liberation movement, world socialism and other contingents of the anti-imperialist movement.

Hwoever, not everyone in the Arab camp welcomes the growing influence and prestige of the PLO. This applies, first of all, to the rulers of Jordan. What is the reason for their negative stand on the PLO?

Jordan's rulers say they recognize the existence of the Arab people of Palestine. 'The Palestinian people,' King Hussein stated in the proposal for a 'United Arab Kingdom' which he put forward in 1972, 'existed centuries before 1948. The Palestinian people continued to exist after 1948 as well.' However, the royal regime's real attitude to the Palestinian problem has not changed in the least since Jordan annexed the West Bank. Jordan's rulers resisted the Palestinians' attempt to regain their legitimate rights and tried to impose themselves on this people as trustees and to rob it of its identity. And when the Palestinian resistance became a really influential factor in Jordan the country's rulers did not shrink from attempts to physically destroy the members of Palestinian organizations, an important force of the liberation struggle in the Arab East.

The Jordanian regime's policy towards the PLO is prompted by disregard of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and hopes of perpetuating the split in the liberation movement. The regime has been trying to disrupt the PLO ever since the first Arab summit (1964) acknowledged that the PLO was laying the groundwork for the political structure of Palestine. The Jordanian authorities went as far as to meddle in the PLO's internal affairs and, taking advantage of the fact that most Palestinians found themselves on Jordanian territory, resorted to outright terror and tried to influence the leading bodies of the PLO.

Lately Jordan's rulers have maintained widespread contacts with Arab reaction to bar the PLO from the Geneva conference on peace in the Middle East. 'Transferring the right to represent our people to others,' said King Hussein in parliament on December 2, 1973, 'makes it impossible for us to safeguard the rights of our people in

the West Bank.' The King even refused to attend the recent Arab Summit in Algiers (November 1973), apparently for fear that conference decisions on Palestine might tie his hands. The Jordanian rulers' position on this issue cioncided with the official stance of Israel. Tel Aviv even threatened to boycott the Geneva talks if the PLO joined in them.

The Jordanian regime took the Algiers summit's recognition of the PLO as the only legitimate spokesman of the Arab people of Palestine as a danger signal. Realizing that its maneuver had miscarried, and faced with the threat of isolation in the Arab world and on the international scene, it embarked on new maneuvers. However, there are no indications so far that Jordan's rulers have given up their plan to nullify the right of the Arab people of Palestine to free self-determination. At this crucial juncture in history, when there is a prospect of settling the Middle East crisis, they again declare allegiance to the plan for a 'United Arab Kingdom' and try to convince everyone that the majority of the West Bank population backs the plan. In other words, the rulers are trying to misrepresent our people's will as in 1948.[11]

To achieve this objective, the ruling classes of Jordan use those Palestinians in the West Bank, the eastern part of the country and the Gaza Strip who are loyal to them. It is not accidental that ever since the beginning of Israeli occupation these shady elements lacking popular support have been paid substantial sums from the 'tenacity' fund, whose nominal purpose is to ease the fate of the poor of the occupied areas.

What the project of a 'United Arab Kingdom' amounts to is an attempt to keep the principles of relations with the Palestinians which existed before the 1967 aggression of Israel and were based on annexation, national discrimination, suppression of civil liberties and loyalty to imperialism. This concept of 'self-determination' brings rightful protests from Palestinian patriots and all anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist forces in the Middle East. The policy of the Jordanian authorities is highly detrimental to the unity of the two fraternal peoples, the Jordanians and Palestinians, and brings grist to the mill of Israeli aggressors. Nor is world opinion on the side of the Jordanian regime. It is indicative that Britain, Pakistan and Iraq (under the Nuri Said regime) were the only states to have recognized Jordan's annexation of the West Bank as legitimate.

The Arab people of Palestine can win the right to self-determination only if the areas occupied by Israel are freed and they are free to exercise the rights to determine their political future. This, obviously, will be possible only when the Palestinian refugees are enabled to return to their homes.

There is no doubt that the Arab people of Palestine will win genuine national self-determination in a way beneficial to the liberation struggle in our region and the future of the Palestinian movement. This invites a logical question about the forms in which self determination will eventually take place and its general principles.

We think it will take the form of establishing a Palestine state in the liberated areas. Afterwards the problem of its future relations with neighboring states: namely with Jordan, could be considered. In either case none but the PLO should be the lawful spokesman of the Palestinian movement, something which would make it possible to foil maneuvers aimed at distorting the people's will.

The rulers of Jordan should now declare the invalidity of the act of accession of the Palestinian territories which was promulgated against the free will of the Arab people of Palestine. This is first of all. Secondly, they must recognize the PLO as the sole legal representative of the Arab Palestinian people; thirdly, they must open negotiations with this organization to decide the nature of future relations between the two people – or the two states, after the Arab Palestinian people found its national independent state. In our opinion, the sooner the rulers of Jordan abandon their bankrupt methods of ruling and their servility to imperialism, the sooner these free negotiations would result in closer relations between the two peoples, both in form and in content.

The Jordanian rulers, however, are stepping up their subversive actions to the detriment of the genuine interests of the Arab people of Palestine. In these circumstances the Palestinian National Front in the occupied territories, as well as most guerrilla organizations, including El Fatah, have declared that any return of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to the rule of Hussein is out of the question.

Thus, as Jordan's rulers, prompted by purely selfish interests, persist in building their relations with the Palestinians on the old lines and as the Palestinian people aspires to establish an independent state, the Jordanian regime will have to bear the full responsibility for the resulting division.

The rise of an independent Palestinian state, if it came about, would lead to bitter resistance on the part of imperialist and Zionist quarters and the Arab reactionaries of neighbor countries. This would objectively encourage the choice of an orientation towards progressive Palestinian national forces – the Arab liberation movement and the progressive regimes of the area on the regional scale, and the world socialist system, primarily the Soviet Union, on the international scale. This state should become the exponent of the revolutionary aspirations of the Palestinian masses.

Such an independent Palestinian state, which would make common cause with the Arab liberation movement against imperialism, Zionism and reaction would set an inspiring example for the Jordanian people in freeing the country from imperialist influence and in upholding democratic rights and freedoms and the policy of laying the foundations for economic independence. Such a state could become the mainstay of the Jordanian people in its just struggle against the reactionary regime. Furthermore, it would have to provide the prerequisites of achieving unity of our two peoples, which have together shed their blood in battles against imperialism, Zionism and government terror. Hence it is safe to

presume that this unity would be brought about through secession, with a view of achieving a qualitatively new unity based on the principles of freedom, genuine equality and anti-imperialism. The record of the mutual struggle of the Palestinian and Jordanian peoples and their common aims offer a firm basis for furthering their brotherly relations regardless of the shape of their formal ties.

As for us, Jordanian Communists, we have fought for tens of years with self-denial for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, for a just solution of the Palestinian problem. We take pride in our attitude of responsibility and sincerity to the problem. And we shall continue the struggle for the full and unconditional restoration of the legitimate rights of the Arab Palestinian people.

1. In 1936 the Palestinian Arabs staged a strike which lasted a full six months and was the longest national strike in history.

2. During the British mandate, the movement's leadership was mainly in the hands of members of the large landowning families and the upper crust of the national bourgeoisie.

3. It envisaged termination of the British mandate and the establishment in Palestine of two democratic states – one Arab and the other Jewish.

4. In the October 1973 war alone nearly a thousand Palestinian guerrillas (fedayeen) fell in battle. This was announced at the November 1973 Congress of the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party by its Chairman, K. Jumblat.

5. A Palestine National Congress in Jerusalem on May 28, 1964, announced the founding of the PLO and adopted the Palestine National Charter.

6. Head of the PLO until 1967.

7. See N. Ashhab. 'To Overcome the Crisis of the Palestine Resistance Movement,' *WMR*, May 1972.

8. An airliner with passengers on board was set on fire.

9. See N. Ashhab, M. Osman, A. Haba. 'The Arab Front in the Middle East Conflict,' *WMR*, January 1974.

10. See K. Mroue, 'The Arab National-Liberation Movement,' *WMR*, February 1973.

11. On December 1, 1948, the Jordanian regime got together in Jericho a convocation of opportunists, time-servers and mercenaries who had gained notoriety by their willingness to serve the British. The participants included such men as Muhammad Ali Jaahari, the incumbent head of the Hebron municipality who today is zealously and faithfully serving the new, Israeli, occupation authorities. The contemptible gathering was dubbed the 'Palestine Congress' and ordered to recognize King Abdullah as monarch of the West Bank instead of holding a free, democratic referendum.

Call for solidarity

At the end of last year a delegation of the Argentine Anti-Imperialist Movement of Latin American Solidarity (MAASLA) was visiting in Prague at the invitation of the Czechoslovak Committee for Solidarity with Asia, Africa and Latin America. At the request of **WMR's** Latin American Commission the delegation members, MAASLA co-chairmen Dr. Juan Azcoaga and Dr. Rafael Marino, MP (Intransigent Party) and executive secretary Manuel Berguier visited our editorial offices and spoke of the movement, which expresses the democratic traditions of the Argentine people.

The Movimiento Argentino Antiimperialista de Solidad Latinoamericana was launched in May 1972, and organizationally constituted at its inaugural assembly the following October. The Declaration adopted by it provides a broad basis for the unity of Argentina's anti-imperialist forces – political, trade union, women's, youth, cultural and other public organizations, people of the most diverse views and faiths, all of which makes for the movement's mass character and impact on political life in Argentina and the continent as a whole. MAASLA, the Declaration stresses, 'has been born of the historic neccessity of strengthening the fraternal ties between the Argentine and other fighting Latin American peoples.'

Latin Americans, said Dr. Azcoaga, have a common enemy in imperialism. This was pointed out back in the last century by the Cuban patriot Jose Marti, who with great foresight predicted the second liberation of Latin America. The existence of a common enemy accounts for the common features in the peoples' struggle, though each country moves towards independence in different ways in accord with its economic, social, political and cultural peculiarities.

The movement's main purpose is solidarity with the patriots fighting imperialism. We lift our voice in defense of people persecuted by reactionary regimes, we demand an end to killings, the restoration of human rights, and freedom for jailed political and public figures. We do this without prejudice or bias with regard to the ways of struggle they have chosen. This policy has proven to be correct, making understanding possible between various national anti-imperialist movements.

MAASLA supports the Cuban people's struggle, spreads the truth about the liberation processes in Peru, Panama and Ecuador and acquaints the masses with the achievements of anti-imperialist movements in Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Mexico, Venezuela and all other Latin American countries. Finally, MAASLA explains to the Argentine public the specific purport of imperialist action in the economic, political and cultural spheres, its role in suppressing the struggle of Latin American patriots.

We seek fraternal ties with other national detachments in the struggle against imperialism. MAASLA took part in the historic World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, Dr. Azcoaga went on, where it met with patriots from South and Central America. During talks with them the idea was voiced of calling a consultative conference of representatives of the national-liberation movements of our countries. We shall give our all-out support to such a meeting. The methods and forms of activity employed by MAASLA were explained by Dr. Manuel Berguier. The movement's governing council, he said, puts out a newspaper, *Voz Latinoamericana*, publishes books and pamphlets on Latin American problems and prints leaflets and posters devoted to the major events of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Prominent scientists, publicists and political figures give lectures, take part in debates and acquaint the Argentine public with current events and issues.

The main form of MAASLA activity is sponsoring of mass campaigns and active public mobilization. Its first mass action was a meeting of solidarity with the people and Popular Government of Chile in September 1972, in which a broad spectrum of Argentine political and public circles took part. It issued a declaration and launched a drive to spread information about the achievements of the Popular Unity government.

Last May a mass rally demanded the immediate restoration of diplomatic relations with Cuba. It was a powerful demonstration of solidarity with the Cuban people. In July MAASLA sponsored several actions in defense of Paraguayan political prisoners. A meeting attended by MP's and public figures back from a recent visit to Paraguay was held in the main auditorium of the National University's Law School. It sparked a nationwide demand of freedom for all Paraguayan patriots, especially Antonio Maidana, Alfredo Alcorta and Julio Rojas, who have been behind bars for 15 years.

Similar campaigns are also being conducted for an end to repressions in Bolivia, Brazil and other countries, notably for the freedom of leaders of the Broad Front and progressive political parties in Uruguay. A new high in many forms of activity was reached after the fascist coup in Chile, and this too was a contribution to the continental anti-imperialist struggle.

Dr. Rafael Marino spoke of the solidarity with the Chilean people. When the military coup took place in that fraternal country, he said, the Argentine Parliament's Chamber of Deputies unanimously denounced it. A group of deputies from parties affiliated with MAASLA moved that a delegation be sent to Chile, despite the risks involved. It included Cominguez (Communist Party), Gaz Natali and A. Guerrero (Civil Radical Union), and myself for the Intransigent Party.

We left for Santiago in the morning of October 14, having cabled the junta that a group of MP's was coming to investigate the plight of Argentinians and other nationals who had sought refuge in the Argentine embassy – 584 persons in all, men, women and children – more than in any other embassy. Those who were able to gain refuge in the embassy will always remember the terrible picture they witnessed: hands, many hands clutching the top of the wall surrounding the embassy grounds. Hands, which slowly loosened their grip after a burst of machine-gun fire . . .

In two days of work we drew up the most complete list in Argentina of detainees at the National Stadium and people who had found shelter in foreign embassies or refuge (frequently illusory) with the help of the United Nations or International Red Cross, as well as a list of more than 40 missing Argentinians.

In the morning of October 17 an officer of the Carabineers called to tell us that General Bonilla, the junta's internal affairs minister,

was expecting us. We arrived at the appointed time. After the initial formalities the minister inquired which of us was the Communist MP. Comrade Cominguez introduced himself, and the minister of the fascist junta was forced to play host to the representative of a Marxist party along with the other members of the delegation.

We asked permission to visit the National Stadium. The minister promised we could, and gave instructions to a colonel. But the next day the colonel informed us of a junta decision: as military tribunal sentences are secret, we would not be allowed to visit the stadium. We then asked permission to visit the detainees on Dawson Island, stressing the inhumanity of holding people in such harsh climatic conditions, dooming them to disease and death. This request was also turned down.

The trip was useful, however, and 220 refugees were soon brought into Argentina. The campaign of Argentine public opinion for the restoration of human rights in Chile continues.

The MAASLA Declaration stresses that it 'is being set up to promote solidarity with the victims of Latin American dictatorships, expose various forms of oppression of our countries by Yankee imperialism, and coordinate and strengthen support for those Latin American republics which have got rid, or are getting rid of imperialist domination.'

Almost two years have passed since MAASLA was launched, and the movement is gaining in strength and influence.

Sources of the housing crisis

Piero Della Seta
Municipal Counsellor,
Member Economic Section,
Italian CP

GROUND-RENT RISING IN CITIES OF COMMON MARKET COUNTRIES

Ground-rent has gone up in the Common Market countries, especially in the towns, resulting in steep prices on real estate, a housing and town-planning crisis, and still greater investments in house-building by the big financial interests.

The whole thing is certainly no novelty – it is part of the very process of capitalist production and the system of privately-owned land. Recall the speculation sparked by Prefect Haussmann's grand project of 'reconstructing' Paris in the middle of the past century,

or Marx's description of the 1850 London building boom in Volumes 2 and 3 of *Capital*. It gives you the feeling that the thing is happening today, before your eyes.

The importance of the rent question is evidenced by the fact that of late various political forces in Europe (the Communist parties and Marxist research groups, the Labor Party in Britain and the Social-Democratic Party in Germany) have devoted much attention to it.

At Labor Party conferences the matter held the limelight in the past two years. In 1972 it was the central topic of Harold Wilson's report. Real estate, he said, was one of the main objects of nationalization, and proposed a government body to control urban development areas, the big real estate companies, and construction financing. The building industry's problems were also central in the recent elections to the Greater London Council, with the result that Labor and Left forces took over the city's government after a five-year Conservative reign. The 1973 congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, too, examined the question of 'new zoning for building land.'

In May 1973, the Paris Marxist Research Center sponsored a symposium, 'Monopoly and Democratic Urbanism,' devoted to the problems of the French capital. In Italy, the democratic forces have been discussing rent curbs and urban land-use legislation for practically 20 years. And after the fall of the right-center government, the discussion has erupted anew.

A few facts to illustrate the dimensions of the problem in Common Market countries. In the past two years, says the Labor Party's Program for Great Britain adopted in 1973, land prices have risen to fantastic proportions. On the average for the country, according to official estimates, they went up 60 per cent in 1972 alone. The average per acre price within a 20-mile radius from the center of London was approximately £40,000 in 1969-1970, £69,540 in 1971, and £121,000 in 1972 – a weekly increase of £250. About one-third of the price of a new house was for the land it stood on in 1971, while recently a lot of three-quarters of an acre in the central part of London went for £1,000,000.

'In France,' says the French Marxist journal *Economie et politique* in its January 1972 issue, 'land prices in rural areas went up 6.5-fold on average in the 19 years between 1950 and 1969 – from 1,100 francs per hectare to 7,500. But considering the devaluation, the rise really was 2.6-fold. During the same period real estate prices in towns, especially the capital, went up much more steeply.' To be sure, land prices in France are much lower than in other European countries. *Le Monde* of September 11, 1973, gives the following figures: in 1970, a hectare of land in rural areas cost 8,000 francs in France, against 13,200 in Holland, 19,800 in Belgium, and 39,000 in West Germany.

In Italy, the latest estimates show, approximately 1,000 billion liras, a quarter of what is invested in construction, including the

cost of land, is annually reclaimed in rent, while the value of land suitable for building equals half the nation's gross national income. However, in Italy ground-rent has always held an exclusive place as an economic category still largely associated with the figure of the absentee landlord. This may be explained by the peculiar origins of the industrial revolution, which began later in Italy than in other countries of capitalist Europe and involved compromises resulting from the alliance of the biggest and most powerful industrial groups with the latifundists of the South. In other European capitalist countries, the steep rent increases are a thing of the *present,* and chiefly due to direct interference by finance capital (though in present-day Italy, too, fiinancial groups play a dominant role in the process).

What are the reasons for the rising ground-rent? Certainly, reasons of a political order are fairly weighty. In nearly all the countries mentioned the recent period has been one of political retrogression, accompanied by a 'liberalization' of house-building and land legislation. In France, for example, the Gaullist regime promoted participation of banking capital in the building industry; in Britain, the Conservatives repealed the town-plannng legislation of their Labor predecessors the instant they were returned to power; in Italy, the Andreotti government attacked the housing reform bill, and in West Germany the government, though Social-Democratic, clung to 'liberal' economic practices and doctrines.

But we are more concerned with the structural reasons for higher rents. Unquestionably, one of the main reasons is the inflation that has been running at an ever higher rate in the Common Market countries in the past several years, and also in the United States and Japan. Many scholars consider it natural and implicit in the nature of the capitalist production system, from which it follows that the spiralling cost of land is not a temporary phenomenon that will sooner or later abate (it can disappear only with the disappearance of private land ownership). Land has been the classical piggy-bank, an object of speculative rather than real income-yielding investment, since the beginning of the capitalist era. 'It is the ground-rent, and not the house, which forms the actual object of building speculation in rapidly growing cities,' wrote Marx (*Capital,* Vol. 3, Ch. 46), and these days, too, most investors are not particularly upset if their buildings stand empty and yield no income, for they know that they will ultimately receive a sum in hard cash – far in excess of their original investment.

True at all times, this is doubly true in a period of rapid money devaluation such as now, when in the first ten months of 1973, that is, before the energy crisis, the devaluation rate ranged from 6 per cent in Luxembourg to 11-12 per cent in Italy. In the absence of effective regulation, the situation objectively encourages speculative investment in real estate, resulting in continuously rising house rents, an alternation of building booms and recessions, and housing crises while dwellings go up in large numbers.

Discussing the sudden crisis of the big building companies in the FRG in its July 16, 1973, issue, the West-German *Spiegel* pointed out that out of some 15,000 homes recently built by private firms in Munich as many as 8,300 could not be sold, 'while throughout the republic thousands of people with fixed income are registered as needing housing,' in Frankfurt 4,000 to 6,000 unoccupied flats, in Duesseldorf 1,200 and about 2,000 in Hamburg. And despite the chronic and truly dramatic shortage of cheap housing in Italy, rooms stand empty in immense numbers – 2,300,000 in 1951, and 7,400,000 at the end of 1971, tripling in a matter of 20 years.

In an article entitled 'The Groundwork of the Inflation,' *Le Monde* of January 18, 1973, dealt with the continuously growing investments in real estate: ever more distinctly the big financial interests are taking over; for them manipulation of real estate has become a preferred field.

British groups, especially active since Britain's entry into the Common Market, are among the most assiduous on the continent. By April 1973, for example, the big British insurance companies had more than £2,000 million in real estate. Abbey Life Assurance alone held property estimated in May 1972 at £180 million or equivalent to half its total assets, and announced plans of investing at least another fifth of its capital in Belgium, Holland, the FRG and France to capitalize on the exchange rate. Ragian Property Ltd. has recently gone into partnership with Guarantie Foncière, a French firm involved in the financial scandals of 1971 that erupted in the shade of the Gaullist regime.

British real estate investments in Europe are assessed at £500 million, including £300 million in France and £125 million in Belgium. In Paris alone they add up to £25 million.

Capitalist groups other than British are also active on the continent, shifting their sphere of operations to profit from rising ground-rents. The Hollywood firm of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, for example, is said to have folded as a film producer and gone into real estate, particularly building and maintenance of luxury villas and hotel-casinos. Meanwhile, its 44 film distribution branches in the USA and abroad and 33 filming parvilions have been put up for sale. One of the giants of the Italian cotton industry, Rossari e Varzo, has also decided to go into real estate, and the well-known veteran in the field, Generale Immobiliare, the Italo-American-Vatican society, has managed to double its capital.

Though a catalyst, the inflation should not be regarded as the one and only cause of the spiralling rents. There are others, such as the rapidly shrinking number of unoccupied lots suitable for urban construction and the fact that their ownership is concentrated in the hands of an ever smaller number of proprietors.

The growth of the urban population associated with the industrial revolution began in the past century and continues at an ever rising rate. Assuming that a population of 20,000 is the minimum for a modern town, we shall find that more than half the people

in economically developed countries are resident in urban areas, with more than half of their number in big cities of over a million inhabitants. But still more eloquent is the fact that the mammoth cities with seven and more million people, such as New York, Tokyo, Paris, Moscow, Calcutta and Buenos Aires, are growing at twice the rate of lesser cities. And we may safely assume that by the year 2000 more than 80 per cent of the population in the economically-developed countries will be concentrated in urban areas.

This process, virtually identical in capitalist and socialist society, objectively creates a land shortage in cities. But whereas the socialist system, which has abolished private land-ownership, can plan the use of land on a long-term basis and according to social needs, those countries where the land is still in private hands encounter considerable difficulties.

Rent is on the rise in all cities, but its growth is truly dramatic in the biggest cities, especially in capitals, due to the increasing concentration of finance in the capitalist world. The concentraton of economic power in the hands of giant companies and groups, the emergence of major multinational companies after World War II and the expansion of the technical, bureaucratic and banking apparatus needed for servicing these complexes lead to the clustering of new managing centers in an ever more limited area. Under capitalism, the result is a crisis in almost every capital. The housing crisis is particularly acute. Land and house prices are soaring and the 'old' inhabitants are rapidly forced out of central districts where new activities requiring new premises are developing. It is above all in this sphere that big financial capital and real estate agents engage in speculation.

Speakers at the conference of the Center of Marxist Studies and Research mentioned earlier stressed that the problems of Paris should not be seen as an outgrowth of 'post-industrial society' but as a distinctive product of capitalist society, which can no longer control the productive forces operating in it. The French press complains that 'if the present trend in land prices persists, 50 years hence the price will amount to 80 per cent of the cost of net construction instead of today's 25 per cent. The possibility of real estate owners enriching themselves to this extent – due primarily to urbanization paid for by society – would eventually give rise to cities whose centers would be made up of office skyscrapers and sumptuous dwelling houses (the only buildings worth putting up in view of the high cost of land) while the outskirts would be taken up by hovels.' Even the bourgeois press is compelled to admit that restricting private property is the primary requisite of a sound policy of planned urban development.

As for Britain, let us turn again to the 1973 Labor Party program. In big cities, it notes, there is a mounting process of selective eviction. Real estate prices have been rising so fast that a growing number of relatively young members of the middle strata of labor and skilled workers prefer to move to suburbs and even more distant areas in search of housing at suitable rent.

Those who stay are either rich enough to pay a higher rent or too poor to move. Since the 1972 Labor program was published, the problem of housing and housing construction has been gaining in acuteness. In 1972 the amount of housing built in Britain was the smallest since the Tory take-over, construction declining most where the shortage was greatest. At the same time, house prices skyrocketed: while in 1970 mortgage payment for an average flat amounted to £36.65 per month; late in 1972 as much as £65.87 was charged for a similar flat. Undoubtedy, the Labor Party program says, something is wrong here and should be put right, since in a city like London there are areas of office buildings where 10 million square feet of space is vacant while over 100,000 families have applied to the municipal authorities for housing. This is also true of Rome, Milan, Bonn and other West European cities.

However, the above is not solely the result of the 'free and spontaneous play' of economic interests. This situation is upheld and all but programmed by the governments concerned, which try to concentrate their agencies and to supervise and control accumulation mechanisms that have become supranational. A case in point is Paris where a new 'financial center' is to be set up. The plan is an object of heated arguments in political quarters and among the general public. France's financial oligarchs have long coveted the central area of the capital. It is estimated that 67 per cent of the French insurance societies today are situated within one kilometre around Place Adrien-Houdin (at the crossing of Boulevard Haussmann and Rue Taitbout). The banks prefer the Opera area, where they have 30 per cent of their head offices and 50 per cent of their personnel within a range of 500 metres. But even this, apparently, is not the limit. In January 1971, 36 banks and insurance companies, some of them nationalized, formed an initiative group called the 'Financial Center of Paris' which declared according to *Le Monde* (April 11, 1973) that 'the financial market of the capital is in danger owing to strong competition from nearby markets (London, Frankfurt, Zurich and even Brussels) and that it must therefore be reconstructed without delay. On these grounds, the group insists that the authorities relax controls over urban development or, in other words, depart from regulations regarding density and maximum height and the distribution of new offices in the center.'

In July 1972 Giscard d'Estaing, the French Minister of the Economy and Finance, acquainted the government with the blueprints of the new business center. Various financial headquarters are to be allotted another 520,000 to 620,000 square metres in the heart of the city to make the French capital the premier financial market of Europe equal to London and capable of competing with Milan, Zurich and Frankfurt. Financial power, the Minister said, is unthinkable without marked geographic concentration within a capital (*Le Monde*, October 30 1972).

Rome is in much the same situation. A provision for setting up a new, 1,100-hectare management district in the municipal area

was included in the general urban development plan adopted in 1965. The buildings to be erected in the district will have 29.5 million cubic metres of spaces, which equals 330,000 offices. In the Milan area, the authorities in 1967 planned to build in the San Dona commune adjoining Milan (20,000 inhabitants) a management center comprising 30,000 offices. The buildings alone will cost 150 billion to 250 million lire. Recently the London Stock Exchange moved into a skyscraper near the Bank of England, with the result that the Stock Exchange offices operating in the United Kingdom came to be housed in eight buildings instead of the earlier 21. The upsurge in speculative deals which these transfers led to is easy to imagine.

We have already mentioned certain solutions to the problem of urban rent proposed by political forces and the Common Market press. In Italy, this problem has been worked out fairly well, both theoretically and politically, and the campaign around it has assumed the character of a mass movement. Ever since the early 50s, the ICP has been fighting against rent speculation, taking common action with other Left-wing and radical forces. The Party regards this campaign as a key task whose solution is a requisite of reversing the trend of the national economy by encouraging social consumption rather than excessive individual consumption, and of relieving the country's production machinery of the back-breaking burden which it has to bear because much of the national income is swallowed by parasitic rent.

The Party is active above all in local government bodies responsible for planning urban development and in the regional government agencies set up two years ago to control construction and territorial planning, a function which earlier was performed by national agencies. Furthermore, this activity involves the trade union movement and various mass organizations formed to uphold the interests of tenants and of working people looking for cheap housing.

In 1971 parliament passed a housing reform law empowering local self-government bodies to take over up to 60 per cent of the area earmarked for urban development and make it available to various organizations or private individuals under definite contracts stipulating the terms of tenure and the amount of compensation for real estate built. The law went much further than earlier legislation, based chiefly on taxation forms and mechanisms through which the state strove to take back at least part of the steeply mounting rent. However, even this law is a half-measure since it does not cover the entire area of urban development. Besides, the political retrogression in Italy which set in after 1971 and culminated in the formation of a Center-Right government prevented the full enforcement of the housing law.

Now that the political situation in the country has changed, the campaign has been resumed with fresh vigor.

To confine ourselves to 1973, here are a few fundamental facts:

the nationwide action of 200,000 building workers 'for homes and social control of housing construction' in Rome on April 14, sponsored by three trade union centers (CGIL, CISL and IUL); the demonstration held in Rome as the most important expression of working people's struggles in the South for a policy protecting and rehabilitating the areas hit by floods in January 1973; numerous regional and national demonstrations organized by the Unitary National Trade Union of Tenants; the 'housing dispute' begun last November by the Federation of three building workers' unions, which wants the government to enforce the 1971 law and invest state capital in construction, especially in the South.

At the end of a debate late in November 1973, parliament instructed the government to submit to both chambers the draft of an urban development reform law to be passed within the next two years. The proposals which the Communists are discussing with other Leftists and democrats are aimed at establishing a *single system of urban land development* based on *separation of the right to build (jus aedificandi) from land ownership* and substantially restricting rent formation. The right to build would go to local government bodies (communes and regions), which would *grant* it to anyone who wished to exercise it, stipulating the terms and length of tenure and specifying the prices of buildings put up. Every aspect of planning, building policy and control of the right to build would be entirely under the jurisdiction of communal and regional democratic assemblies.

Outlines of the new way

Vladimir Shundeyev

At the invitation of the Democratic Party of Guinea and the Congolese Party of Labor our correspondent visited the Guinean Republic and the People's Republic of Congo. Below is the second instalment of his round-up of talks and interviews with Party leaders, statesmen and public figures of the two countries. The first instalment appeared in the March issue of WMR.

In the People's Republic of Congo people speak of 100 years of anti-colonial struggle and of 10 years of revolution – the national, democratic, people's revolution. The Congolese Party of Labor (CPL), the country's ruling and only party, was founded four years ago.

Congo and Guinea have much in common: both follow a consistent anti-imperialist policy, are working to unite the nation around that policy, overcome the difficulties of building up a national

economy, weakness of the state sector, inadequate investment funds, currency disarray, high prices, a large share of the population living by subsistence farming, etc. But there are important differences. The two countries, and particularly the two parties, began their development at different times. Their leaderships subscribe to different economic development strategies. In Guinea, for instance, foreign assets were nationalized in the early years of independence, while in the Congo the state sector is being built up mainly through new construction, and nationalization has not assumed appreciable proportions. Guinea's per-capita national income is small whereas Congo, according to UN statistics, ranks with the top 10 African states. Lastly, unlike Guinea's mass Democratic Party, the Congolese Party of Labor is so far a small vanguard party, its program and activities based on scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism.

One's first impressions reflect all this. As the ferry from Kinshasa to Brazzaville crosses the Congo River and, ploughing through a green-and-white carpet of floating flowers, makes fast at the landing stage, what immediately catches the eye in the Congolese capital are billboards with such familiar names in the capitalist world as Shell, Citroen, Kodak, Texaco, Renault, Volkswagen, Olivetti, Sony. There are attractive shops and well-stocked department stores, with a supermarket under construction. But everywhere one feels the dominance of foreign capital.

The experience of social transformations suggests that an important prerequisite for building the material and technical basis of the new society in countries that have chosen the socialist orientation is nationalization of foreign companies, giving the state control of entire branches of the economy.

In this respect Congo's experience is in a class by itself. How does the Party justify the path it has chosen? What are its underlying theoretical principles?

Here is the explanation I was given by *Christophe Moukoueke, the Party's propaganda secretary:*

'This is a delicate question and for us it has practical rather than theoretical implications. Our Party program says: "At the stage of the national, democratic and people's revolution, the Congolese Pary of Labor has as its priority aim economic independence, to be followed in the next stage by socialization of the basic means of production." We know that a number of African countries began nationalizing foreign assets as soon as they won political independence. Lacking an economic base and management knowhow, many of them were faced with formidable difficulties. When we performed our revolution in August 1963, we felt that we were not yet prepared for nationalization. Lenin's words, addressed to economic managers of the Soviet Republic in its difficult early years, when it had to enlist foreign capital and grant concessions to help build up the socialist economy, fully apply to us. Lenin said at that time: "You will have capitalists beside you, including foreign capitalists, concessionaires and lease-holders. They will squeeze

profits out of you amounting to hundreds per cent; they will enrich themselves, operating alongside of you. Let them. Meanwhile you will learn from them the business of running the economy. . . ." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 71-72).

'Now there is a differentiated approach to national and foreign private capital. We encourage the former, so that it can help the Party in the fight for economic independence. As for the latter, the policy is gradual elimination, for it is the source of the main contradiction of Congolese society, that between the people and foreign, chiefly French, monopoly capitalism.* So far, however, we often have to work in contact with French capitalists who, incidentally, have proved adroit in adapting to our economic needs. In fact, of late they have suggested forming mixed companies, and we agreed to that with the proviso, of course, that we hold a controlling interest.

'There is not enough investment capital. That largely explains the rather peculiar orientation of Party economic policy. We must convince the people that the path chosen is the correct one. After all, people must live and eat while making revolution. Besides, bourgeois and racist propaganda is trying to instil the idea that Black Africa cannot build socialism. The imperialists are increasing investments in capital-oriented African countries to prove that capitalism is the only way.

'A recent Central Committee decision is designed to set things right in the state sector, give it sounder leadership and more competent personnel. We have been sending people to work there without in many cases even defining their functions. That was a mistake, and it has had ruinous results. "Instead of adding to state revenue," Marien Ngouabi, Chairman of the Party's Central Committee, said in one of his speeches, "state enterprises have been adding to the budgetary deficit we inherited from the past." The fault is not with the enterprises, but with lack of managerial experience. . . . One example: at a time when state-owned enterprises find the going hard, one of them, the post office, has been spending 33 million francs a year on staff bonuses. . . . That money would suffice for three new post offices to serve the people.'

The Party has declared war on sabotage and corruption, laxity and irresponsibility among managerial personnel. All state institutions have been instructed to apply the principle adopted by the fourth Trade Union Congress: 'He who does not work, neither shall he be paid.'

In the light of all these facts one can appreciate the Party's efforts, begun late in 1973, to cut administrative expenditure and economize wherever possible. For instance, expense accounts have been cut, office cars abolished, no more 'thirteenth month' salary for top-ranking officials, and all this is coupled with stringent control of how public money is used.

'In examining these and all other questions of the Congolese

*Imports and sale of oil products have now been nationalized and transferred to a new state company, Hydro-Congo. – *Ed.*

revolution,' Christophe Moukoueke said, 'it is important to keep in mind that our Party is still very young. The decisive organizing force of the 1963 revolution was not the Party, but the trade unions. But even they were weak, some under Catholic influence, others avowedly oriented on France, etc. Little surprise, then, that the question is still being debated of whether the objective and subjective conditions for revolution were ripe. The main thing is that the masses supported the revolution. But the masses were not organized, had no leading core, no adequate understanding of the revolution's aims. For that matter, the revolutionaries themselves – with only Congo's experience or that of the French Left to guide them – were sorely in need of organization. It was in this situation that the National Revolutionary Movement was founded in 1964. It brought together elements of diverse orientation, and this political heterogeneity soon made itself felt. From the very outset, its leader, Noumazalay, sought to isolate the progressive elements. This precipitated a crisis. The more consistent revolutionary groups were aware of the need for a more clear-cut organization. The National Council of the Revolution was formed with Captain Marien Ngouabi as its leader. It united three viable elements: civilian revolutionaries, the 'civil defense' group (made up of ex-servicemen) and progressive elements within the army. It set out to create a new political structure and founded a new Party: the Congolese Party of Labor was founded at a constituent Congress in December 1969.

Its path has been a tortuous one. Drawing up an ideological platform proved a difficult job. There were still tribal traditions to reckon with and the discord they generated within the Party. In March 1970 there was the abortive counter-revolutionary coup led by Lieutenant Kinganga, a man closely linked with reactionary elements in Kinshasa and supported by the gendarmerie and other elements within the country. The Party Emergency Congress in March-April 1970 took measures to strengthen the revolution. One of them was to disband the gendarmerie and transfer all its functions to the army. Unrest among students and school pupils, obviously instigated, broke out in November 1971. In February 1972 there was another attempted coup, this time led by Lieutenant Diawara, a member of the Party leadership. This came as an especially heavy blow, for many Party members were involved, and after the putsch was suppressed only 18 of the 50 Central Committee members remained true to the Party. It took much effort to explain to the people what had happened. The Party began a nationwide campaign, culminating in a national conference in July 1972 of representatives from all sections of the people. The Party engaged in self-criticism and heeded the criticism of the masses. 'A clash at the top' is how Party Chairman Ngouabi described it. 'The leading core of the Congolese Party of Labor was but a heterogeneous group, or a collection of groups, widely differing in their views and subscribing to socialism only in words. . . . The Central Committee was at the mercy of these groups and was not an effective revolutionary vanguard.'

It was only at the July 1972 Conference that, in effect, the Party was accepted as the country's leading force. The Special Party Congress (December 1972) called for strengthening the Party and its organizations to create a viable structure. Members of the Central Committee elected by Congress toured the country to set up local government bodies and enrol new members.

'Of course a Party is judged not by its slogans but by its achievements,' Moukoueke remarked. 'And these are modest indeed: for three years there was no program; it was approved only in December 1973. We decided to disband the police and replace it by a security force. The first elections to the National Assembly and local government were held only in June 1973. The Constitution was approved by a national referendum. In short, we are only just beginning to put into practice the Party Program, are not satisfied with the results to date, but have sorted things out and can move ahead.'

The most pleasant and impressive sight in Brazzaville, as in Guinea, are the schoolchildren. Strong, sturdy, neatly dressed, they seem to dominate the city. One gets the impression that the country has a long-standing intellectual tradition, a deeply-rooted urge for knowledge. Everywhere you see people reading, in the daytime sitting on doorsteps or on the grass, in the evenings, under the street lamps. Lectures on the revolutionary movement and theoretical seminars are held daily in the Town Hall and there is always a full audience. Similar lectures over the radio are very popular, too, especially among the youth. Listener groups are formed, and I was told that the lectures have a sizable audience in neighboring Zaire, Cameroon, Gabon and Chad. The next radio-lecture series will be on the theory and practice of building socialism.

This is what I was told by *Martin Mberi, education secretary of the Party Central Committee.* 'There is a historical background to the problems we have to solve. The French colonialists made the Congo a training center of administrative personnel for the whole of Equatorial Africa. That explains why we have a fairly developed system of primary and civil service education. You can say that we took over a good inheritance when we won liberation. Of course, all education was biased, the French were concerned only for training clerks. There was only one technical school, and it specialized in training stonemasons. Civil servants were educated in the spirit of disdain for everything technical and abhorred manual work. After independence, the white civil servants were replaced by black, but the old psychology, the ingrained prejudices of the colonial days, persisted.

'By the 40s the bulk of the population could read and write. There were primary schools in the rural areas, secondary schools in the towns and a university in the capital. Our job was to extend the system and change its character. Today virtually all children attend school. The Party Program clause on eliminating illiteracy among the adult population should be understood as eliminating "job illiteracy," that is, teaching people more arithmetic, giving

them a better idea of their job, a better understanding of the changing world they live in, and a higher sense of civic duty.

'There is also the problem of what to do with specialist personnel: increase employment in the civil service to provide jobs for all trainees or leave some unemployed. Obviously, in our underdeveloped economy there are more specialists than we can use. Yet we will be opening technical schools, even though we realize the difficulties new personnel may have in finding satisfactory application of their knowledge in our economic structure.

'The important thing, however, is that we are fully aware of the situation. Education has been nationalized and secularized. In 1970 the Party adopted a program defining the aims of primary and secondary schools. The ideological aim is to cultivate a national consciousness and root out survivals of the colonial mentality. The socialist aim is to give the pupils an understanding of imperialist exploitation and, in a more practical aspect, bridge the gap between their education and the requirements of society.

'The Party education system, too, has to be seen against our peculiar background. Unlike some other countries of former French Africa (Senegal and Guinea, for example) where a kind of revolutionary elite began to take shape at a relatively early stage, the progressive, anti-imperialist ideology in Congo took definite form only at the close of the 50s. Our first organized party, the National Revolutionary Movement, was a pretty motley affair, made up of underground movement activists of the colonial days, with all the vacillations and ideological differences that were part of that movement. And up to a short while ago debate and controversy, confrontation of views with little attempt to work out a common line, were characteristic of ideological work.

'It is only against this background that one can really appreciate our victory in making Marxism-Leninism the underlying ideology of the Congolese Party of Labor. True, Party education exists more in plans than in practical reality, but we are giving it all our attention and valuable assistance is coming from friendly socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union. We have started a Party school, so far confined to three types of short-term courses. All Party members have gone through a week's course in the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. The next course will be taken by members of parliament. Later on we intend to run a six-month course and a regular three-year school with diplomas issued to graduates. The fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism – political economy, philosophy and law – are taught at the university and the National Administrative School.'

Central to all Party work today is increasing the membership, firming the organizational structure and expanding links with the masses. 'Organizational work is today the very heart of the Party,' *Central Committee Organization Secretary Emile Bongouande* said, 'and it is only natural that Party building was the main question at the October 1973 Central Committee plenum. It worked out a new leadership structure: a five-member Political Bureau headed

by the Party Chairman, a standing Secretariat headed by a Political Bureau member, and a permanent CC Secretary. The Central Committee has four departments, on international relations, education, organization and propaganda, each headed by a CC Secretary, and two Commissions, on the army and on planning, likewise headed by CC Secretaries, and besides there is the Party Control Commission. The Central Committee appointed 10 of its members political commissars to supervise work at provincial and district level, set up local party branches and bring new people into the Party.'

'The Congolese Party of Labor,' its program says, 'must become the class Party and vanguard of the Congolese working class.' So far it has a small membership, is stringent in admitting new members and in no hurry to do so, though it has thousands of applications on file. It therefore devotes special attention to work in the mass organzations, those 'parallel Party organs.'

When I arrived for my first meeting with *Anatole Kondo, General Secretary of the Congolese Trade Union Federation,* I found him sitting behind a huge desk looking at a copy of *Trud,* the Moscow trade union daily and trying to overcome the language barrier – it had an interview with him taken during the World Trade Union Conference in Varna. The Congolese trade unions are eager to expand international ties and learn from the experience of other countries. But, naturally, their chief concern is how to boost job discipline, raise productivity, help to build up the economy and achieve the Party's aims.

The trade union slogans of the 'Decisive Three' and the 'Three C's' have taken hold. They were endorsed by the last Party Central Committee Plenum. The 'Decisive Three' are the Party, the state and the trade unions, and the 'Three C's' are their joint leadership, joint responsibility and joint work in building up the economy.*

Still another pressing problem of Party work is the campaign against laxity and bureaucracy. The slogan now is: 'Seven hours of work, not seven hours at work,' and the trade unions have been effectively instrumental in carrying it out.

All adult women belong to the Revolutionary Women's Union of Congo, we were told by *Mane Panaty, Vice-President of its National Executive, and Amelia Néne, member of the Central Council and permanent organization secretary.* The union was founded in 1965 to advance women's social emancipation, eliminate illiteracy and enhance women's role in public life. The union is now a mass organization working under Party guidance, has branches in all provinces and districts, and groups in the villages. It also has closer international contacts, is affiliated to the International Democratic Women's Federation and maintains close contact with the Soviet Women's Committee.

On the desk of *J. Okabande, First Secretary, Congolese Socialist Youth League,* was a volume of Lenin's articles and on the walls were pennants of youth organizations of the socialist countries

*From the French 'cogestion,' 'coresponsabilité,' 'cooperation.'

and the Berlin Youth and Students' Festival. Central Committee members *Francois Onka and Christian Lambo,* and *Gervais Yoma* of the International Department, took part in our talk. The first thing I learned was that three-quarters of the League membership were now out helping organize local government in the rural areas. Our tasks are identical with those of the Party, the comrades emphasized, and the main thing now is to strengthen popular rule. (This is symbolized in the League's emblem: Hoe and Hammer, Pen and Gun on the background of a map of Congo). 'The youth is especially receptive to social change and we consider it our duty to convince adults, relatives, friends and acquaintances, of the correctness of the Party's policy, explain to them the aims of the Congolese revolution. The membership spans the age bracket from 16 to 30 years. The organization's main task is to rear cadres for the Party. Special attention is devoted to the Young Pioneer movement, which is in charge of a Commissioner General, the Organizational Secretary of the Central Committee. Incidenally, the Central Committee has no full-time officials – everyone is expected to work at a factory or office.'

'Strengthening the Party and its link with the masses,' *Permanent CC Secretary and Political Bureau member, Pierre Nze* said, 'will be the main question in all preparations for the Second Party Congress, to be held later this year, on the Party's fifth anniversary.

'The Congress will show that the Party has become stronger and bigger, with probably two thousand members and branches in the main administrative centers and the big industrial enterprises.

'The Congress will also be able to record closer national unity in democracy – a democratic state structure, election of all authorities, and an anti-colonialist state apparatus. (It might be noted that, to promote unity, the Party recently amnestied political prisoners, including some involved in anti-government plots.)

'Our painstaking work among the workers and peasants has brought results – socialism is taking hold in peoples' minds. But we cannot yet say that most of the population is involved in solving the Party's practical problems. Even today, in working to bring to reality one or another provision of our program, in some areas we encounter resistance from diverse sections of the population. And the Diawara putsch made it clear enough that not everything is well in the Party itself. There is still an ideological struggle in the mass organizations, among revolutionary activists, even among Party members, on practical issues, and many problems are decided in the course of discussion. We believe this is normal for such a young Party as ours.

'We can safely say that the tasks of each mass organization have now been clearly defined and the job is to give them a more active part in resolving the problems facing the Party and the country. That will have to be accomplished within the next two or three years.

'Living standards are still low and it will take at least four, even five, years to achieve a tangible improvement. This will require

an intensive effort and the overcoming of serious economic difficulties, particularly in planning. The fact is that we have no planning technique, nor mechanism, nor planning agency, nor even a planning policy. Policy is mapped out by the Party Central Committee. Apparently, we shall have to set up a planning mechanism, at first in conjunction with the Central Committee. Planning will probably be easier when People's Councils, the local government bodies, will be operating throughout the country. So far we have been conducting planning seminars and in March and April we will hold a ttheoretical conference on planning.

'And so, the Second Congress will firmly establish the Party and finalize its organizational structure. It will be a Congress of the mustering of our forces.

'Building socialism in Africa is not easy. There are few real Communists and the Communist and Workers' movement has not achieved much in Africa. Many leaders of the national liberation struggle have a very hazy idea of the future. But millions look for positive answers. Can we Marxist-Leninists ignore how our work is likely to influence other Africans? Can we simply draw on the experience accumulated in other African countries, Somalia, say, Guinea or Mali? Our Party is convinced that if it achieves its aims in the Congo, this will have a tremendous revolutionary impact on the whole of Africa where, we know, our experience is being closely followed, and that gives us fresh strength.'

Brazzaville-Prague

Lost stake in anti-Soviet game

Commentary

The whole thing could be a textbook example of how to engineer and conduct an anti-Soviet campaign.

Shortly before New Year's, *France-Presse* reported that 'The Gulag Archipelago,' a new book by Solzhenitsyn, had appeared in Paris, only in Russian for a start, but with French, German, English and Swedish translations scheduled soon. On the same day, *L'Express* (France), *Spiegel* (FRG), *The Observer* (Britain) and *Montreal Star* (Canada) synchronously devoted pages to passages from the book. And the *New York Times*, says Albert Kahn, the U.S. writer, gave it as much space as it probably would have given to nothing short of the outbreak of a third world war. Springer's *Welt am Sonntag* embellished its report with a photograph allegedly taken in a Soviet camp, showing prisoners chained to

wheelbarrows. In fact, the picture dates to tsarist times, the year 1907, depicting convicts on Sakhalin Island. There were other howlers. Though the papers appeared on the same day and in different countries, some of their formulations were word-perfect, betraying the haste to launch the campaign.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn's name has been exploited for quite some time in hostile activity against the Soviet Union. Burgeois propagandists capitalized on his writings, giving worldwide publicity to his written and oral statements telephoned or given at press conferences. Then came the time to make the final stake, the biggest of all. For this purpose, so the story goes, 'The Gulag Archipelago' had been kept in storage for many a year. . . . We shall yet go back to how this anti-Soviet campaign was mounted, but first a word about the man behind it – Solzhenitsyn, who was not averse, and did not hide it, to wearing the martyr's halo.

The right to delusion

The association between Solzhenitsyn and good literature is now of little or no concern to anyone. His works are examined in columns that newspapers devote to political rather than literary commentators. His latest book, 'The Gulag Archipelago,' too, is far removed from artistic prose. One needn't be a Nobel Prize winner to produce such a political pamphlet, wrote *Voz Proletaria* (Columbia); it could have been written by any CIA-hired 'expert on Soviet affairs.'

Yet those who are drumming up publicity for Solzhenitsyn have set out to link his name with that of the great Lev Tolstoi. Since the concept of bad or good writer is at best nebulous (for in the final analysis every book has its reader), let us turn to the determining feature of Russian classical literature. This is doubly justified, because Solzhenitsyn's patrons refer to him as a specifically Russian – it wouldn't occur to anyone to say he was a Soviet writer. They are unsparing in their praise of his pious reverence for Russian autocracy and his complaint that he himself saw no possibility of having his books published at home 'if only because of the one fact, that the word "God" would have to be written with a small letter' according to present Russian spelling rules.

Always, a writer's talent and the artistic value of his writing have been gauged by the reader and critic in Russia in close connection with his social, political position. It was skill in portraying the most progressive trends of the times, in distinguishing between the nascent and the moribund, that ultimately determined a writer's place in the history of Russian literature.

The great Russian critic, Vissarion Belinsky, wrote more than a century ago that the public regarded its writers as 'champions and saviors against the Russian autocracy, the orthodox church and pastoralism, and was therefore always willing to forgive a writer for a bad book, but never for a malicious one.'[1] Belinsky addressed these lines to Nikolai Gogol in connection with the latter's 'Selected Passages From Correspondence with Friends.' In his

book Gogol eulogized tsarism and vindicated serfdom. Was Belinsky concerned here over genuine or fancied literary merits? Certainly not. The book offended his civic feelings, and he wrote: 'Even if your intention had been to take my life, I should not have hated you more than I do for these disgraceful lines.'[2]

But why is Belinsky so utterly outraged? Isn't the writer only human and prone to error? Hasn't he the right to delusion? Literary critic Belinsky denied it to Gogol, and let him know about it: 'Perhaps you will say: "Supposing I was deluded and all my thoughts are a lie, but why should I be denied the right to delusion and why won't you believe the sincerity of my delusion?" Because, I shall say to you, such a trend is no longer a novelty in Russia.'[3]

A writer who wishes his country that which life and history have rejected, commits a grave civic crime against his people. And by defying reason and dreaming of reversing the course of history, maligning the October Revolution, hating the very sound of the word 'socialism,' mocking the life style of Soviet people and extolling the old Russia (tsarist prison, too, gets his praise), Solzhenitsyn is guilty precisely of such a crime.

Solzhenitsyn's first publication in a Soviet periodical ('One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich') placed the question of the writer's views in sharp focus. In his novel he denounced what the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had uncompromisingly and courageously condemned much earlier, eradicating the very possibilty of recurrence. But how did the new writer visualize Soviet reality? Controversies erupted. However, those who were well disposed to Solzhenitsyn and those who would not accept him, could not conclude their argument. The matter could only be settled by the writer's own subsequent steps. And these turned away his original supporters, and Soviet readers, and also progressives and writers abroad who had believed in him and expected something entirely different.

Anti-Soviteers seized happily on 'The First Circle' and 'Cancer Ward,' which presented a one sided and biased picture of Soviet reality. But the alternative that the writer suggested for the Soviet people was not fully revealed until later. Whether it was only maturing all that time or was carefully concealed, is immaterial. It came out in the novel 'August 1914,' and then more conclusively in 'The Gulag Archipelago.' Small wonder that the bourgeois press describes precisely this book as his 'opus magnum.'

In effect, the 'opus magnum' negates everything associated with the post-revolutionary past, present and incontestable future of the Soviet Union, and will give preference to anything, even fascism, so long as it isn't socialism. Writing in *L'Humanité*, Yves Moreaux observed appropriately that by negating everything Soviet and accusing Soviet leaders of all mortal sins, Solzhenitsyn 'reminds us of those who persist in France to portray Marie Antoinette as an innocent lamb, Robespierre as a tyrant, and Mirabeau as a man of pure heart.'

In his first novel, Solzhenitsyn described the lot of guiltlessly condemned people. They had the quality of rising above the wrongs, of not living by them alone. Yet for his own wrongs Solzhenitsyn presented society with an account to settle in which everything millions upon millions of Soviet people had lived by, would have to be wiped out. He is possessed by bitterness. It prods him to lies and slanders. Belinsky could not have been more right when he said: 'How profoundly true that if one abandons oneself to lies, one is abandoned by reason and talent.'[4]

A dissident or enemy?

Solzhenitsyn described his latest book as 'an experiment in artistic research.' If it is research, the experiment is a strange one: the author handles history, which he has undertaken to judge, as he would papers on his desk – shuffling it to suit his purpose. Taking a phrase from Lenin's letter to Gorky out of context and thereby distorting its meaning, is part of a day's work. And the ordeal of Bolshevik Dzerzhinsky, who had spent years in a tsarist prison is sneeringly dismissed, 'What of it!' This about a man who had worn a convict's irons, had done hard labor, contracted tuberculosis, and once led a prison rising, capturing the prison, and organizing its defense.

Solzhenitsyn's attitude towards the enemies of Soviet power is entirely different. Here he displays a kind of morbid affection, and does not hesitate to refer to 'the outstanding and uncommon personality' of General Vlasov, whose name the world associates with treason, savage cruelty, and obedient service to the Nazis.[5]

The author claims that his exposition follows the 'satanic theory of history.' What this probably means is that he picked a method of historical analysis best suited to falsify the facts. He deliberately evades everything the Soviet people had to win and defend, he portrays as senselessly brutal, actions directly necessitated by the counter-revolution. If we are to believe the author, it would appear that there had been no civil war in Russia started by the white guard, no white terror but only red terror, no armed intervention by 14 foreign countries, that Soviet Russia was never blockaded, that it never had to fear aggression, or that these was no atomic blackmail following the Second World War.

And here there is a surprising, yet natural twist. The very thing that Solzhenitsyn quarrels with, befalls his own work: while accusing Soviet historians of bias, he resorts to an unheard of concentration of prejudice and falsehood. To be sure, this is not entirely so, for here, too, he blazes no new trails: *Der Spiegel* observed that the picture painted by Solzhenitsyn has been known for many years and nothing different was ever said abroad by any of the opponents of the Soviet system. Who is Solzhenitsyn's latest book meant to serve, and what is the purpose of the falsification? The answer is provided by the neo-fascists of the NPD. They said in their paper, *Deutsche Wochenzeitung*, that after Solzhenitsyn's book the reader will see that not the German Reich 'declared war on the Soviet

Union in 1941, but that the war was declared in 1918, and precisely by Moscow!'

One should be inured by now to Solzhenitsyn's antics. Yet when you see one fact twisted and another misrepresented, you cannot help wondering. Yet there is nothing to be surprised at.

All of Solzhenitsyn's examples and diatribes follow a definite pattern. 'Of course, Russia was not suited for any type of socialism.' The Great Patriotic War 'showed us that the worst thing on earth is to be Russian.' Roosevelt and Churchill showed 'wretched political acumen' by not pressing home their atomic advantage against the Soviet Union.[6] Yes, he has long since adhered to an utterly immoral principle, first of all towards his own people – the worse, the better.

Solzhenitsyn displays an amazing social constancy. Half a century after the socialist revolution, when so many writers, artists and scientists overcame the pull of class gravity and went over to the new system, Solzhenitsyn continues to see the world from the standpoint of Russian capitalists and landowners.

There is joy over victories and grief over losses on either side of the barricades. Solzhenitsyn is still upset by the dissolution of the Cadet Party and the League in Defense of the Constituent Assembly, who had fought on the side of the counter-revolutionary General Kornilov besieging Petrograd. He calls it a 'crime' of the new Soviet government to have imprisoned politicians, generals, officers and ministry officials who sabotaged its decrees. His list of 'crimes' covers all the measures the new worker-peasant republic had been obliged to take for its defense. He knows precisely who his enemies are.

They are those of whom writer Vsevolod Vishnevsky, Communist and civil war veteran, wrote in his books. How many Communists were there in the Red Army and Navy during the civil war? Vishnevsky asks, and answers: 'Two hundred and eighty thousand. Half the Party. Every second Communist was on the front lines. The rest were on the line of fire in cities, the steppes and forests, because there is no rear in a class war. And the list of wounded Communists includes Lenin, and that of the killed includes Volodarsky, Uritsky, the 26 commissars, entire gubernia committees and organizations slaughtered to a man.'[7]

In the class struggle, each side upholds its own truth. But there is only one historical truth. Let us not ask rhetorical questions to find out on whose side historical truth is today. Let us try to imagine the world according to Solzhenitsyn, the world he visualizes, a world without socialism, and touch on only one issue, that of war and peace. With today's level of technology, what would await mankind if all the thermonuclear weapons were in the hands of rival imperialist groups?

Bourgeois propaganda has been at pains to instil the idea that Solzhenitsyn and his ilk are dissidents. This was meant as a sort of protective cover: don't touch them, they are harmless dissidents. But the fact is that Solzhenitsyn long ago began using freedom of crea-

tion for hostile political action. At home and abroad he slandered Soviet reality, engaged in incitement against the Sovet system, opposed détente in an attempt to prevent normalization of international relations, urged military pressure on the Soviet Union. Lastly, Solzhenitsyn stated that he did not want to – and did not – submit to the laws of his country.

The enemies of socialism, he anti-communists, use every available weapon. This anti-communist found his own weapon, too, and has used it to cause the Soviet Union whatever damage he could. No, he is not a dissident; he is an active enemy.

Illusions that should be shed

No anti-Soviet campaign is complete without attacks on socialist democracy or claims that only the so-called 'free world' guarantees freedom of opinion and criticism and provides objective information. The same is true of this one, too.

We could, of course, remind the reader how much space and time the bourgeois press, radio and television have devoted to Solzhenitsyn and how astonishingly cool they have been to the atrocities of the Chilean junta, the arrest and torture of Greek democrats, the fate of the 200,000 thrown into South Vietnamese concentration camps. On the very day the Solzhenitsyn clamor reached its peak, the writer Juan Carlos Onetti was arrested in Uruguay and clapped into prison for no more than speaking out in defense of a story by a colleague. Few were moved by that arrest.

The list could be continued. But, in the final count, it is only natural that the bourgeois press should extol anti-communists and remain silent about the victims of dictatorial regimes – that's why it is a bourgeois press. Natural, too, is the hatred the leaders of capitalist society have for Communists, and the overt and covert, but alway subtle, persecution of Communists. And yet bourgeois propagandists make a point of comparing democracy under capitalism and socialism – they want a direct comparison, a mirror reflection. But every child knows that in a mirror reflection what is on the right is shown on the left. A mirror-comparison of the two mutually-opposed social and economic systems is bound to produce a topsy-turvy picture.

Anxious to veil its reactionary essence, capitalism has devoted much energy, invention and money to mimicry. The idea is to show that power belongs *not only* to the capitalists, that the lion's share of national incomes does *not* go to a few families, that the monopolists who own the mass media *cannot* use them as they like. And to give that a semblance of verity, it allows – more in some places, precious little in others – some leeway to democracy, or, to be more precise, its accessories.[8] But even these are disregarded where the interests of big capital are concerned – all laws and rights, national and international, are flagrantly violated. Modern history provides ample evidence of that.

To say that under socialism, in countries where genuine government by the people is a fact, criticism of shortcomings and the

effort to eliminate them is always encouraged, is to repeat what has been said, written and proven long ago. For instance, *Pravda* wrote in reference to the publication of Solzhenitsyn's book: 'A number of books have been published in our country criticizing the shortcomings and mistakes of the past, . . . and the Soviet public has responded to them positively because their authors have written the genuine truth, did not lapse into one-sidedness, did not lose the historical perspective.'

Solzhenitsyn's eulogizers are least of all concerned for freedom of criticism, let alone constructive criticism. What worries them is that in the Soviet Union there is no freedom for the restoration of the bourgeois order, even if only of bourgeois ideology for a start.

But, then, no one in the Soviet Union has ever given an undertaking to allow representatives of the exploiting classes rights or freedoms. Referring to the fate of the bourgeois press at a meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee in 1917, Lenin remarked that to tolerate bourgeois papers would be 'marching to socialism backwards' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 284).

Is it not time for capitalist theorists and politicians to shed their illusions? In a country where the first new chldren's reader began with the words 'We are not slaves,' where, throughout all these years, everything possible has been done to root out bourgeois consciousness – in such a country the door will never again be open to the bourgeois ideology. The campaign around Solzhenitsyn has revealed anew the aims of those who have latterly been clamoring for free circulation of ideas and a broad exchange of information. What they want is ideological launching pads on foreign territory, not peaceful cooperation. What they are concerned with is ideological subversion, not confrontation of ideas.

Solzhenitsyn has tried to produce his own picture of the counter-revolutionary plots of the early Soviet years. 'In the scientific language of today,' he says, 'this would be called a study of possible alternatives.' Well, there is not going to be any 'possible alternative' – restoration of the bourgeois system – because it is antihistorical for the first land of socialism; because it is wholly alien to a country where there are no exploiter classes, where the overwhelming majority of the population were born after the October Revolution, and where a new historic community, the Soviet people, has been formed. (It might be noted that in the Soviet Union Solzhenitsyn's 'alternative' met with nothing resembling significant support; he was absolutely isolated.) It will not be accepted, lastly, because the path traversed by the Soviet Union is irreversible, and because of the effort and sacrifice it entailed. In the words of the poet:

> Was it for this that
> Dzerzhinsky spent his energy,
> Gorky spent his health,
> Lenin accomplished what would have taken ten
> ordinary lives . . .

To accept this 'possible alternative' is to erase from memory the

bloody trail counter-revolution traced across the world, from the Wall of the Communards at the Père Lachaise Cemetery in Paris to the Santiago stadium where the heroes of the Popular Unity were done to death.

Calculations and miscalculations

All things considered, Solzhenitsyn is not in tune with present-day anti-communism: to call for the liquidation of socialism in the 70s, or frighten the reader with the spectre of dagger-wielding commissars, is grotesquely at odds with the times. The line now is to 'improve the Soviet regime,' 'cleanse it of the heritage of October.' In fact, up till a while ago Solzhenitsyn was considered among those who were out to 'cleanse and improve' life in the Soviet Union. But then he began preaching liquidation of socialism.

Nonetheless it was decided to stake on him, and in a big way. Uncalculated? No, there was a definite design: slander is like disease – easy to catch, hard to get rid of. But there were also much weightier political motivations. Here are three of them.

Anti-communism is a built-in part of the ideological system of the most reactionary bourgeoisie. It is being used to impede détente, the expanding East-West cooperation, and hold back the liberation of mass consciousness from cold-war stereotypes. And we find the London *Daily Telegraph* proclaiming: If anything happens to Solzhenitsyn, the West should break off the détente negotiations.

The scale of this campaign is in direct proportion to the anxiety caused our ideological opponents by the deepening general crisis of capitalism. Anti-Soviet, anti-socialist ballyhoo will, they hope, divert attention, even if only for a time, from the sharpening contradictions in their own countries.

And third. The past year has seen continued strengthening of the Communist and Workers' Parties. Here is a charactesistic remark on the subject from the Italian weekly *Sette Giorni*: 'In Denmark, the Communists have won five seats in Parliament where they had none before. The Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish governments depend on Communist support to maintain themselves in office. In Italy, from 26 to 27 per cent vote Communist. In France, the Communist Party is strong and it is part of the united Left forces, which should not be discounted, considering that they poll as much as 46 per cent of the vote.'

Continued strengthening of the international Communist movement's unity plays no small part in extending Communist influence. And the new provocation is spearheaded against that, too. Its organizers did not foresee that the appearance of Solzhenitsyn's book, the publicity given it, would be met with such wrathful condemnation from the Communist and Workers' Parties and their press. The campaign has been denounced in no uncertain terms as a blind revival of the foulest type of anti-Soviet propaganda. Fraternal parties regard the publicity build-up of this anti-Soviet book as a general reactionary offensive. Recent developments con-

firm what the Brussels Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of capitalist Europe said in its Political Declaration: 'To advance to socialism it is necessary to demolish such barriers, impediments and survivals as anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, which for many years bred division in the ranks of the workers and democratic forces.'

Mention of Solzhenitsyn is increasingly rare in newspapers and magazines, which up to a short while ago devoted much space to him. The Paris *Le Monde* mentioned him only in an advertisement announcing that his novel has been included in a collection which, it appears, was being offered practically gratis.

It is now perfectly clear that the campaign has proved a failure. It began with a spurt, but never really got off the ground – the springs of the unmeshed mechanism snapped. 'The Gulag Archipelago' is but the first stage of what was conceived as the sensation of the century. Next its author would be arrested, then tried and after that there would be the campaign for his freedom. . . . An inexhaustible lode! Everything had been rehearsed: the gun shown the audience in Act One would duly go off before the curtain fell.

Readers of the bourgeois press were systematically being prepared for the inevitable 'martyrdom' that awaited Solzhenitsyn. Whiteguard emigres prayed for the 'salvation' of their brother-in-spirit. How they wanted – how they needed – all the misfortuntes that would befall him! Even if a brick fell on him, even that could be put to good advantage. The worse things got, the better – that cynical principle was now applied to Solzhenitsyn.

And he helped to provoke getting himself arrested. Statements were prepared in good time describing how he would behave in detention. Twice he refused to obey a summons to the prosecutor's office and had to be taken there under guard. A *France Presse* message said: 'The evolution of the whole affair leaves one with the impression of a theatrical trick . . . deliberately staged by the writer who knew that, having refused to obey two summonses from the prosecutor, he would have to be taken there under guard.'

Talking to journalists in the FRG, Solzhenitsyn remarked that he had spoken enough in Moscow and now was the time to be silent. Perhaps he thinks the world is waiting for him to speak out. We do not prophesy complete oblivion for Solzhenitsyn. Very likely he will still be sought out by publishers, newspapers and radio stations of questionable reputation. But a man renounced by his country has never been a great asset.

Jan Prazsky

1. V. G. Belinsky, *Collected Works* (in Russian), Moscow, 1948, Vol. 3, pp. 712-713.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 709.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 711.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 713.

5. Solzhenitsyn maintains that Vlasov, a former Soviet general, whose army was surrounded in 1942, was abandoned to his fate. In fact, however, large formations of three arrmies mounted an operation to relieve the surrounded force and succeeded in developing a breach. Supreme Headquarters was anxious about his fate, wanted to help, partisan units searched for him, and paratroopers were landed in the area. Solzhenitsyn claims further that Vlasov's army saved Prague

from destruction in 1945: 'But did all the Czechs understand later which Russians had saved their city? Our history is falsified and we are told that Prague was saved by Soviet troops, though these could not have arrived in time.' The Czech newspaper, *Rude Pravo*, wrote on this score: 'Before fleeing to surrender to the Americans the Vlasovites required an alibi in Prague; this was why, for self-preservation, some of them turned their nazi weapons against the Nazis. An artificial legend was thus to have concealed their participation in brutal punitive operations against partisans, also in Czechoslovakia, and to have transformed them from devils into angels. The purpose of the legend was also to cast a shadow on the mass heroism of the people of Prague inscribed in our country's history in letters of gold, and to detract from the great historical significance of the Soviet Union's mission of liberation.' In a letter in *L'Humanité*, 'I was in Prague in 1945,' the Frenchmen Marcel Veyrier testified that until the last minute the Nazis had colossal strength in Prague. It was not until May 9 that the Czechoslovak capital was liberated by Soviet troops. At that time, it never occurred to anyone to shout: 'Long live Vlasov!'

6. Injury is inflicted on the national feelings not only of Soviet, but also other peoples. Solzhenitsyn holds forth about the 'liberalism' of the tsarist autocracy, but on this score the Poles 'have their own opinion, close to that of the Petrograd workers, rather than of the landowners of the old Rostov Gubernia, with whom his Western patrons so readily, and evidently not without reason, identify Solzhenitsyn,' writes the newspaper, *Zhie Warszawa*. He contends that 'the Gestapo tried to discover the truth,' but in *Unsere Zeit* he is rebutted by prisoner No. 4186, Emil Carlebach: 'In 1938 I was taken with another 2,000 prisoners from Dachau to Buchenwald concentration camp. When we were liberated, there were just twenty of us. Have you ever heard anyone mention the Gestapo's "love of truth" in Auschwitz, Treblinka or the dozens of other camps?'

7. V. Vishnevsky, 'The Optimistic Tragedy.'

8. James Aldridge, the English writer, has some characteristic observations about criticism in capitalist countries. In Britain today, he writes, you can discuss anything – religion, politics, the royal family, sex, drugs – anything you like. The only condition is that you do not propose social solutions. On television you can hear the harshest words said about our society. The ruling circles can allow that, as long as there is no suggestion that social change is the only alternative. More, the ruling circles are, to a certain extent, interesting in holding up the evils of the modern world and in this way instilling the idea that the world is not perfect and there is nothing we can do about it; everyone for himself . . . Capitalism fears every form of social thought, its purpose is to isolate it.

KARL MARX **FREDERICK ENGELS**

Collected Works

VOLUME 1 MARX: 1835-1843

One of the most important publishing ventures of the century, the definitive English-language edition of THE COLLECTED WORKS OF KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS is being launched with this first volume of the 50-volume work. THE COLLECTED WORKS will contain all the writings that Marx and Engels published during their lifetimes, plus their voluminous correspondence, unpublished manuscripts and many newly discovered works, appearing here for the first time in any language. Volume 1, consisting of Marx's works, letters, preparatory material and literary experiments in prose and verse during the early years of his intellectual development, reflects the formation of his revolutionary ideas in law, history, philosophy and political economy. Illustrated and annotated, with relevant biographical documents as appendices.

Spring release—advance sales accepted **Cloth $8.95**

books and journals

Concentrated experience of proletarian struggle

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF 'KOMMUNIST,' THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL JOURNAL OF THE CC CPSU*

The words in the title are from the leading article, 'Our Tasks,' published in the first issue of the political and economic biweekly *Bolshevik* founded in April 1924. When, in November 1952, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dropped the word (Bolsheviks) from its official name, the journal was renamed *Kommunist* and subtitled 'Theoretical and Political Journal of the CC CPSU.' It began with a circulation of 12,000, now it is 940,000.

The decision to found the journal was taken by the Organizational Bureau of the CC CPSU (B) in Lenin's lifetime, on November 19, 1923. Revolutionary reality determined the nature and line of the new periodical. The journal was intended to contribute, in both theory and politics, to the construction of the first socialist society in history and analyze the amazing, complex and unique process of translating the theory of scientific communism into the everyday practice of millions.

'History,' said the leading article mentioned above, 'seems deliberately to have put communism to an unprecedentedly severe test. It seems to be saying to Communists: "Here is a backward, illiterate, poor and ruined country in which the non-proletarian elements preponderate. This is where you must build socialism and prove that you can lay the foundations of a new world even in unprecedentedly difficult conditions. If the future belongs to you, go on to your goal whatever the obstacles".'

That was half a century ago. The issues which have appeared since add up to a vast diary of creative plans and quests, of theoretical and practical achievement by generations of Communists. They convey the heartbeat of these generations without correcting or distorting what each of them had to go through. This historical authenticity, which time cannot change, lends them their scientific worth.

The tens of thousands of articles, reports, letters and reviews published in *Kommunist* could be made the theme of serious sociological research. Among the contributors were prominent leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state – K. Y. Voroshilov,

*Contributed by the editorial board of *Kommunist*.

A. A. Zhdanov, M. I. Kalinin, S. M. Kirov, V. V. Kuibyshev, A. I. Mikoyan, G. K. Ordjonikidze, J. V. Stalin, N. K. Krupskaya, P. P. Postyshev and Y. M. Yaroslavsky, all responsible for key sectors in the socialist economy, science and culture, Party workers, statesmen and economic executives.

As in the past, current problems are discussed in *Kommunist* by the Party's finest minds. Recent contributions to the journal by members of the Political Bureau and Secretaries of the CC CPSU make up the main body of *24th Congress of the CPSU: Unity of Theory and Practice,* a collection brought out by the editors of the journal quite recently. Over 40 Secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist parties of Union republics and of Territorial and Regional Party committees have written for *Kommunist* in the past three years.

The very first issue of the journal gave ample coverage to problems of the international revolutionary movement. There were contributions from Klement Gottwald, Georgi Dimitrov, Bela Kun, Wilhelm Pieck, Harry Pollitt, Ernst Thaelmann, Palmiro Togliatti and Maurice Thorez. In the last three years alone, *Kommunist* has carried articles by more than 50 leading members of Communist and Workers' parties.

The story of *Kommunist* is largely that of Marxist-Leninist thought theoretically generalizing and forecasting struggles for the consistent realization of the various stages of socialist and communist construction, and the development and consolidation of the socialist world system.

The rudimentary experience of socialist reality was the basis for Lenin's articles 'A Great Beginning,' 'How Shall We Organize Competition?,' 'On Cooperation' and many other writings, notes and outlines in which he put forward a scientific plan for building socialism and which furnished an enduring example of brilliant analysis of reality. *Kommunist* inherited these Leninist traditions. Beginning with a few disconnected facts about the rise of the new society, it advanced to the theoretical treatment of problems of socialist economy and culture, socialist democracy and the Soviet way of life, to analysis of the international practice of building socialism.

As one stage of building the new society was succeeded by another the journal concerned itself with such objective law-governed phenomena and processes of socialism as the winning of political power by the working class and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, led by the Marxist-Leninist party; the alliance of the working class, peasantry and other working people; the abolition of capitalist property and the establishment of socialist, social ownership of the basic means of production; planned economic development aimed at building socialism and communism, at raising the working people's living standards; gradual reorganzation of agriculture on socialist lines, accomplishing a socialist revolution in ideology and culture; growing friendship among peoples; the promotion of socialist democracy; safeguarding the gains of

socialism against encroachments from internal and external enemies; proletarian internationalism.

Kommunist described and theoretically assessed the arduous path of the world's first socialist state: industrialization, collectivization, the Soviet people's historic victory in the Great Patriotic War, post-war economic rehabilitation and progress.

Typical of the journal today are articles devoted to the progress of Marxist-Leninist science and taking theoretical stock of social phenomena in the light of the decisions of the 24th Party Congress. It is impossible to list all the diverse contributions that go into such sections of the journal as 'Decisions of the 24th Congress of the CPSU: A Militant Program for Advancing Our Country,' 'The 24th Party Congress and the Development of Marxist-Leninist Science,' 'Social and Economic Problems of Developed Socialism,' 'Theory and Practice of Party Building,' 'The World Revolutionary Process,' 'Activities of Communist and Workers' Parties,' and others. The main themes treated in *Kommunist* are as follows:

– the historic significance of Marxism-Leninism and the development of its fundamental tenets today;

– philosophical problems in the light of the practice of Communist construction and the ideological struggle in the world arena; the significance of Marxist-Leninist methodology for the natural and social sciences;

– developed socialist society, its criteria and place in history; the social structure and main characteristics of social progress in the Soviet Union;

– problems of the economic policy of the CPSU, and ways and means of solving them; the tasks of economics in fulfilling the 24th Party Congress program for building communism;

– forms of ideological work; communist education of the masses and work to raise their cultural standard; struggle against manifestations of bourgeois ideology;

– growing role of the Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society; the Party's increasing ideological and organizational unity;

– progress of the world socialist community and its transformation into the decisive factor for the social progress of mankind.

– implementation of the 24th Party Congress Peace Program; ways and means of applying the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence;

– the theoretical and political position of the Communist movement on the national liberation struggle and its place in the world revolutionary process;

– theoretical problems of the world Communist movement; strengthening its unity and cohesion on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism;

– exposing the anti-communism of bourgeois ideology and of Right and 'Left'-wing revisionism; criticizing Maoism and the Peking leadership's anti-Soviet policy.

The journal has done much to scientifically elaborate and pub-

licize Lenin's legacy. The section 'Lenin and Leninism' (initiated in the early issues of *Bolshevik*) contains articles, letters and notes by Lenin, as well as information on his life and work. In the past five decades, the journal has published 125 works, letters and other writings by Lenin that were little known, or previously unpublished.

Kommunist has also published hitherto unknown writings and letters by Marx and Engels, translated into Russian for the first time.

Leninism is no passing phenomenon – it does not age, any more than the proletarian revolution that will reshape the world, as the first leading article (April 1924) put it. It goes on to say: 'Our main task is to defend and prove the validity of *historical* Bolshevism and to combat every attempt at distorting or misrepresenting its principles . . . Already there are attempts to distort and vulgarize Leninism in Lenin's name. Already there are attacks on the most precious inheritance of the international working class – the purity of Leninist principles. We are going to combat this with the utmost determination. *Russia's Bolsheviks will never allow anyone to "adapt" Leninism to opportunism*, irrespective of whether attempts to this end are a result of malicious distortion or honest error.'

Founded at a difficult and complicated time, when the issue of first building socialism in one country – the Soviet Union – became particularly pressing, the journal immediately went into action for the purity of Lenin's theoretical legacy and for the ideological and organizational unity of the Party ranks. It fought uncompromisingly against Trotskyism, petty-bourgeois adventurism, Right-wing opportunism, national deviationism and other anti-Leninist trends and groups. Its exposure of the reactionary character of those who attacked revolutionary theory is highly instructive for the present-day 'refuters of Marxism-Leninism.' Historically, socialist reality has proved the concepts of their predecessors to be completely indefensible and has put them out of the mind of subsequent generations.

Over the past half-century, everything published in *Kommunist* has been part of the Party's theoretical work and, at the same time, it belongs to the world Communist movement. From year to year the experience of proletarian struggle and communist building is pooled and concentrated in the journal's columns. Thus *Kommunist* meets the condition which Lenin considered a requisite of the Party press. 'We must try,' Lenin wrote, 'to keep pace with events, to sum them up, to draw conclusions, to draw from the experience of today's happenings lessons that will be useful tomorrow, in another place, where today "the people are still mute" and where in the near future, in some form or other, a revolutionary conflagration will break out' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 8, p. 104).

Over a thousand issues of *Kommunist* have appeared to date. They may be compared to so many soldiers of the great and victorious army of builders of communism.

Voice of honor and conscience

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF 'L'HUMANITE'

Monday, April 18, 1904, saw the appearance in Paris of the first issue of a newspaper destined to share with the people their trials and tribulations, to be by their side in days of joy and of sorrow. Today that paper – *L'Humanité* – is known worldwide.

The French Communist daily is one of the most widely read publications in capitalist Europe. Unswervingly dedicated to the Party, to communism, *L'Humanité* stood courageously for its ideals through fascist occupation and in the most trying days of the cold war. It has become a genuinely national daily speaking for the honor and conscience of France. It has been read and promoted by more than one generation of working people. They like the paper, they trust it. They know that no reactionary attacks or threats, however violent, can keep *l'Humanité* from fearlessly speaking out for the people's interests or fighting for their socialist future.

The lot of a Communist paper under capitalism is as hard as a Communist's, with the inevitable police raids, arrests, underground work and financial difficulties. But then there is also the people's recognition, the greatest and most enviable reward one can have. The record of a Communist paper is a record of struggle without respite, an inspiring example of courage and perseverance.

L'Humanité began publication as a daily paper of the French Socialist Party. 'Humanity does not yet exist as a community or is only just becoming one,' wrote its founder, Jean Jaurès, in 'Our Goal,' the first editorial published in the first issue. 'None but socialism, by making the means of labor the common property of all classes, will resolve this antagonism (between the capitalist oligarchy and the proletariat) and turn every nation, finally reconciled with itself, into a particle of humanity.'

Jaurès was admittedly not innocent of reformist illusions, so typical in his day. But his human qualities – courage and devotion to the truth, to working-class unity, to peace and socialism – were admirable and largely determined the character of the new paper.

On January 24, 1905, *l'Humanité* hailed the fighters of the first Russian revolution with a manifesto of the trade unions of Seine District. 'The working people of revolutionary Paris,' it wrote, 'are with you heart and soul. You can rely on us and be certain of our aid.' 'The Russian people's liberation,' wrote Jaurès himself on March 4, ' . . . will translate itself not only into legislative control institutions, but into a labor regime that will undoubtedly put the Russian proletariat in the van of the European proletariat.'

Two years laer, April 4, 1907, *l'Humanité* carried its 'Interview with Citizen Lenin' on the elections to Russia's Second Duma.

It was a dangerousand difficult time for the editorial staff. Jules Renard, the French author, wrote in his recollections that the editors lit their candles as late as possible at least to economize on them.

L'Humanité played an increasing role in the class struggles of the French proletariat. On March 11, 1906, in a leading article on an accident at Courrières in which 1,300 workers lost their lives, Jaurès wrote: 'They died before they could share the high material and moral standards which Communist organization will ensure for all. And yet this organization is possible already.'

In October 1910 police raided the premises. In the series of articles he wrote in April and May 1911, Jaurès exposed the 'triumphant generals and financiers' and their plan for Morocco in which 'colonialism and reaction, piracy and repression' reigned. 'We shall waste the money, blood and honor of France,' he commented. 'And we shall forfeit the right to speak of rights, the right to direct lofty words about justice and human hope to the Moslem world.'

To his dying day, Jaurès fought in the *l'Humanité* to save peace. The war had already broken out in Serbia and yet, on July 30, 1914, he appealed through *l'Humanité* 'for solidarity of the proletarians of all countries in the struggle against the abominable menace.' Next day, July 31, he was assassinated.

The failure of the Second International was a dark period in the paper's history. A new stage began when in 1917, *l'Humanité* devoted itself to the growing movement against the war and explicitly demanded support for the Russian revolution. After October 1917 the paper took a stand against imperialist intervention, in defense of Soviet Russia.

The big strikes of 1919 coincided with a campaign for the Socialist Party to join the Third International. On August 14, 1920, *l'Humanité* published an appeal to the proletariat by Anatole France under the headline, 'For the Russian Revolution.' Marcel Cachin went to Soviet Russia and the paper printed his impressions in issue after issue. All this largely predetermined the resolution passed by the Tours Congress. 'Adherence was decided on by 3,252 votes,' *l'Humanité* reported on December 30. This is how unequivocally the Party declared for joining the Leninist International.

The controlling interest in *l'Humanité* belonged to veteran Communard Camélinat, and thanks to him the paper became the property of the rising party of a new type.

L'Humanité owed much of its initial progress to worker and peasant correspondents whose cooperation was enlisted by Marcel Cachin and Paul Vaillant-Couturier. Imprisoned, Marcel Cachin continued to direct the worker correspondents. He wrote: 'The working class must participate more than ever in the life, preparation and editing, as well as dissemination, of its newspaper. Workers and farmers in the Communist Party must express their aspirations, feelings, suffering and anger through the paper.'

Full-page spreads were devoted to letters about the Renault and Citroen plants and miners' working conditions, and to letters from soldiers. The layout of December 12, 1928, was composed by French workers and correspondents in Algeria, Tunisia, Syria, Indochina, and the Antilles.

In due course, *l'Humanité* became a better and better agitator, propagandist and organizer, helping redouble the militancy and political consciousness of the masses and shape the party of the new type.

The bourgeoisie stopped at nothing to try and destroy the paper: its staff members were imprisoned, its property was impounded, searches, court prosecutions and fines followed in swift succession. The scene was set to declare the paper bankrupt. By August 1929 the situation seemed hopeless.

But no, Marcel Cachin appealed to the people. Hundreds of committees sprang up to help *l'Humanité*. As much as 187,000 francs were collected by August 30, and in December the fund passed the 1.5 million mark. *L'Humanité* was saved! Henceforth, the *l'Humanité* festival in Sacco and Vanzetti Park in Bezons on September 7, 1930, was attended by several thousand people. Nowadays, of course, attendance is in the hundreds of thousands.

It was in *l'Humanité* that Maurice Thorez published his well-known articles of 1931, which marked the beginning of the Party's renovation: 'Down with the Mannequins,' 'People are Beginning to Speak their Mind,' and 'At Last We Can Argue.' All this paved the way for the anti-fascist struggle and the resounding victories of the Popular Front.

L'Humanité inspired actions for Republican Spain, denounced the Munich deal and Nazi aggression. The French and German fascists remembered this and at the first opportunity shot those splendid journalists, Péri and Sampaix.

Shortly before the Second World War the paper was banned. Its last headline, 'Alliance of the French Nation against the Hitler Aggression,' appeared on August 26, 1939, and its first underground issue on August 27.

By the time of the national rising in August 1944, there had been 317 underground issues (197 stencilled and 120 printed). Together with the special issues, even excluding provincial editions, 50 million copies were circulated. In the Paris area alone, the one issue of January 29, 1941, was circulated in 121,850 copies.

It was through *l'Humanité* that Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos issued their call for resistance on July 10, 1940, the very day when Petain and Lavalle buried the Republic with the consent of the servile Vichy parliament.

Four hard years followed. Thousands of Communists devoted to the paper that showed the nation the way to liberation, fell in battle. André Bréchet, responsible for the paper in the Paris area, was arrested in May 1941 and was among the first of the 75,000 Communists executed by the Nazis.

On August 21, 1944, when fighting raged in the streets of Paris,

l'Humanité emerged from underground. Since then, the big bourgeoisie has tried to muzzle it many a time – in the critical days of the first Vietnam war, during the war in Algeria, and in the grim clashes in which the Communists – almost single-handed – fought for peace, independence and freedom in France.

The monopolies have found that they cannot destroy *l'Humanité*. So they are trying at least to reduce its readership. As before, but now more covertly, they are determined to strike at the till. *L'Humanité* gets only a negligible portion of the advertising that, in effect, keeps the bourgeois papers going. Bourgeois advertisers would have been glad to withhold even that negligible portion, but cannot afford to completely ignore a party that represents so large a section of the population. The bourgeois papers can keep their retail prices low. With printing and delivery costs rising, *l'Humanité* is compelled to sell at a higher price.

Reactionary propaganda is at pains to show that the day of the political daily is over now that radio and television are within everybody's reach. This creates a peculiar situation – there is the appearance of press freedom, while the authorities monopolize information and let only a small number of Parisian and provincial papers, directly or indirectly controlled by monopoly, exist alongside the ORTF.

L'Humanité, the only national political party newspaper in France, has alone been able to survive the effects of capitalist concentration, for at no time have Communists slackened the struggle for their paper. In residential quarters, villages and at factory gates, *l'Humanité* committees and volunteers sell the paper and solicit new readers. Five thousand correspondents – writers, scientists, specialists in all fields of knowledge – provide free contributions.

Paul Vaillant-Couturier said the workers want 'the whole world in their paper,' and *l'Humanité* tries to cover all public happenings, defending the Party line and repulsing anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaigns.

Today, France is in a promising period: the general crisis of capitalism's deeper and new sections are lining up with the working class. This makes it especially important to improve the paper even more, and increase its circulation.

Full-page spreads and articles on vital topics help readers understand the present-day problems and grasp the general perspective. The ideas propagated by the paper must reach those exposed to bourgeois propaganda and fenced off from daily reading of communist publications.

The 20th Congress of the FCP (December 1972) instructed the Central Committee and the committees of federations, sections and cells to promote *l'Humamnité*. The results have been good: the paper's circulation has risen. At the end of January 1974, for example, as many as 100,000 additional copies of *l'Humanité dimanche* were sold in just several days by Communist volunteers. Activists who are unable to help sell the paper every day, make up for it by going to the most lively places from time to time. And if some event

is of special importance, the paper is sold at factory gates, street crossings, subway and railway stations, and at bus stops. All this in addition to the mass sales days organized on a national scale.

The annual *l'Humanité* festival is always a popular affair. No one, be it friend or foe, is indifferent to what the paper writes. In capitalist society a working-class newspaper cannot survive and grow, unless it fights for circulation and popular support. In our case that fight is ceaseless.

Lucien Benoit
L'Humanité Editor

Preparations for 10th Congress of Yugoslav League of Communists

Milan Rakas, Editor-in-Chief of **Komunist** answers our questions.

Question: Yugoslavia's Communists are working to fortify the League of Communists organizationally and ideologically, and to enhance its role. Could you tell us about it, and about your paper's coverage of the preparations for the next LCY Congress?

Answer: In effect, preparations for the 10th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, scheduled May 27-30, began some two years ago. More precisely, we began preparing after the 21st Meeting of the LCY Presidium in December 1971. Acting on the recommendations of that Meeting – to fortify the leading role of the LCY in the further development of socialist non-aligned Yugoslavia based on self-management – the League, all its organizations and leading bodies, set to analyzing what had been accomplished since the Ninth Congress (1969). The purpose is to assess the positive results and experience, and pinpoint flaws in the performance by the LCY of the leading role in building a socialist society based on self-management.

Preparations for the Congress became especially active after all the LCY organizations and leading bodies received the Letter of the Chairman of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Comrade Tito, and the Executive Bureau of the LCY Presidium on September 18, 1972. It will be recalled that the Letter called for greater activity and responsibility by all League members, rapid development of self-management, and all-round consolidation of socialist Yugoslavia on the basis of associated labor. In substance, definite action had already been taken before the Letter was published, and there was considerable experience in self-management and in enhancing the socialist commonwealth of all the peoples and nationalities of Yugoslavia. All this was reflected in the con-

stitutional amendments of 1971. The Communists' involvement in advancing the objectives set in the Letter stimulated political activity and quickened the search for new solutions. In the something like 18 months since the Letter was published, we have, with the wholehearted support of the workers, all working people, managed to accomplish the immense political work entailed in drawing up a new Constitution, which was recently adopted by the Federal Assembly. The Letter of Comrade Tito and the Executive Bureau also stressed the necessity of eliminating all the flaws that had surfaced in the League's work when building socialism based on self-management. Elimination of these flaws will assure a still more consistent LCY policy based on the League's Program and the guidelines of our Ninth Congress.

Eighteen months ago the LCY Presidium formed a committee under Comrade Veljko Vlahovio, member of the LCY Presidium, to assure more efficient and comprehensive preparation for the 10th Congress. Following discussions and consultations in LCY organizations and leading bodies, the Committee drew up a Platform for working out the guidelines and decisions of the 10th LCY Congress, the first part of which sums up the main socio-economic changes of the past 25 years (since the beginning of our first five-year plan). The *Komunist* has given extensive coverage to these changes effected by the working class in order to show the basis with which the peoples of our country associate their future. The lively interest in this part of the Platform is natural, because the results we have achieved are substantial: between 1947 and 1971 gross national income went up 4.5-fold, or per capita 3.5-fold: industrial output in 1972 was fifteen times that of 1946; the industrial potential of 1972 was five times that of 1952; employment in industry was up 180 per cent, and productivity of labor 160 per cent. A score of years ago industrial goods accounted for just half of our exports, and now for nearly 85 per cent.

Our farms have some 70,000 tractors, and use as much as 1,750,000 tons of mineral fertilizer (which was hardly ever used before the war). Between 1953 and 1971, the rural population declined by some 2.5 million, while employment in socialized production went up something like 150 per cent (employment of women more than 200 per cent). By now about 60 per cent of the population are outside of agriculture.

We have built or modernized nearly 20,000 km of roads, built a network of airfields and a new merchant marine, with sea-going tonnage increasing 10-fold and inland tonnage doubling.

Our higher educational establishments have more than 294,000 students, or 18 times as many as before the war. Some three million citizens have finished secondary or higher schools. In 1939, Yugoslavia had four radio stations, and 166 in 1971. The number of doctors has increased by more than 20,000 in the past 20 years. Our average life expectancy is 65 years for men, against 45 prewar, and 69 for women, against 46 prewar.

The facts and figures cited in the Platform show the really substantial results have been achieved in all economic areas, social affairs, in culture, science, etc., since 1950, when the system of worker self-management was first introduced.

The Platform also outlines the principal LCY objectives of further socialist construction. It examines the politico-ideological aspect of Yugoslavia's economic and social development, socialist relations of production based on self-management and the related tasks of the League, ways and means of improving the class composition and social role of the LCY, the substantive features of the struggle for socialism, present-day international affairs, the foreign policy trends of Yugoslavia and the LCY, and the League's policy in culture, science and education. Thus, the Platform provides a broad basis for defining LCY tasks designed to further its position as the leading force in all areas of life in socialist non-aligned Yugoslavia – a community assuring the equality and unity of all peoples and nationalities in the country, with the working class playing the decisive role.

The results of the preparations for the 10th Congress, the republican congresses and regional conferences show that congress resolutions and documents will be consonant with the guidelines of the Platform. This is natural, because the Platform is the outcome of a broad, long and thorough discussion in all the organizations and leading organs of the League, during which the experience of the LCY, accumulated in performing the tasks set in the LCY Program and the decisions of its Ninth Congress, was closely scrutinized.

As a newspaper of the LCY, the *Komunist* is deeply involved in the Congress preparations. It regards and performs the serious tasks related to the coming Congress as its basic duty. Not only does it cover the Congress preparations, but also promotes and supports the participation in them of League members. The editorial boards of the newspaper (it appears in all the languages spoken in Yugoslavia) and the staffs of its many editions have adopted a special plan for participating in the Congress preparations. The *Komunist* published interviews with the chairman of the Congress Preparatory Committee and heads of the working groups that drew up the Platform, who described how they worked on the guidelines and decisions for the coming Congress. These interviews have stimulated the Communists' discussion of LCY policy between the two congresses. The same purpose was served by interviews of all chairmen and many of the committee members that prepared the republican congresses and regional conferences of the LCY.

To involve all LCY members in the preparations and the discussion of the Platform, *Komunist* publbished its text in full, and is printing a series of articles under a special plan, organizing a discussion of the key issues raised in the Platform. Let me name a few: development of socialist relations of production based on

self-management; strengthening the decisive role of the working class in decision-making based on self-management concerning all relevant issues of developing socialist society; implementation of the principles of democratic centralism and the League's class role in society; the role of the League and its Program in assuring creative freedom for science, culture and education; the League's task in promoting consistent implementation of non-aligned Yugoslavia's foreign policy as a contribution to the worldwide process of socialist construction; the role and significance of non-alignment in securing equality for all peoples, and the final decolonization of the world.

The preparations for the 10th Congress have entered their final stage. Our paper has already covered the results of the discussion of some of the draft resolutions, and in the period left before the opening of the Congress will continue a broad discussion of the provisions to be recorded in congress documents.

What we regard as particularly important is that *Komunist* devotes ever more space to workers, people in production, farmers, the youth, and 'rank-and-file' members of the League, who deal with problems coming up at the Congress. This is how *Komunist* participates in the preparations for the 10th Congress, a forum of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, all its organizations, all members, and an event in which they have a vital stake and to the preparation of which they are all making a vital contribution.

Question: The politico-ideological influence of Communists depends on their own Marxist-Leninist theoretical grounding. What materials promoting theoretical education of cadres does *Komunist* publish?

Answer: I should like to stress that the LCY is not only concerned with raising the theoretical and ideological level of its members, but that it also pursues longer-term strategic aims; it regards political, ideological and theoretical education as continuous training of Communists for concrete participation in building socialism based on self-management. This is why the League urges consistent study of Marxist-Leninist theory. Enterprises, communes, regions and republics have Marxist centers and political schools with comprehensive curricula, providing a grounding in Marxism-Leninism and raising the ideological level of Communists. The curricula are oriented on the use of Marxism-Leninism in our conditions: the building of socialist society based on self-management.

The *Komunist* examines the rich and varied experience of our far-flung political education system. By so doing, it furthers the League's work of raising the Marxist-Leninist education of Communists. In its many articles on the subject, the paper tries to show as graphically as possible how Marxism-Leninism is to be applied to our conditions. Many of the articles about League

activity, quite routine at first glance, are in fact designed to raise the political and ideological level of Communists. As concerns material specially intended for the purpose, the paper has a column, 'Thought and Practice,' in which the use of Marxism-Leninism in our country is popularly set forth. The column deals with such topics as self-management – a form of proletarian dictatorship; the role of the state in building socialism on the basis of self-government; the fallacy of quasi-Leftism from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint; the origins of anarcho-liberalism and technocratic conceptions. Many other topical problems are raised to illustrate revolutionary creative use of Marxism-Leninism. I might add that as a publishing enterprise, *Komunist* also issues a number of journals directly engaged in analyzing the politico-ideological work of the LCY.

Question: As emphasized by LCY Chairman Josip Broz Tito, and other leaders, fortifying the leading role of the LCY implies greater responsibility for every Communist. What does *Komunist* do to create an atmosphere of high Party responsibility?

Answer: It is quite true that Comrade Tito and other leaders, and the leading organs of the League, have repeatedly drawn attention to the necessity of increasing the leading role of the LCY and the responsibility of every Communist. However, Comrade Tito and all the leading League bodies stress continuously that the effort to fortify the leading role should not be reduced to issuing orders, that it implies debate, convincing arguments, the revolutionary activity by the League of Communists as the vanguard of the working class. It is the duty of every League member to participate in implementing the conception of building socialsm based on self-management, and to promote in his own environment, among workers and other working people, the policy of the LCY. As for the League as a whole, it conducts concrete activity designed to discharge its Program, according to which it is our aim to implement the power of the working class rather than power in the name of the working class. For the working class of Yugoslavia the League of Communists is a genuine revolutionary vanguard, the guarantee of its present and historical interests. This is borne out by the visibly greater influx of workers to the League.

Clearly, the LCY has every opportunity to perform its politico-ideological vanguard role effectively and successfully without administrative fiat, but also without group conflicts or abstract discussions, through consistent observance of the principles of democratic centralism. The principles of democratic centralism are implemented in our country in a setting of broad democratic discussion and participation of all Communists in shaping the policy of the LCY. At the same time these principles imply obligatory responsibility of all organizations, their members, all leading League bodies, for the consistent implementation of the League's gudelines and decisions adopted as a result of such discussion.

Komunist throws its pages open to broad discussions and participation in working out the gudelines and decisions of the LCY.

Furthermore, it gives coverage to the implementation of the guidelines and thereby participates in creating a climate of high Party responsibility for the policy they have approved among all members, organizations, and leading League bodies.

Straight talk

Comment

There are occasions, Lenin once said, 'when the nature of a certain order of things is revealed, as it were, suddenly, and with extraordinary power and clarity in connection with some relatively minor happening' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 153). Something of the kind occurred recently in a routine weekly television program, 'Washington Straight Talk.'

Time magazine correspondent Hugh Sidey asked U.S. Defense Secretary James Schlesinger what he thought of the likelihood of U.S. armed forces capturing mid-East oil fields if the Arab oil embargo continued. Naturally, the experienced newsman put the sensitive question in a hypothetical form.

Something like this: Voices are already heard in business circles that the Arab countries should simply be colonized, that their oil is not only for them but the rest of the world. Fifty years ago this would be all right. Troops could be shipped in to take control. Could things come to a point where people in our country will demand a demonstration of force?*

The Defense Secretary, introduced to the TV audience as an 'economist and administrator,' had an excellent opportunity to dissociate himself from the interventionist imperialist posture. Hadn't the world heard Washington proclaim of late that U.S. capitalism has changed beyond recognition, turned its back on its imperialist past, dropped brute force, relinquished thoughts of conquest, and was championing the rights and interests of small and weak countries?

Televiewers most probably expected something of the same kind from James Schlesinger. But the 'economist and administrator' talked straight. It never occurred to him to say that imperialist interference in Arab affairs was out of the question.

'That is running too high a risk,' he remarked nonchalantly. 'One

*Sidey doubtless refers not to some fancied 'voices,' but specific statements, and not only by businessmen. Mr. Schlesinger's subordinate, West Point superintendent Lt. Gen. William Knowlton declared in so many words that the oil crisis 'raises the question– will armed forces have to be used, or will armed forces have to be present?' At least one other proponent of 'internationalizing' the Arab oilfields is presidential adviser Walter Levy, who, according to the French press, said that oil is 'a raw material that doesn't belong to any one state.'

should not tempt fate by pushing the concept of national sovereignty too far . . .'

Good that the Defense Secretary is aware of the risks of armed overseas adventures. Though it is no extraordinary intellectual feat these days, since the United States' experience in Vietnam. But Schlesinger went on to confuse the issue with talk about the risks and dangers of the Mid-East states' policy, 'crippling the large mass of the industrial world.' In effect, he issued a flimsily veiled threat when he said Washington would not 'come to the contingency of military intervention' because it expected the Arab states to reverse their oil policy.

Not surprisingly, the Arab public reacted sharply to this ill-disguised blackmail. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, the chief targets of Schlensinger's threats, made preparations for mining their oil fields and blowing them up should the American 'internationalists' go from words to action.

That there is never smoke without fire and that Schlesinger's straight talk reflected the thinking in the Pentagon, was borne out by reports in the West European, principally French, press. On the day after his TV appearance, the French *l'Aurore* said in an article, 'Lightning War to Occupy Arab Oil Wells?' that 'the idea of an American armed response is less and less unlikely. This threat, expressed among others by Secretary of State Kissinger, looks like a new factor in U.S. policy towards the Arab "boycott".'

The press reported that the operation planned by the Pentagon thinkers under the code name Volcano, consists of two phases. It is to open with Israeli paratroopers landing near the oil fields in Saudi Arabia, and in its second phase envisages intervention by the U.S. Seventh Fleet to 'separate' the combatants – Israelis and Arabs. It is perhaps no accident that ships of the Seventh Fleet are now located in the northern part of the Indian Ocean.

Irrespective of the accuracy of the French press, the elements of this report are typical for U.S. imperialism's adventurist strategy (the code name, too, has a prophetic ring, for any attempt to put the plan into practice could trigger truly volcanic eruptions on the international scene). The use of Israel as the detonator in another aggression against the Arab world to capture its oil certainly looks credible. So does the piratic role assigned to the U.S. Seventh Fleet. And by the way, it shows that the U.S. drive for naval bases in the Indian Ocean is not motivated by any fear of the alleged 'Soviet threat' in the region, but by aggressive designs against the Arab states in the Persian Gulf.

Yes, the talk in Washington this time was really straight: as soon as imperialism's interests are in the least jeopardized, it substitutes undisguised blackmail, frequently a prelude to outright aggression, for honeyed words of peace.

L. Dean

Books in brief

Bulgarskata komunisticheska partiya – rukovoditel i organizator na izgrazhdaneto razvito sotsialisticheska obchestvo v Bulgaria (The Bulgarian Communist Party – Leader and Organizer of the Building of a Developed Socialist Society in Bulgaria.) Sofia, Partizdat, 1974. 600 pp.

A collection of articles by scientists investigating both the general problems of building a developed socialist soceity and the concrete problems of economic policy.

Vizit Leonida Ilyicha Brezhneva v respubliku Kuba. (Visit of Leonid Brezhnev to the Republic of Cuba.) Moscow, Politizdat, 1974. 112 pp. Materials on the friendly official visit of the General Secretary of the CC CPSU to Cuba, January 28-February 3, 1974.

El imperialismo hoy. Cifras, hechos, America Latina (Imperialism Today. Figures, Facts, Latin America.) Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1973. 221 pp.

A collection of studies of modern imperialism that reveal the scope of imperialist plunder in Latin America.

A. CABRAL. *Revolyutsia v Gvineye* (Revolution in Guinea). Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1973. 280 pp.

An examination of imperialist policy and the motive forces of the liberation revolution, and a summing-up of the experience of the armed struggle of the people of Guinea-Bissau. The author emphasizes that the victory of the liberation revolution is impossible without the closest links between the struggle of the oppressed peoples with the struggle of the international working class movement and active solidarity with the Soviet people and the socialist countries.

A. LERUMO. *50 let borby, Istotria Yuzhno-afrikanskoi kommunisticheskoi partii, 1921-1971* (Fifty Years of Struggle. A History of the South African Communist Party, 1921-1971.) Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1973. 331 pp.

In his preface to the Russian edition the author writes that he is sure the publication of this book will be greeted with great satisfaction by Communists and revolutionary democrats in South Africa. A deeper acquaintance with the past and present of this struggle, he points out, will help further to strengthen the friendship of the peoples, tried and tested in the crucible of struggle.

G. Y. GLEZERMAN, O. RHEINGOLD, and others. *Razvitoye sotzialisticheskoye obshchestvo: sushchnost, kriterii zrelosti, kritika revizionistskikh kontseptsii* (Developed Socialist Society: Its Essence, Indicators of Maturity, Criticism of Revisionist Views.) Moscow, Mysl Publishers; Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1973. 422 pp.
One of not many works specifically devoted to developed socialism. It makes use of the contribution to, and findings of, a joint sym-

posium sponsored by the Academy of Social Sciences of the CC CPSU and the Institute of Social Sciences of the CC SUPG held in Moscow in November 1971.

Rada vzajemne hospodarske pomoci. Sbornik dokumentu o vyvoji a cinnosti RVHP, 1949-1973 (The Council of Mutual Economic Assistance. Documents on its Development and Activities, 1949-1973.) Prague, Svoboda Publishers, 1973. 380 pp.

Important CMEA documents reflecting the main stages of its development and prospects.

GUS HALL. The High Crimes and Misdemeanors of Monopoly Capitalism. New York, New Outlook Publishers, 1974. 71 pp.

The two-party system in the United States, which so admirably suits monopoly interests, is increasingly coming into contradiction with the requirements of the time. But the leaders of the two bourgeois parties are unable to offer a way out of the difficulties besetting American society. The growth of the movement against imperialist policy and racism is testimony to the need for a change in the social structure. The General Secretary of the CPUSA outlines the perspectives for the work of the Communist Party.

R. STEIGERWALD, *Marxismus — Religion — Gegenwart* (Marxism, Religion, Our Times.) Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Marxistische Blaetter, 1973, 188 pp.

The author, a well-known Communist philosopher, discusses new processes taking place within the church and among the masses of believers, the relationship between Marxists and Christians, present-day theology and Marxist criticism of religion. He emphasizes that the pivotal issue of life today is ideological contention, not ideological coexistence.



Brief information on Communist and Workers' Parties

COMMUNIST PARTY OF IRELAND

First formed in Ireland in 1921. In the complex situation that followed the Irish Civil War (1922-23) and the partitioning, by the British imperialists, of the island into two states, the Party lapsed. Those who abided by Marxist-Leninist positions formed later the Irish Revolutionary Workers' Groups (RWG) with the aim of reconstituting the Party.

In June 1933, in semi-legal conditions, the conference of the RWG to reconstitute the Communist Party of Ireland took place. The CPI functioned throughout the country till 1940. As World War II developed, and particularly after the Nazi attack on the USSR, the Party made considerable progress in Northern Ireland, but in the South it declined. In the North, the Party developed as the autonomous Communist Party of Northern Ireland, and in the South it functioned from 1944 to 1962, also as a separate party, called the Irish Workers' League and then the Irish Workers' Party.

On March 15, 1970, the CPNI and IWP were reunified at a special congress as the Communist Party of Ireland. The congress adopted a Constitution and a Manifesto and elected a National Executive Committee. As a result, the Communist movement in Ireland benefitted considerably, both organizationally and ideologically.

The National Executive Committee has overall authority between congresses in both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. The Party organization within the two states consists of two area committees.

Workers make up 90 per cent of the CPI membership, whose average age is 30 to 40 years.

The Party wields considerable influence in the trade unions and the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA). Some leading members of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions, the national trade union center which covers both states, and the NICRA belong to the Party leadership. Numerous CPI members are active on trade union district committees and as branch officials, shop stewards, etc., as well as in other public and professional organizations.

The Connolly Youth Movement, which is the largest and most active youth organization on the island, is fraternally linked with the CPI.

The Party publishes a weekly paper *Unity* in Belfast. In Dublin

it publishes the weekly *Irish Worker's Voice* and the monthly *Irish Socialist*. There is also the theoretical quarterly, *Irish Socialist Review*, which appears in Dublin.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Founded on August 26, 1930 – anniversary of the 'Cry of Balintawak'* – and proclaimed on November 7, 1930 – anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution – a fact reflecting the national-internationalist outlook of the Party since its inception.

In the 43 years of its existence, the Party was legal for not more than eight years: two years after its founding, four years after its legalization in 1938 and less than two years after the end of the Second World War.

It held four congresses during its legal existence, and one illegal congress in 1973. The Party Program and Constitution, adopted originally in 1931, were twice revised, once in 1938 when the Communist and Socialist parties of the Philippines were merged into one legal party, and again in 1973, after the imposition of martial law.

Even during periods of illegality and suppression, the CPP managed to work within and lead legal mass organizations and struggles of workers, peasants, students and intellectuals, youth and women. It participated in electoral struggles, winning many local positions in areas of its greatest influence before and after the war, and a few seats in the National Congress. It also participated in and led armed struggles, first during the Japanese occupation, when the Hukbalahap (Anti-Japanese People's Army) was organized, and then shortly after American reoccupation, when the pro-Japanese collaborators were prodded and supported by the Americans to suppress the growing national-liberation movement. The Party suffered serious losses at the time.

The survivors of the defeat succeeded in reorganizing the Party and began to lead anew legal mass movements and struggles of workers, peasants and students. But the Party's activity was complicated by the divisive tactics of the local Maoists, who formed an organization of their own. The Maoists' adventurist actions provided an excuse for the imposition of martial law in 1972.

The basic unit of the Party is the nucleus, organized in factories, big landed estates, schools and universities, government offices, the mass media, prisons, and in barrios in rural and streets in urban areas.

The highest authority is Congress, which elects the Central Committee. The latter elects the Political Bureau and Secretariat, which directs Party activities in between Central Committee conferences. Intermediate leading organs vary in accordance with time and place.

The CPP has conducted Party and mass schools during both its legal and illegal existence.

*The call for insurrection against Spanish rule, launched from the town of Balintawak in 1896. – *Ed.*

It circulated mass publications during its period of legality, and irregularly in conditions of extreme clandestinity. Its earliest mass paper was *Kalayaan* (Freedom), published regularly before the Second World War. During the short period of legality after the war, it published *Katubusan* (Redemption). Its latest publications are *Ang Komunista* (The Communist) for mass circulation, and *Organisador* (The Organizer), exclusively for the Party membership. It also publishes the *World Outlook*, which reprints articles from the *World Marxist Review* and the theoretical journals of fraternal parties.

First World Peace Congress

The history of the peace fight includes events crucial to the development of this democratic movement. Such an event was the First World Peace Congress which took place a quarter of a century ago, April 20-25, 1949, in Paris and Prague.

The sponsors were the International Bureau of Cultural Workers for Peace, the World Democratic Women's Federation, and public figures of 17 countries. In their Appeal to all democratic organizations and champions of peace they outlined the compelling reasons prompting the calling of such a Congress. Towards the end of the 40s an uncontrolled arms race had started, imperialist military blocs had been created threatening the peaceful future of peoples, and new hotbeds of war had arisen in various parts of the world. Enmity and hatred and war propaganda were being openly spread by aggressive circles. The American imperialists aimed to 'roll back socialism' in the countries of Eastern Europe. In these circumstances it was essential to unify all the active forces of the peoples in defense of peace.

The Appeal met with a lively response everywhere. More than 2,000 peace fighters from 72 countries, representing national and international organizations, set out for Paris. In round figures they represented more than 600 million. However, the French authorities, in the spirit of the cold war, denied entry to many delegates, who were subsequently welcomed in Prague. Those attending the meetings in the Czechoslovak capital described their session as an 'integral part of the Paris Congress.'

Professor Frederick Joliot-Curie, Chairman of the Preparatory Committee of the Congress, in his speech sounded a serious warning to the 'supporters of war' – they were not being asked for peace, peace would be forced upon them, he said. Joliot-Curie and his colleagues fully understood all the complexity of the tasks which had fallen to their lot. No single people, or isolated personality, they said, would be able to save itself from the danger of

war; only the united efforts of the peoples of all countries would make the achievement of this aim possible.

The participants of the Congress pointed to the danger of two extremes: underestimation of the strength of the fomenters of war, which could lead to passivity, or an over-estimation of their possibilities, which could lead to pessimism. Representatives of the working class, trade union leaders, scholars, writers, artists and churchmen expressed their views on the most effective ways to arouse various classes and sections of the people in defense of peace.

The Congress devoted particular attention to the threat of an atomic war. The supporters of peace realized that in order to frustrate American imperialism's plans for world domination, it was essential to expose the monstrous design of the inciters of atomic war, subject them to severe condemnation, and to prove that in our epoch, an epoch in which the balance of forces is changing in favor of socialism, the people cannot be frightened by even the most sinister threats.

The People's Assembly, as the Paris forum was called, elected a Permanent Committee of the World Congress of Peace Fighters. The following year this was reorganized into the World Peace Council. In close collaboration with national peace committees it has since carried out fruitful work in the organizational strengthening of the anti-war movement.

The WPC and the movement which it led added many glorious pages to the annals of the people's struggle against imperialist wars and aggression, for developing a healthier international climate, for putting into effect the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It is sufficient only to recall the 500 million signatures collected for the Stockholm Appeal in 1950, which demanded the banning of atomic weapons, the movements for an end to the aggression in Korea, cessation of the French colonial wars in Indochina and Algeria, and also the mass protests against American aggression in Vietnam.

The imperialists did not hide ferocious hatred of the peace fight. By various means they tried to silence or distort its aims, to throw the movement into confusion. They labelled it 'a communist propaganda stunt,' although every unprejudiced person could see that this movement included Communists, Social-Democrats, Catholics, Liberals and representatives of other political parties and groups.

During the past decade the peace movement has made important qualitative advances. Increasingly it is becoming associated with the peoples' struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, while new, organized sections of the working class are coming into the movement. In 1972, the first-ever Assembly on European Security and Cooperation was held in Brussels and brought new forces into this struggle. The peace movement is on the rise in the developing countries. The first conference of National Peace Committees of African countries was held in Bamako in 1973, and in Dacca there was an International Conference on questions of security and co-

operation in Asia, attended by delegates from 26 countries and also representatives of the World Peace Council and other international organizations.

During these 25 years the peace movement has traversed a long road and achieved considerable successes, thanks to its mass character, its determination and its ability to assess tasks and aims which are understood and supported by wide sections of the people.

A new, powerful impetus to the movement was provided by the World Congress of Peace Forces held in Moscow in October 1973. Delegates to the Moscow forum gathered from almost 1,100 national bodies from 143 countries and more than 120 international organizations. Representatives of the UN, its committees and specialized agencies also actively participated. The Congress vividly marked the powerful and courageous advances which the movement of peace fighters had achieved in a quarter of a century.

The session of the World Peace Council which met in Sofia in February 1974, adopted a basic document, a call 'For a Stable, Democratic and Just Peace,' as well as a resolution on the situation in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and the Middle East.

Today millions of anti-war fighters see their task as one to guarantee mankind a stable, just and democratic peace, and to make détente irreversible. *V.P.*

DIARY

The General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party, Comrade Alvaro Cunhal, visited the Editorial offices of *WMR*. He spoke to the members of the Editorial Council about the changes in the balance of political forces in Portugal, the deep crisis of Catano's fascist regime, its new colonialist maneuvers, the developing struggle of the masses led by the Communist Party and other democratic forces against the dictatorship, for an end to the colonial war in Africa, for the independence of Portugal's colonies, and for a solution to the social problems of Portugal.

At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium, Comrade Jaime Schmirgeld, CC member of the Communist Party of Argentina and its representative on the Editorial Board of *World Marxist Review*, attended the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium, which was held on December 14-16, 1973.

At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria a *WMR* delegation attended its 22nd Congress, held January 18-20. The delegation consisted of Comrade Tsogtyn Namsarai, candidate member, CC Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, and member of the Editorial Board of the journal, and Comrade Sebastian Zapirain, CC member, Communist Party of Spain and its representative on the Editorial Council.

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM' 1974

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd., 37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C. 1, England.

Progress Subscription Service, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, M5V 1T4, Canada.

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism, 5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi, India.

FRENCH EDITIONS:

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale):

Société d'Edition et d'Information, 9 Boulevard des Italiens, Paris (2e), France.

Librairie Rousseau, 36 rue J.-J. Rousseau, Genève, Suisse.

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

Socialist Studies Institution, Dar Al-Hilal P.O.B., Cairo, Egypt.

ETH-Thaqafa el-jadida, Place: Tahrir Baghdad, Iraq.

BENGALI EDITION: Manisha Granthalay Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee St., Calcutta — 12, India.

BULGARIAN EDITION: "Russki" 6, "Hemus," Sofia, Bulgaria.

CZECH EDITION: Artia, Praha 2, Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden, Dr. Tvaergade 3, 1302, Kobenhavn K., Denmark.

FINNISH EDITION:
Aikakauslehti Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

GERMAN EDITIONS:
Deutscher Buch-Export und-Import GmbH, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, GDR.

"Globus," Vertrieb ausländischer Zeitschriften, 1200 Wien, Höchstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldtstrasse 46, Switzerland.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literatur-Vertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITION: Laikon Praktorion, Tricoupi St. 53 r, Nicosia, Cyprus.

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura, Konyv-és Hirlap külkereskedelmi Vallalat, Budapest 1., Fö u 32, Hungary.

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4, Roma, Italy.

JAPANESE EDITION: Nauka Ltd. 2, Kanda-Zinbocho 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

MONGOLIAN EDITION:
Mongolgosknigotorg, ul. Lenina 41, Ulan Bator, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715, Oslo, Norway.

PERSIAN EDITION: P.B. 49034, 10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden.

POLISH EDITION: RSW, "Prasa-ksiazka-ruch" BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

RUMANIAN EDITION: I.C.E. "Libri," Calea Victoriei 126, Bucuresti, Rumanla.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya kniga, Moscow C-200, USSR.

EDITIONS IN SPANISH:
Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Nacional 1253, Bogota, Colombia.

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos, Casilia Correo 589, Montevideo, Uruguay.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular, San Juan de Letran, 37 —4° piso Mexico 1, D.F.

Ideologia y Politica, jr. Moquegua 718-203, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracas, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Editorial "Anteo," Buenos Aires. Argentina.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o' xuât nhap khâu sách báo 32, Hai Bá Tru'ng, Hà-nôi.