WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

January 1977, Vol. 20, No. 1 75¢



Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

January 1977, Vol. 20, No. 1

Features

3 To our readers

4 For new frontiers in détente, for stronger security and broader cooperation in Europe

5 Some lessons of socialist construction in Hungary
J. Kadar

18 Results and prospects of the Portuguese revolution
A. Cunhal

31 Time of big and realistic hopes
M. Reimann

Party experience

40 Alternative to monopoly policy
W. Kashtan

50 Reflections on the 1,000 days of Popular Unity rule
V. Teitelboim

62 The progressive program and working people's activity
A. Menon

69 For a big mass Communist Party
S. Zapirain

Viewpoints

74 Material basis of the socialist community
P. Verner

82 Will of the unsubdued people of Cyprus
E. Papaioannou

87 Communist internationalism: a factor we can rely on
C. Rocha

92 French imperialism on the world scene
M. Verlet

102 A journey into inflation
B. Sinclair

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

106 The social purpose of artistic creation
R. Gamzatov

Exchange of views

114 On ideological and political pluralism
A. Kozharov

123 The new internationalism
A. Rubbi

The press

130 Dangerous myths
S. Mokshin

Facts and figures

137 Capitalist economic crises

Represented on the Editorial Board and Editorial Council of PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM are the Communist and Workers' parties of the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Senegal, South African Republic, Spain, Soviet Union, Sudan, Syria, Sweden, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada. ISSN 0043-8642

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: $6.00 a year. Single copies 75 cents. Overseas $9.50.

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

Subscriptions to these may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION 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.

feature

TO OUR READERS

Dear Friends,

The Editorial Board, Editorial Council and international staff of *World Marxist Review* convey best wishes for the New Year. We wish you good health, happiness and success in your particular field. We wish to thank all readers for their suggestions and remarks which help to improve the journal, and we thank everyone who contributed to its circulation. We look forward to still closer contacts with our readers in the New Year. We welcome more letters, articles, notes on the thoughts and deeds of the working people and Communists in all the five continents.

In offering our opening issue of 1977, we assure you that the journal will continue to contribute to internationalist cooperation and solidarity of fraternal Communist and Workers' parties and to the unity of all the progressive and anti-imperialist forces working for peace, security and social progress.

In line with the recommendations of Communist and Workers' parties, we will continue actively to popularize the ideas of scientific socialism, share in the creative elaboration of major problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and keep readers in touch with activities of fraternal parties.

May the New Year — the year of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution — be marked by new victories in the struggle for the triumph of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

Happy New Year, Comrades.

For new frontiers in détente, for stronger security and broader cooperation in Europe

As already reported in the press, the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Treaty Organization met in Bucharest toward the close of November. The meeting was attended by delegates from the following countries: the People's Republic of Bulgaria, led by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary, CC BCP and Chairman of the State Council; the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, led by Gustav Husak, General Secretary, CC CPCz and President of the Republic; the German Democratic Republic, led by Erich Honecker, General Secretary, CC SUPG and Chairman of the State Council; the Hungarian People's Republic, led by Janos Kadar, First Secretary, CC HSWP; the Polish People's Republic, led by Edward Gierek, First Secretary, CC PUWP; the Socialist Republic of Rumania, led by Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary, RCP and President of the Republic; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, led by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary, CC CPSU.

Established in accordance with the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance the socialist countries concluded in Warsaw on May 14, 1955, the Political Consultative Committee is the supreme political authority of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Its jurisdiction includes consultations between member states and examination of problems that arise in the course of implementing the Treaty.

In the more than 20-year history of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, its Political Consultative Committee adopted such documents as the Declaration on strengthening peace and security in Europe (Bucharest 1966), Appeal of the Warsaw Treaty states to all European countries (Budapest 1969), Statement on questions pertaining to the strengthening of security and the development of peaceful cooperation in Europe (Berlin 1970), Declaration on peace, security and cooperation in Europe (Prague 1972), Communique of Political Consultative Committee meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Organization (Warsaw 1974).

The participants in the November 1976 PCC Bucharest meeting unanimously adopted the delcaration 'For the Further Advancement

of Détente and the Consolidation of Security and Development of Cooperation in Europe.' There was an exchange of views on the problems involved in the continued struggle for peace and extension of détente. The leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries noted that events since the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe have confirmed the vast positive significance of its results and of the obligations assumed by its participants under the Final Act.

The obligation undertaken by all the states that signed the Final Act not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other, the Bucharest conference noted, accords with the strengthening of peace, security and trust among countries and peoples. It was decided to submit the draft treaty approved by the meeting, together with the appropriate appeal of the Warsaw Treaty countries, to all other countries represented at Helsinki for their consideration.

With a view to perfecting the mechanism of political cooperation within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty, it was decided to set up a Foreign Ministers Committee and a joint secretariat as organs of the Political Consultative Committee.

The PCC conference was held in an atmosphere of complete mutual understanding, fraternal friendship and close cooperation. The discussion demonstrated the identity of views of the Warsaw Treaty countries on fundamental problems of world politics and reaffirmed their community of aims in the struggle for peace and socialism, international cooperation and friendship among the peoples.

World Marxist Review intends to publish in one of its early issues an article on the results of the Bucharest meeting.

Some lessons of socialist construction in Hungary

Janos Kadar
First Secretary,
CC Hungarian Socialist
Workers' Party

Such events in Hungary's modern history as the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1919; the fascist Horthy regime between the two world wars; the second victory of working-class power in 1948, after the country's liberation; the 1956 counter-revolutionary

rising and its subsequent suppression, show that the class struggle in Hungary has often been extremely intensive and has clear and unforgettable lessons for us.

The path traversed by our Party and working class was not an easy one. In our long struggle successes alternated with setbacks. The facts show that the Party has drawn the necessary lessons and that our working class and people emerged from these ordeals with added strength. The 11th Congress of the HSWP in the spring of 1975 had every right to declare, in its assessment of the situation: 'Over the past 20 years the internal situation has been stable, development has been steady and dynamic, the people accept the Party's leadership, working-class power and the positions of socialism are strong and durable. Our republic is successfully building a developed socialist society.'

The Congress adopted a program statement setting out the main tasks for the next 15-20 years, emphasizing that this will carry us a long way toward our ultimate goal of a classless communist society. The Congress consolidated and, in conformity with the new requirements developed, the Party's general political line forged in momentous struggles, formulated the key principles of our policy and singled out the essential elements in our practical activity. I propose to discuss some of these elements.

Patriotism — internationalism

The revolutionary vanguard of the Hungarian working class, our Party has from its very inception, in November 1918 been a patriotic and internationalist Party, and under all circumstances has consistently remained true to these principles. Now, in building socialist society, it considers it its priority duty to take account both of our specific national conditions and of the common international regularities of building socialism.

The Hungarian people enjoy national independence and sovereignty; exploitation of man by man has been abolished; a developed socialist society is being built, and socialist patriotism has become a moral code. The Party and working class, which play the leading role in our society, give expression to our national interests, are the inheritors and continuers of Hungary's progressive traditions, the custodians of all the genuine values of our national past. Our Party deems it its duty to maintain and enhance respect for these progressive traditions, especially by the young generation. Effective patriotism is a great stimulating force in building socialism. The people's acceptance of the building of developed socialism as their national program is for us an immense source of strength.

Our Party maintains that patriotism in inseparable from proletarian

internationalism, that these two noble ideas are two aspects of fidelity to socialism. In present-day conditions we consider the following to be the main criteria of proletarian internationalism: coordination of national and international interests; promotion of unity; friendly mutual assistance and comradely cooperation; formulation of collective positions and actions on major political issues, but on the basis of independence, equality and voluntary cooperation of fraternal parties. The recent experience of the international communist movement, the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, have highlighted the special importance of systematic bilateral and multilateral exchanges of views, continued joint development of Marxist-Leninist theory, upon which our movement rests, ideological cooperation, and generalization of experience.

The study, assimilation and correct application of the experience of the international communist and workers' movement is, we believe, a major element of proletarian internationalism. At the same time, however, the fraternal parties enrich the ideological fund of Marxism-Leninism by their own experience of struggle and activity.

Alongside its own experience, the HSWP, now as always, attaches great importance to the experience of the international working-class movement and of the fraternal parties. Our Party continues to learn from all the Communist parties and all the revolutionary forces. And of especial importance for us is the vast theoretical and practical experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union founded by Lenin, and the development of the world's first socialist state, which blazed the trail into the future. The world's revolutionary forces have always drawn on the inexhaustible treasure-store of the historic experience of the Soviet Union, which this year will be celebrating the 60th anniversary of Soviet power. And this will be so in future, too.

Drawing on the experience of others is not the same as mechanical copying and does not impair a party's independence. For each Party is responsible for what experience it draws on and how it uses it. Our own Party makes a point of applying the commonly valid doctrine of Marxism-Leninism with full account to Hungary's historical, political, economic and other pecularities. This is expressive of the fact that ours is, at one and the same time, a patriotic and internationalist Party.

The Party

It is a fundamental proposition of Marxism-Leninism that the working-class party plays the decisive role in directing the socialist revolution. The party is the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary vanguard of the working class, its supreme political organization representing

and implementing the interests of the entire working class and the entire people.

In all its activities the HSWP is guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the Leninist norms of Party life. The HSWP is the recognized leading force in Hungarian society and this is formalized in the Constitution. Today, our Party is directing the building of a developed socialist society.

Our experience has taught us the vast importance of a correct interpretation of the Party's leading role. In the past there have been mechanical interpretations, according to which the Party must itself, directly, decide on everything, that it can play its leading role only if it itself undertakes to accomplish practical tasks. Some went to the other extreme: the leading role of the Party can be confined to supervising ideological activity.

Now, however, having drawn the necessary lessons from the past, the Party's leading role is carried out as follows: it takes the initiative, determines the main direction of the country's constructive effort, convinces non-Party people and all the working people of the correctness of its policy, mobilizes them to fulfill our plans and controls fulfillment. Party decisions are binding only on the Party and its members. And all Party members in administrative and economic departments and in the mass organizations are responsible to the Party for carrying out these decisions. We do not regard our leading role as a privilege, but rather as a service to the people, as a duty to formulate the tasks ahead in good time and in conformity with the people's interests. Communists must set an example in every sphere of endeavor.

As a result of historic development and the political unity of the working class, Hungary has a one-party system. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party was formed by merger of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties, a merger that materialized the workers' desire for unity. Our party thus expresses the interests of a united working class. Its founding about 30 years ago was essential to the winning of working-class power and the building of socialism.

A one-party or multi-party system is not, in our opinion, fundamental to the building of socialism. And there are many examples of socialism being built in countries with more than one party. The decisive factor is militant unity, the political cohesion of the progressive forces committed to socialism.

There is an important conclusion to be drawn from the fact that, though different classes still exist in our society, ours is the only ruling party. This makes it incumbent on us to reckon with and coordinate the various interests within the society. Social and politi-

cal development has led to the elimination of the former exploiter classes, so that today there are only friendly working classes and strata whose basic interests coincide. Nevertheless, beside the overall interests of society, there are different group and personal interests. The Party recognizes this and considers it its duty to cater to them, but with priority to the overall interests of society. The social and mass organizations and movements, notably the trade unions, cooperatives and youth organizations, play an important part in expressing these group and personal interests. Systematic exchange of opinions at various levels between representatives of the Party and government and these mass organizations make in possible to take into account and coordinate these group and personal interests. That has been our practice for a long time now and it has fully proved its effectiveness.

The Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party is a living, active and developing organism whose aims and structure must always be abreast of the requirements of the times. Our Party has always strictly adhered to the principle of democratic centralism both in its structure and activity. The Party's vanguard role has a different meaning today than in the early period, particularly when it was illegal, operating within a narrow framework and was a party of professional revolutionaries and not, in effect, a mass party. Today, the vanguard role means, on the one hand, uniting all the progressive forces on the various sectors of socialist construction and representing all the classes and strata of society, and, on the other, directing social development.

The influx of new generations of Communists and the new problems that arise in the process of socialist construction require that the Party improve its style of work, that it always be attuned to the requirements of our age, that Party members steadily improve their Marxist-Leninist training and strengthen their ties with the masses. That was facilitated by the 1975 exchange of Party cards, which strengthened the Party's ideological and political cohesion and unity, and also by the recent Central Committee decision on the Marxist-Leninist training of Party members and the expansion of Party propaganda.

By serving the interests of the broad masses, our Party, the working-class vanguard, extends its mass basis and in this way is increasingly becoming a party of all the working people. That is stressed in our program statement: 'In the continued process of social development, as the distinctions between social classes and strata are narrowed, the Party becomes the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the entire people.'

The policy of alliance of all classes and strata of the working people

The leading role of the Party is necessary. But history is made by the people, and socialist society can be established only by the people. The Party, if only because of its numerical size, cannot build socialist society single-handed. The new society is built by all the people, and the building has to be done, under Party leadership, by the joint efforts of Communists and non-Party people, by the people, the masses, the makers of history. The Party and its members can move ahead only together with the people, for the point and purpose of their life is serving the people. Consequently, the results of the Party's work in directing socialist construction depend on its ability to rally the non-Party masses. Without allies, without the masses, victory is inconceivable. Hence, the policy of alliance of all classes and strata of the working people, the constant strengthening of our ties with the masses, is for the Party not a question of tactics, but a political question of the utmost importance.

Alliance policy is a class policy. Above all, it is a policy of alliance of classes based on uninterrupted strengthening of the worker-peasant alliance. Our alliance policy also reflects the cohesion of the 750,000 Hungarian Communists and the millions of non-Party working people. Our experience has shown that close ties with the masses rests on their confidence, which the Party must win again and again. Our 11th Party Congress approved this gratifying statement: 'Close ties, unity of Party and people, mutual trust between the Party and the masses, is something we prize above all else. The people know that, under all circumstances, they can rely on our battle-tempered Party, and the Party knows that in the accomplishment of any task it can rely on the people, on the steadily growing socialisty unity of the nation.'

We have learned that we must find allies and appeal to the masses not only in difficult situations, but also when things are going well. Our Party has pursued an alliance policy from its very inception and it has been successful when its ties with the masses were strong. But when these ties, because of a supercilious or unprincipled attitude to our allies, weakened, the Party suffered reverses.

The alliance policy implies, above all, political cooperation based on common interests and aims. A cardinal feature of this policy is that the Party, as the vanguard, must indicate the path ahead, but only if the masses are convinced of its correctness, only if we have won their support, their readiness to follow our lead. In the past there were cases when we advanced too fast, ran ahead and had to turn back to reality and find correct ways and methods. That is what happened with the socialist reorganization of agriculture, when after several

inadequately substantiated attempts we finally solved the problem in 1958-61 by strengthening the worker-peasant alliance, heeding the intentions and interests of the peasant masses and stringently adhering to the voluntary principle.

We must from day to day convince our allies of the correctness of our long-range aims and in this way broaden support for our cause and our ideas. It is no exaggeration to say that the Hungarian people support our political aims. However, setting a proper development pace of socialist revolution is a political question that always demands very close study. It is practice that convinces our allies of the correctness of our policy. And there is the proof of experience that the alliance becomes closer when we set correct aims and a correct pace of social progress based on a principled policy hammered out in joint discussion and joint examination with all our allies.

Political cooperation involves people of different philosophical outlook. And we do not depart from Marxism-Leninism for the sake of political cooperation, in which principled discussion of views and positions, frank consideration of all problems, with due account to common interests, constructive exchange of views, complement each other. Our patient, and at the same time, principled policy, has convinced even the Church leaders of the need to cooperate. Besides, our program of building socialism expresses the basic interests also of our religious-minded citizens. Both factors contributed to the adjustment of relations between the state and the Church. Favorable conditions for cooperation with Hungary's Church leaders were created also by the Patriotic People's Front, which unites our society in building socialism.

The Party's policy is one of socialist unity of the nation. This is the broadest form of our alliance policy. Its objective and subjective basis is the elimination of antagonistic social contradictions, so that we now have only friendly laboring classes and strata. Thus, the building of socialism has become a national program. The very scope of our alliance policy is a measure of our progress. Socialist unity of the nation rests on community of fundamental interests, on the common desire for socialism, progress, peace and national prosperity, and on the achievement of these aims through concerted effort. All this found expression at the recent Sixth Congress of the Patriotic People's Front, which approved the 11th Party Congress's policy and its program of building a developed socialist society.

The nature of power and the role of the state

The fundamental issue of every revolution is that of power. Power is a means of achieving social and economic goals. Its nature is determined primarily by the class wielding it, by the classes and strata

whose interests it expresses and the aims it pursues. History knows numerous forms of assuming and exercising power. The assumption of power by a class and the form in which it exercises its rule always depend on the concrete circumstances. This also applies to the working class.

Socialist construction in Hungary is impossible without working-class power. It is a means of achieving our historic goals — winning, defending and building socialism. In Hungary working-class power was embodied in the Soviet Republic in 1919 and in people's democracy in 1947-48. The latter differed substantially from both the dictatorship of the proletariat in Soviet Russia (1917) and the Hungarian Soviet Republic (1919).

All the socialist countries came to socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat. In tsarist Russia, the working class took power by force of arms and defended it in armed struggle, in the civil war and the fight against foreign intervention. At that early stage of development of the Soviet Union, socialist changes, industrialization and collectivization were impossible without forcibly suppressing the resistance of the exploiting classes, the capitalists and landowners. The situation changed with the growing strength of the working class, the consolidation of its rule and the progress of the revolution. This enabled the CPSU to declare that the dictatorship of the proletariat had fulfilled its historical mission and that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat had become a state of the whole people, with the working class performing its leading role also in the period of communist construction.

In the people's democracies the working class came to power in a different situation. The existence of the Soviet Union, its progress, its victory in World War II had created new conditions. In the socialist countries of Europe, the working class won power by relatively peaceful means and from the outset was in a position to follow a broader policy of alliance with other working classes. In Vietnam, China and Cuba, however, the working class had to fight its way to power.

Establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary was an historical necessity in both 1919 and 1947-48. True, the Hungarian working class took power by relatively peaceful means in both cases, but in either case it had to defend its power in hard struggle. Class antagonisms assumed an extremely acute form in a society weighed down with survivals of feudalism. Day after day the first Soviet Republic had to defend itself against foreign armed intervention, and was defeated only by the superior external forces. The danger of enemy attack continued in the decades after 1945, though it tended to diminish, but in 1956 a counter-revolutionary rebellion broke out, the

causes of which are well known and had to be put down in armed struggle.

Our Party is convinced that to ensure internal and external conditions for building socialism, the HPR needs working-class power and the socialist state and will need them for a long time to come. Just as the thesis about the continuous intensification of the class struggle during socialist construction — a thesis we know from an earlier period — was wrong, so it would be a delusion to imagine that the class struggle will steadily abate. This always depends on the balance of forces at home and in the international arena. The Communists never seek an intensification of the class struggle, but they must reckon with its likelihood and be prepared to face it, must safeguard the revolution. They must also remember that while détente, peaceful competition between the two social systems and ideological struggle are coming to the fore on the world scene, imperialism has by no means renounced political subversion nor given up attempts to interfere in the affairs of socialist countries.

The functions of the socialist state continuously develop and change in content. The consolidation of the positions of socialism and the abolition of exploiting classes have reduced the activity of the class enemy to a minimum, with the result that the functions of the state as an instrument of suppression have diminished. The main function of the Hungarian state today is organization and management in the economic, cultural and educational spheres.

Democracy is the essence of socialist power and of the socialist state. It is a well-known Marxist tenet that the democracy of a system depends basically and invariably on who holds political and economic power, the state apparatus and the means of production, what classes are allowed to, and really can, participate in managing the affairs of state and society, and whether the working people can really share in decision-making and control. Since the socialist state embodies working-class power and serves the interests of all working people, it is more democratic than any bourgeois democracy. Socialist Democracy is people's democracy in the genuine sense of the term. It is the most democratic of all systems ever created by mankind.

Socialist democracy gains in breadth and depth as our socialist state develops. The substantial results achieved in past years provide further opportunities for promoting democracy, above all in three key spheres of public life: local government, the factories and the cooperatives.

We now attach special importance to the development of democracy in the production sphere. A basic component of socialist democracy, it enables the working people to participate effectively in decision-making in their place of work in the solution of other prob-

lems of local or general significance, and helps make work more creative. It serves as an important means of shaping socialist relations between superiors and subordinates, makes the working people more aware of their responsibilities and encourages their activity.

We also develop democracy by improving the functioning of administrative bodies. The Party does much to perfect them, for clearly defined powers and efficient operation, coupled with a sense of personal responsibility, foster a democratic atmosphere and are effective in combating bureaucracy.

History has borne out the forecast of Marx, Engels and Lenin, who maintained that the transition from capitalism to socialism would take many different forms although the substance would be the same. The Paris Commune (1871), the Great October Socialist Revolution and all the people's democracies brought into being after World War II showed at their very inception features arising from the possibilities and the requirements of time and place. The existing socialist states, too, are changing as they develop. It is safe to assume that the socialist revolution will yet give rise to new forms. Power, the state, government, democratic institutions may change in form, but we can not predict their concrete forms. It is clear, however, that, in every country, social relations will undergo qualitative changes when the socialist social system succeeds capitalism.

The form which working-class power has taken in Hungary has proved effective; it accords with Hungarian conditions, which are distinctive in many respects. Undoubtedly, other solutions may arise in a different set of circumstances. Our further course is clear. 'As our society progresses and as class distinctions are effaced and a developed socialist society comes into being,' the 11th HSWP Congress noted, 'the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat will gradually become a socialist state of the whole people, the working class remaining its leading force. In developed socialist society there arise and grow the elements of communist self-government by the people.'

Economic development

A most important task of the working class after winning power is to set out immediately to clear the ground and then lay the economic foundations for the new society. Success in building up the economy decides the fate of socialism; it decides whether socialism can gain the upper hand over the declining capitalist system and bring people a better and fuller life than capitalism. This depends largely on the standard of organization and efficiency, on how well economic growth is planned. The 11th Party Congress emphasized that every sphere of our public life depends on results achieved in production, through creative effort.

Socialist economic development is based on the people's ownership of the basic means of production, which makes it possible to manage the economy according to plan, make optimal use of the country's resources, steadily develop the means of production and relations of production, and continuously improve the standard of living. There are different forms of planned economy. In Hungary, basic economic processes are determined and controlled by central government bodies, with considerable autonomy at factory level. They include and are complemented by the plans of enterprises, local government bodies and cooperatives. Our fourth five-year plan was successfully fulfilled and we are working on the fifth. It will carry us a long way toward a developed socialist society.

The figures of our economic progress are impressive. Qualitative changes have occurred since the country was liberated. In assessing the figures, however, it should be borne in mind that Hungary has an area of only 93,000 sq. km., a population of 10.5 million and modest raw material and energy resources. Production capacity has been expanded and renewed, and now stands at 350 per cent of the last prewar year. Hungary was a backward country but in the 30-odd years since its liberation, what was an agrarian-industrial country has become a country with developed large-scale industry and large-scale farming. It will not be long before it joins the ranks of industrial countries. Compared with 1938, industrial output has increased tenfold, agricultural output on a smaller area and with half the work force engaged in the past has grown by more than half and the national income shows a fivefold increase.

The composition of society has changed with changes in the economy. The greater part of the population is engaged in industry and the working class is the most numerous class now. The standard of life is in keeping with our economic level. We have achieved full employment, social insurance encompasses all members of society and every citizen is entitled to free medical care. In rate of housing construction, Hungary is among Europe's leading countries, though housing conditions are still difficult. One million new flats have been provided over the past 15 years.

Against the background of the crises that have shaken the capitalist world in recent years, the advantages of the socialist planned economy stand out especially clearly. Even in trying conditions, we made steady economic progress and continued to raise, if on a more modest scale, the standard of life. The people regard this, and with good reason, as an indication of the solidity and dependability of our system. We cannot say yet that we have overcome all difficulties. We can and will offset the adverse impact of economic changes in the world, which we will have to reckon with for a long time to come,

primarily by improving our economic activity, raising its effectiveness, strengthening the CMEA, extending socialist economic integration and promoting economic relations with capitalist countries on the principle of mutual benefit. We have every reason to look ahead with confidence, for working-class power is solid and our economic progress dynamic and we can rely on socialist economic cooperation. In the next 15 to 20 years, Hungary will build the material and technical basis for developed socialist society and become an economically developed country.

Cultural development

For a long time to come, an important function of the socialist state will be to organize and promote culture and education. Cultivating socialist consciousness and raising cultural standards are both a major factor in economic growth and the main prerequisite of the development of the individual and stimulating his public activity. An important objective of our socialist system is to further the people's cultural development and eliminate distinctions in cultural standards.

Marxist-Leninist ideology and ideological education play a decisive part in every sphere of our public life. The Party does much to ensure that the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas holds an important place in all party activity. A thorough knowledge and creative application of the new conclusions of Marxist-Leninist theory and the social sciences, it emphasizes, are the main source, and at the same time an earnest, of the Party's successful guidance of socialist construction. Interest in the ideas of scientific socialism is seen in the fact that lately an annual average of over 2,200,000 people have been studying Marxism-Leninism. The spread of Marxist-Leninist ideas raises the ideological level of society and, in addition to our political unity, strengthens the ideological unity of society.

Socialism and science are natural allies. Our state makes a special effort to develop education, vocational training and science in step with the growing social requirements. A big gain of our socialist society is the introduction of compulsory eight-year education and the fact that most school-leavers can continue their studies. Our realistic goal now is universal secondary education, and that the choice of profession is not substantially influenced by economic circumstances. In secondary education, the focus is on training of skilled workers. Some 25,000 young specialists are graduated from our higher institutions every year, and they are fully confident of their future. Three per cent of the national income is appropriated for scientific research and development — an amount that can justly be regarded as satisfactory by international standards.

Our state encourages the free development of socialist culture, the

arts and letters. There are ample opportunities for creative endeavor and experimenting. The results achieved in the cultural field are widely known. Our people's state registered a great historic achievement by abolishing the monopoly on education held by the privileged classes. Today there are more persons with a higher education than there were with a secondary education prior to liberation. Every year we publish over 70 million copies of books, or eight times as many as before liberation. The audiences of theatres, concerts and cinemas and the number of museum visitors have grown many times over. Much of value is being done in culture, education and science. The State Assembly of the HPR recently passed a law on education and culture making it possible for very large sections of the population to raise their cultural standards.

Socialist culture encompasses all genuine human values. Our country publishes the classics of world literature in large editions. Specifically, French classics are published in larger editions than in France. There are numerous other examples showing that publicity for and exchanges of cultural values — which were endorsed by the Helsinki Conference — are a common practice in Hungary. Furthermore, we see new opportunities to expand international cooperation and are willing to explore them. Works serving humanism and progress, values of universal culture, past and present, always find support in our country. However, we do not want hostile propaganda to make its way into our country in the guise of exchanging cultural values, and we do not allow it. This is both a right and a duty of the socialist state, whose mission is to attain the greatest ideals of man.

The program statement adopted by the 11th HSWP Congress says that fostering social consciousness, transforming people's thinking and raising their moral and cultural standards are inseparable from the development of socialist society. We must see to it that the motto of the finest workers and socialist work teams — 'Work, study and live in the socialist way' — becomes a universal social standard. To put it into practice is an important task facing the Party and the socialist state in the spheres of cultural education and organization.

The 11th Party Congress summed up the experience of constructive efforts, specified the country's tasks and noted that socialist construction is making good progress and that the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws of building socialism are applied according to our distinctive national conditions. But new problems arise and we seek and find solutions. Our Party considers itself accountable to the people and, in a broader sense, to the international working-class movement. We want our every step and every action to serve the cause of our people and international progress. Our Party has persevered in its policy line for 20 years now. We see our paramount

task in maintaining and creatively developing a firm general line ruling out all right- and 'left'-wing distortions. This demands that we should spell out and substantiate our fundamental principles and our theory again and again and carry them forward by correctly solving the new problems that crop up in the course of construction.

The program statement of the 11th HSWP Congress describes building a developed socialist society as our goal. Having laid and strengthened the foundations of the new society, our country entered the period of building socialism on its own basis. In building a developed socialist society, we already discern the outlines of the ultimate historic goal of the Communists and the working class, which is fulfilling its historic mission — the outlines of communism.

Results and prospects of the Portuguese revolution

Alvaro Cunhal
General Secretary,
Portuguese CP

The Eighth Congress of the PCP — our first regular congress since April 25, 1974 — holds a special place in Portuguese political life. It analyzed the situation in the country and set immediate and long-range tasks for the Party and the people.

The revolutionary process in Portugal remains very complex, zigzagging, inconsistent. Nonetheless, the two and a half years of heroic struggle have won our people truly historic gains and have wrought profound political, economic and social changes. A wide measure of freedom has been introduced. An end has been put to the colonial war, thus opening the road to independence to peoples subjugated by Portuguese colonialism. The working people have won better conditions. Workers' control was instituted, and many factories are managed by the workers. The monopoly groups have been deprived of their economic and political power. Most of the latifundia have been expropriated and hundreds of collective farms organized. Diplomatic, trade, economic and cultural relations have been established with socialist and Third World countries.

Our people have repelled internal reaction and imperialist pressure and, after nearly half a century of terrorist dictatorship, have turned

the fascist Portugal of yesterday into a democratic Portugal that has boldly taken the road of socialism.

The revolutionary process and the political tasks of the movement

The Portuguese revolution has confirmed the existence of objective laws of social progress and of common features of revolutionary development of countries with similar socio-economic systems and political regimes. It has demonstrated anew the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist propositions on the decisive role of the popular masses in revolutionary transformations, the vanguard mission of the working class, the inevitability of resistance by the ruling classes who have lost their privileges, the class substance of political democracy and the importance of the problems of state and government. On the other hand — and this, too, is corroborated by Marxism-Leninism and international experience — a combination of different objective and subjective factors has imparted to the Portuguese revolution many unique features.

The alliance of the popular movement and the Armed Forces Movement (AFM) was the basis of the revolution. It implemented deep-going economic reforms (primarily nationalization and the agrarian reform) though it did not possess political power, which was shared by constantly quarrelling social and political forces, both in the government and in the military-political bodies.

These contradictions and complexities were further aggravated by the fact that democratization of national life engendered two different processes. At times they would merge, thereby advancing the cause of democracy, at other times they would clash. On the one hand, this was the political development based on the election campaigns conducted at a time when large areas of the country were under the sway of reaction and did not enjoy democratic freedoms. On the other hand, there was the revolutionary movement of the working class, the popular masses, the army, inspired by the liberation ideals of April 25. The existence of democratic institutions and the important role of elections cannot obscure the fact that the activity of the government and the solution of concrete problems affecting the people's interests were strongly and constantly influenced by the correlation of social, political and military forces.

The very system of power, based on the constitution now in force, reflects in its structure and in other aspects both the depth of the revolutionary process and its contradictions and peculiarities.

Parliament (the Assembly of the Republic) is elected by universal suffrage. The government is appointed by the president and is accountable both to him and to parliament. The Revolutionary Council instituted by the military plays an important role in political and

military affairs, in line with the importance of the AFM. The president, elected by popular vote, is Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces and Chairman of the Revolutionary Council, thus personifying the country's political development based on elections and the revolutionary movement of the armed forces.

The constitution also provides that democratic organizations, such as the workers' and residential-area commissions, play a part in national affairs and exercise control over industrial enterprises.

The democratic system formalized by the constitution facilitates the development of the revolution and the retention of its main gains. The democratic system is characterized by three interconnected features. These are the wide measure of freedoms and rights, the radical democratic transformations (liquidation of the monopolies, workers' control, agrarian reform) and the power structure described above.

However, the present regime cannot be regarded as firmly established, for internal reaction, reformist elements, the Social Democrats and imperialism have not reconciled themselves to the liquidation of monopoly capitalism and to the socialist course followed by Portuguese democrats.

The reactionaries and the reformists are exploiting all the weak points in the system in an attempt to annul the gains of the revolution. There is no unitary revolutionary political power capable of replacing the structures and personnel, still employed in many departments, of the old fascist machine of government. Though we can hardly speak of collusion with the counter-revolutionaries, the government is showing extreme tolerance of their activities, including terrorist actions. All this gives reaction many opportunities for frenzied attacks on the progressive forces, for unremitting attempts to torpedo democratic transformations and prepare a violent coup to destroy the young democracy.

One might recall the three counter-revolutionary sallies in July and September 1974 and March 11, 1975. They were foiled by the powerful actions of the popular masses in alliance with the AFM. The revolution was thus able to move ahead with broad and quick steps. If the AFM had retained its unity, and if the Socialist Party had not openly come out against the revolutionary process, reaction would have been crushed once and for all. The split in the AFM and the Socialist Party's alliance with the reactionaries, an alliance directed against the left forces, precipitated a profound military and political crisis, which on November 25, 1975, culminated in the defeat and breakup of the military left wing.

The reactionaries, now united with one of the AFM groups (the 'Group of Nine'), tried to exploit the situation to suppress the workers' movement, steal a march on their allies and capture power. This

attack was repelled, but for a long time the position remained unstable and dangerous.

The counter-revolution is trying to launch a three-prong offensive: plots and terrorist acts as preparation for a violent coup; gradual takeover of key posts in the state apparatus, especially the army; exploiting the anti-democratic situation in many parts of the country in the hope of 'winning the elections' and taking over power by 'peaceful means.'

Reaction's immediate goal is to replace the minority Socialist government by an avowedly right-wing government with Socialist participation, abolish the military-political bodies committed to AFM policy (the Revolutionary Council) and thus capture leadership of the armed forces. These plans are helped by the Socialist Party's policy. For like the reactionaries, the Socialist government has, in effect, come out against a democratic constitutional regime and is working to destroy the revolutionary gains, primarily the agrarian reform, workers' control and state participation in the management of factories where production is being sabotaged in order to dismantle nationalization. These anti-constitutional actions of the reactionary and Socialist parties are gaining momentum with every passing day.

To counter reaction, which is trying to provoke instability as the prelude to a counter-revolutionary coup, the democratic and progressive forces, as our Eighth Congress emphasized, are working for stability, social order and calm. The Communist Party is making the biggest effort to consolidate the democratic system and assure normal democratic life within the framework of the existing structures. The fight for respect of civil rights and freedoms in every part of the country, the suppression of subversion and above all of the terrorist groups, democratization of the state apparatus, appointment of a democratic government with Communist participation, capable of overcoming the present difficulties and safeguarding democracy on the basis of the revolutionary gains formalized in the constitution — that is how our Eighth Party Congress formulated the central political task of Portugal's democratic forces.

Democracy and the road to socialism

Even under fascism, the PCP declared that the main aims of the anti-fascist revolution and the condition of its victory was liquidation of the monopoly groups and the latifundia. Experience has confirmed the correctness of these aims and the accuracy of the Party's forecasts.

Other political forces, notably the Socialist Party, regarded the anti-fascist revolution merely as a change of form of government by the dominant classes, with their privileges remaining intact. The

Socialists advocated a Western-type bourgeois democracy, with the monopolies retaining their economic and political power within the framework of a parliamentary system.

The PCP program approved by the Sixth Congress (1965) defined fascist government as the terrorist dictatorship of the monopolies and latifundia. Accordingly, having carefully analyzed the situation, the PCP declared that the aim in eliminating fascism and establishing a democratic system was not to change the form of government, but to destroy both the political and economic power of the monopolies and latifundists. In Portugal the democratization of political life was and is inseparable from democratization of economic and social life.

The overthrow of fascism was soon followed by preparation of a counter-revolutionary coup and widespread economic sabotage. This faced the country with the alternative: either reaction, big capital and the proprietors would destroy the young democracy and establish a new dictatorship, or the revolutionary forces would crush the monopoly groups and destroy the latifundia to defend democracy.

At the end of 1974 and in the early months of 1975, bankers and capitalists unlawfully took billions of escudos out of the country and managed to transfer to monopoly enterprises huge sums from the banks. In the factories, reactionary managers thwarted the fulfillment of orders, sharply cut output, depleted funds and posed the threat of mass unemployment and a standstill in production. Import and export invoices were systematically doctored with the aim of illegally exporting foreign exchange. In the rural South, where latifundia predominate, the land owners stopped farm work and unlawfully exported livestock or starved it.

Economic sabotage, which had become an important weapon of counter-revolution, was coupled with conspiracies and preparations for a coup. These schemes were foiled by workers' control in the factories and the vigilance of rural working people. Nationalization and the agrarian reform constituted radical revolutionary changes and were also needed to save the national economy.

Late 1974 saw powerful actions by urban and rural working people against financial, industrial and agrarian sabotage; there were emphatic demands for nationalizing key industries. The peasants began to till uncultivated and abandoned lands. The suppression of the Spinola coup (March 11, 1975), which was backed by the big capitalists and landowners, and vigorous action by the masses, which made common cause with the AFM in foiling the conspiracy, rapidly advanced the revolution. On March 14, the Revolutionary Council announced the nationalization of banks and declared that an agrarian reform was needed.

As we see it, the reactionaries tried to reduce the economy to a state

of chaos. But the working people and the revolutionary forces led by the Communists, having ended the domination of monopoly groups and abolished most of the latifundia, prevented economic dislocation and assured the operation of hundreds of enterprises which their owners had wanted to close down; they occupied and began cultivating abandoned lands and harvested a bumper crop in the agrarian reform area.

Certain critics accuse the revolutionary forces, primarily the PCP, of having acted too hastily, imposed much too fast a pace on the revolutionary process and thus endangered democracy. What happened was the exact opposite. It was the revolutionary changes effected in the economic structures that made it possible to maintain freedom and democracy.

There are also those who charge the PCP with taking a stand against freedom and democracy by rejecting the bourgeois-democratic model of the capitalist countries of Western Europe. That is an absolutely groundless charge. What the PCP is opposed to is not democratic freedoms but monopoly power, which persists in countries governed by bourgeois-democratic regimes. This is why it insists that there is no room in Portuguese conditions for a West European type of democracy.

Portugal's Communists were the most determined freedom fighters under fascism and remain staunch defenders of freedom. Furthermore, they consider the defense of democratic freedoms to be inseparable as the Eighth Congress re-emphasized, from the defense of other gains of the revolution, first of all nationalization, the agrarian reform and workers' control.

The restitution of capitalist property and the suspension of the agrarian reform (on the plea of promoting a West European type of democracy) would inevitably lead to repression, curb and eliminate freedom and install a new dictatorship. Reality speaks of this only too plainly. The government, which is committed to a policy of restoring capitalist and landowner property, has already begun to curb freedom and resort to repression. By contrast, the struggle to consolidate the gains of the revolution is itself a struggle to consolidate democratic freedoms and institutions.

The revolution has transformed the country's economic strutures.

Nationalization involves 245 enterprises in banking, insurance, the power industry, oil refining, metals, chemicals, cement, the paper, glass and tobacco industries, brewing, shipbuilding, rail, sea, air and road transport, fishing and other important fields. The assets of the nationalized enterprises add up to 38 per cent of the country's share capital. The nationalized enterprises provide 25 per cent of the increase in gross revenue and 44 per cent of the increase in fixed capital

and employ 14 per cent of the work force, according to tentative estimates.

Also within the range of this vast sector are 261 major enterprises in which sabotage by the owners has compelled the state to intervene by putting them under its control, 200 enterprises with government participation and about 800 cooperatives based on enterprises abandoned by their reactionary owners. This sector employs about 250,000 workers.

In hundreds of instances, nationalization, government intervention and the founding of cooperatives were ensured largely as a result of *workers' control.* Operating through their commissions, the workers exposed and frustrated the owners' subversive activities, established control over the enterprises and often assumed their management.

The *agrarian reform,* a measure of special importance to the areas where latifundia predominated, began with the peasants' seizure of land. A total of 1,140,800 hectares, or about one-fifth of the farmland area, was expropriated and 450 collective production units (CPU) run by the peasants themselves were set up.

Nationalization and government intervention virtually eliminated the monopoly groups that had all economic power in their hands. The agrarian reform made it possible to transfer most of the latifundia in the South to CPUs.

Some allege that by insisting on these measures, the revolutionary forces, primarily the PCP, created serious economic difficulties. Reactionaries, reformists and Social Democrats put out rumors at home and abroad that these reforms spelled disruption, paralysis and chaos in industry and farming.

The fact that many factories and other enterprises neither failed nor closed down is due above all to the struggle and devotion of the workers, who prevented a halt in production. Much more land is cultivated now in the agrarian reform area. Wheat production has gone up by 60 per cent, oats by 50 and barley by 70 per cent. New crops have been introduced, the construction of dozens of small dams has helped to expand the irrigated land area and production on stock farms has grown. Due to the agrarian reform, unemployment, once chronic, has dropped sharply in areas where latifundia predominated. The proportion of people working on CPUs or in cooperatives is estimated to have increased by 30,000.

As a result of democratic changes, Portugal today has four economic structures: (1) non-capitalist (the public sector, nationalized or state-controlled enterprises, cooperatives and CPUs in the agrarian-reform area, cooperatives based on one-time small and medium-sized industrial and commercial enterprises); (2) capitalist (national enterprises, mostly in light industry and foreign companies);

(3) the small-commodity production sector (small farms and factories, and handicraftsmen); (4) an economic structure tending to transform itself into a state-capitalist sector (enterprises with government participation).

On analyzing today's economic set-up and the share of the structures listed above, the Eighth Congress came to the conclusion that considerable sectors of the national economy no longer come under capitalist laws. The economy is going through a period of transition from the capitalist to the socialist type. The capitalist type of economy predominates but a non-capitalist type is beginning to play a decisive part. The Congress stressed that the absence of revolutionary power threatens the loss of what has been achieved.

This means that the policy of restoring capitalist and landowner property on which reaction insists and which the Socialist government is virtually pursuing conflicts with the economic development laws of present-day structures. Only a policy geared to consolidating the gains of the revolution and to a socialist perspective can solve today's challenging economic and financial problems and foster the progress of the country. Experience shows that the economy can be revived and advanced only if account is taken of the working people's will, labor élan, initiative and revolutionary spirit and if the gains of the revolution are consolidated.

The economic policy should reckon with the existence of diverse structures and with the incentives and dynamics of their development. It must provide conditions for the growth of the capitalist sector. However, the orientation should be on dynamically developing a non-capitalist structure on the basis of nationalized enterprises, workers' control and the CPUs and cooperatives.

To nullify the gains of the revolution and restitute capitalist and landowner property would mean putting an early end to democracy and imposing a new dictatorship. In view of the revolutionary changes carried out to date, the road to preserving and promoting freedom and democracy is not a capitalist but a socialist road.

The Socialist government and the democratic alternative

Less than a year has passed since the new Constitution was adopted, that is, since the democratic system was legalized, yet Portuguese democracy is in danger again.

The economic and financial situation is particularly alarming. The trade and balance of payments deficit is growing. The 1976 figures are likely to amount to 66,000m. and 40,000m. escudos respectively. This means that gold and foreign exchange reserves will be exhausted before long. Yet the government solicits more and more new foreign loans, making the economy increasingly dependent on imperialism.

Domestic reaction tries, in collusion with imperialism, to drain the country of its money reserves and upset food supply so as to enable the 'benefactors' who offer financial 'aid' to impose on Portugal draconic political conditions and pave the way for the abolition of democracy and the formation of a reactionary government.

The deterioration of the financial situation expected in the near future demands prompt action.

The Socialist minority government is becoming less and less popular. It cannot solve the country's urgent problems by resorting to Social-Democratic demagoguery, on the one hand, and restoring capitalist and landowner property, on the other. Its anti-labor and anti-popular policy, which puts the whole burden of economic difficulties on the working people's shoulders and leads to greater exploitation, cannot bring about the requisite economic upturn and financial stabilization.

The Eighth Congress pointed out that the country's difficulties can be overcome only by mobilizing untapped resources, the people's effort, will and energy and by drawing on their patriotic enthusiasm.

This, in turn, can only be done by consolidating the gains of the revolution and firmly pursuing a policy of non-capitalist development.

The inability of the present government to cope with its problems has compelled the political forces of the nation to concern themselves with the issue of an alternative.

While continuing preparations for a coup, the reactionary forces are also working feverishly to replace the one-party Socialist government with an undisguised right-wing cabinet which would include the Socialist Party (SP), the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and the Social Democratic Center (SDC).* Such a government would work to return property to the capitalists and to stop the agrarian reform. The Eighth PCP Congress stated clearly that, as regards national interests, such a policy would be even worse than that of the Socialist government. It would not only cause greater economic depression, but would also endanger the democratic system.

The Congress pointed to the necessity and possibility of a democratic alternative and proposed two possible solutions: either a *left-wing government* supported by a majority in the Republic's Assembly (i.e., by the SP and PCP), or a *government with a non-party leader* (civilian or military) to include the military and civilians, members of parties and independents, but supported by the Socialist and Communist parties. In either case the new government must lean on a program approved by the president and the Revolutionary Council.

Obviously, conditions for the formation of a democratic govern-

*Two right-wing political organizations. In October 1976 the People's Democratic Party became the Social-Democratic Party.—*Ed.*

ment which would include the PCP will arise only after the SP leadership has abandoned its anti-labor and anti-popular course and its alliance with the right. The 107 Socialist and 40 Communist deputies in the Assembly form a majority (121 deputies represent the SDC and PDP). The Socialist Party leadership, opposing cooperation with the Communist Party, is responsible for the fact that so far no democratic solution has been found. Faced with differences in their own party, they exclude anyone holding leftist views from the national leadership. Several decrees and resolutions have been issued by the government lately, spearheaded against the working people's interests and against the agrarian reform.

Notwithstanding all this, the Communist Party is campaigning untiringly for Socialist-Communist unity because on this depends the future of democracy in Portugal. We are for closer unity of the working-class and trade union movement, for their cohesion which reaction and the SP leadership would destroy. We are for strengthening the organizations and movements of small and middle farmers and other intermediate strata. We are for an alliance between the people and the armed forces because, although the situation has changed, democracy depends largely on the strength of this alliance.

The struggle for democratic unity is being waged at the 'top' (at the level of governing bodies) and at grass-roots level, among the masses. The PCP is striving to cooperate with the Socialists in Parliament, with the president of the republic and with the Revolutionary Council. In the Assembly the Communist Party is working for mutual understanding with the Socialists on specific issues, as was the case during the debate on the municipal election law, or when the Communists and Socialists, voting together, defeated a bill tabled by reaction through the SDC.

At the same time, the Communist Party is working to organize the masses and their activities in defense of freedoms and other revolutionary gains and to stabilize the democratic system.

At this writing, Portugal is preparing for municipal elections. The concrete composition of the local government bodies will be very important, but the December 12 elections will have even greater political consequences. If the reactionary parties (SDC and PDP), taking advantage of the situation in the big areas under their control that have not yet been touched by democracy, are able to win the support of a large number of Socialists, this will undoubtedly strengthen their positions and they will demand a share in the government. If the 'United People' candidates, representing the Communist Party and certain non-party democratic circles, win as many or more votes as were cast for the PCP candidates during the April 1976 elections to the Republic's Assembly (mainly in the industrial

regions and the agrarian-reform area), this will greatly help to defend and consolidate the revolutionary gains and cause a leftward shift among a large section of the Socialist Party and the circles influenced by it.

The trade union congress at the end of January will be an important event. Maneuvers against working-class unity are part of the policy employed by reaction with the connivance of the SP leaders. A split in the trade union movement would weaken the working people's opposition to the plans to return the property of the capitalists and landowners and could undermine the strength of the organized contingents of working people who are strongly in favor of a socialist course for Portuguese democracy.

Reaction and the SP are attacking the united trade union center, Intersindical, through a campaign of slander and intrigue, trying to portray it as a 'PCP tool.' Supported by several trade unions, their plans are either to impose their hegemony on the trade union movement, or to split it. But every day they are losing support. Some trade union leaders, who opposed Intersindical, have been forced by public pressure to change their positions. The mass movement for unity is making rapid headway. The most representative trade union meeting in Portugal's history was held on October 22 with 222 unions attending (of these 160 are branches of Intersindical) with a membership of 1,585,000. On November 6 a meeting was held of 621 trade union leaders representing 156 unions, 3,155 trade union delegates, and 1,377 delegates from commissions representing 711,860 workers at 2,016 enterprises. The working people are determined to protect trade union unity from being split by reaction and the Social-Democrats with the support of imperialism.

The workers' and popular movement, well organized, with a high level of political awareness and an outstanding fighting capacity, played a deciding role in winning and defending freedoms and in carrying out revolutionary economic reforms. And today, it is mass action that can defeat the reactionary forces, frustrate their plans to return property to the capitalists, landowners and imperialists, defend the revolutionary gains and ensure democratic advance along the socialist path.

The party of truth, hope and the future

During the days of fascism the PCP was the main force of resistance. It made the biggest contribution to defending freedom and to the revolutionary transformations that followed the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. A tried and tested vanguard of the working class and of all toiling people, well organized and closely bound up with the

people, the PCP plays a special role in the present revolutionary process.

Without the working people or against their interests democracy can neither be defended nor strengthened. To repulse reactionary sallies and solve the country's urgent problems, the working people and their Communist Party must participate energetically in the nation's affairs at all levels, including the government level. The PCP's struggle to defend and strengthen democracy acquires exceptional importance today. The Eighth Congress stated there can be no democratic solution of the existing problems without the PCP, still less against it.

The Eighth Congress demonstrated anew the role of the PCP in a democratic Portugal. It showed the Party to be well organized, with a high level of political consciousness and revolutionary spirit of its members, it demonstrated their solidarity and deep ties with the working class and people. The congress made it clear that the Communists are ready to give all their strength and creative energy to solving the problems facing the working people for the sake of national interests and for a democratic society.

The congress delegates represented 115,000 Party members and 7,000 branches, 3,000 of them at enterprises. Of the total Party membership, 59 per cent are workers, 20 per cent employees and 6 per cent professionals. Fifteen thousand members (13 per cent) are farm workers. Thirty-five per cent of the membership are under 30 years of age, 47 per cent are from 30 to 50 years old and over 5,000 are under 20. The Communist youth organizations* have a membership of 25,000. The number of women in the Party is relatively small (17 per cent).

The congress heard a report on the Party's intensive information and propaganda work. During the election campaigns 10 meetings and 80 get-togethers were held daily to discuss and explain the main issues. Posters, slogans and manifestoes were published in millions of copies. During the first nine months of 1976 the average edition of the Communist Party newspaper *Avante!* was 99,871 copies. Since April 25, 1974, we published 139 books and pamphlets in a total edition of 2,174,430 copies, which is about 15,643 copies for each publication.

The Eighth Congress was preceded by intensive preparations conducted in conditions of complete democracy. The Central Committee theses were available for discussion a month before the congress and the Central Committee report a week before.

Over 2,300 special meetings were held, attended by close to 50,000 Party members to discuss the theses and elect delegates to the congress. At these discussions Party organizations and members made

*Young Communist League and Union of Communist Students—*Ed.*

3,149 suggestions, of which 1,366 were incorporated in the congress's Political Resolution.

The Eighth Congress analyzed the development of the revolutionary process in Portugal and outlined the tasks in building a democratic society with a socialist perspective.

The new Central Committee elected by the congress included all the 36 members and alternate members of the previous Central Committee, and 54 new members. There are 44 workers and 22 employees in the new Central Committee. Twenty-four members are under 30 years of age and 53 are under 40.

From four to six thousand members and non-members of the Party attended each session, the total adding up to approximately 40,000. The congress was also attended by 63 foreign delegations and numerous delegations from Portuguese political parties, including the Socialist Party, Intersindical and trade union associations, small and middle farmers' organizations, and others.

The Eighth Congress was a vivid demonstration of the PCP's internationalist and deeply national policy. Because of the identity of working-class interests in all countries, we hold that the internationalist and national obligations of workers' parties are inseparable. Proletarian internationalism, far from ruling out, presupposes resolute defense of the interests of one's own people and country, the defense of national interests. The PCP's firm internationalist position and the internationalist feelings of its members were characteristic of the Eighth Congress and were also seen in the warm and sincere reception accorded the delegations from fraternal parties and national-liberation revolutionary movements.

The rally in Lisbon on the closing day of the congress attended by tens of thousands was particularly impressive. It was addressed by representatives of the PCP, the CPSU, Vietnam, FRELIMO and the MPLA. The inviolable fraternal friendship and solidarity with the Soviet Union, with the peoples who had freed themselves of Portuguese colonialism vividly symbolized the PCP's consistently internationalist policy. The Eighth Congress demonstrated that the Portuguese Communists are true to their people and to their country.

The congress set this central goal — upholding the working people's interests, strengthening the democratic system, opposing foreign interference, defending the interests of a free, democratic and independent Portugal. Strengthening Portuguese democracy is inseparable from consolidation of revolutionary gains and an independent national policy. Democracy, socialism and national independence are indivisible conceptions and goals.

The political and economic situation in Portugal is very complex. There are many signs that the revolution is again in danger. The

Eighth Congress warned of this danger and showed what should be done against it.

The PCP is firmly supported by the working class and all working people. Its policy is finding an ever deeper response among them. By its struggle against domestic and external enemies, by overcoming difficulties and obstacles, by placing itself at the service of the people and the country, the PCP is asserting itself in the revolutionary process as a party of truth, hope and the future.

Portugal's Communists will spare no efforts to live up to the hopes placed on them.

Time of big and realistic hopes

Max Reimann
Member of the Executive
Presidium, German CP

As an idea, a utopia, a dream of a brighter future, socialism has existed for centuries. Its biography as a scientific vision of the world's future is much shorter: 128 years ago the *Communist Manifesto* proclaimed the objective necessity of socialism's appearance in the world arena. Measured in terms of history, as a reality, an existing social system that is developing and winning new positions, it is very young indeed: this year the Soviet people will be joined by people throughout the world in celebrating the 60th anniversary of the first socialist revolution and proclamation of the world's first socialist state. But millions throughout the world now associate their aspirations and hopes with scientific and existing socialism.

Why? First, because with every passing year there is brought to the fore and vividly demonstrated to the masses the humane aims, plans and practical deeds of the Communists — those who were victorious in October 1917 and have been consolidating that victory, and those who since the October Revolution led the working people of their countries to power and the building of socialism, and those who are continuing the struggle against capitalist exploitation and oppression.

Much has been written about the significance of October as the watershed between two historical eras, as the beginning of a new historical period marked by the collapse of imperialism and the assertion of socialism. Marxist-Leninists have every right to claim that the Great October Socialist Revolution, though a revolution of the work-

ing people of the old, tsarist Russia, was a supreme gain of the international proletariat, the triumph of proletarian internationalism. For us proletarian internationalism means solidarity and unity of the working-class forces of different countries, and also of those who firmly support its positions and are working toward a definite goal — the refashioning of society along socialist lines. Now as always, we differentiate this from the international solidarity of broad sections of the population for the attainment of aims of a general democratic character: peace, security, social progress, i.e., aims which, in particular, were discussed at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties.

The October Revolution brought to reality the forecasts of the founders of scientific socialism and was the first big step in attaining the common ideals of the international working class, reaffirming the reality of the aim of international unity of the workers, the very substance and meaning of internationalism. It has laid its imprint on the entire revolutionary process, giving it a new quality which I would define as the strengthening of the Communists' historical optimism. At the same time, the October Revolution came as the embodiment of the bold visions of all the thinkers of the past who dreamed of a social system founded on the ideals of humanism, happiness and justice. That explains why it has met with worldwide support among the peoples, among all progressive and honest-minded men and women.

It is the humanism of socialism and the ideas of October that I wish to reflect upon in this article.

I belong to the generation that went through the First World War, the uncompleted 1918 revolution in Germany, the Weimar Republic, fascism and the Second World War, the defeat of Hitler Germany by the anti-Hitler coalition, the revival, in contravention of the coalition's Potsdam agreements, of monopoly capital in the FRG, Germany's partition by the West German and U.S. imperialists, and the emergence of the socialist German Democratic Republic. Together with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, my generation of German revolutionaries hailed the victory of the Russian workers and peasants in October 1917. We were trained, and trained the younger generation, in the spirit of Ernst Thaelmann's behest that the criterion of a Communist's genuine devotion to the revolution is his attitude to the Soviet Union. Today, too, the FRG Communists maintain close ties of solidarity with the land of Lenin and the other countries of the socialist community. And we are convinced that the Soviet Union, which under Bolshevik leadership was the first to embark on the building of a socialist society, has always expressed the fundamental interests of all the peoples, that today, too, it is the cardinal force in the fight against imperialism and the chief guarantor of peace, security

and social progress. And we are working for the triumph of socialism also in our country, where the capitalist system is suffocating in a tangle of difficulties and unresolved problems.

The FRG has not escaped aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. The arms drive, conducted primarily in the interests of the military-industrial complex and the international monopolies, has exacerbated rather than moderated social contradictions. It is now clear that we can hardly expect a substantial decline of unemployment, particularly among the youth, in 1977. The vocational training system has no places for nearly 300,000 youngsters. Deterioration of the educational system continues: schools are overcrowded and yet more and more schoolteachers are finding themselves without jobs. And there are these other aspects of the crisis: monopoly attacks on the trade unions, the notorious 'ban on radicals,' which now affects not only Communists, increasing corruption at the federal, state and municipal level, more crimes and violence and the unsolved monetary, energy and environmental problems.

Regardless of high living standards in individual capitalist countries, the FRG among them, capitalism cannot, by its very nature, eliminate political and economic inequality, poverty, oppression, crises and the workers' fear for the future.

Nor are these problems exclusive to the FRG. The situation is even worse in the leading imperialist power, the United States. This is what Jimmy Carter, long before his election, had to say about social contradictions in the United States: 'Too many have had to suffer at the hands of a political and economic elite who have shaped decisions and never had to account for mistakes nor to suffer from injustice. When unemployment prevails, they never stand in line looking for a job . . . They never do without food or clothing or a place to sleep . . . An unfair tax structure is designed to serve their needs . . .'*

The capitalist world is rich enough to squander billions of dollars, marks, pounds, francs, etc. on armaments, on developing and producing new weapons of mass annihilation, and yet it cannot permit itself humanism, even to the extent of reducing unemployment, appropriating more for public health, culture, the social services, schools and housing. Only socialism, its home and foreign policy expressed in the terse formula: 'everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man,' guarantees the people what is most important — work, health care, education, social confidence, political rights and freedoms, peace and security.

Sixty years ago the Russian Bolsheviks proclaimed:

— power to the Soviets!

— the mills and factories to the workers!

**International Herald-Tribune*, July 19, 1976.

— the land to the peasants!
— peace to the peoples!

It was with these slogans that the Bolsheviks began building the most humane social system known to history, a system free of exploitation, crises, unemployment, poverty, national, racial and political inequality, militarist psychosis and fear for the future. And this system, the socialist world system, is advancing from strength to strength and is reaching out to new frontiers.

The building of socialism and communism is proceeding successfully. That was recorded by the 25th CPSU Congress and by the congresses of the ruling Communist and Workers' parties in a number of socialist countries. In 1976, too, the family of socialist states continued to gather strength. The reunification of Vietnam was completed and the country is now a socialist republic. In Laos, following the victory of the patriotic forces and the coming to power of the Marxist-Leninist People's Revolutionary Party, the people, now that power is in their hands, have launched out on building the new life.

Fresh victories have been scored by the national-liberation movement. The road to independent development was opened to Democratic Kampuchea. Angola's patriots defeated imperialist intervention and internal reaction.

The ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin are spreading throughout the world. Communist parties in a number of capitalist countries have made impressive headway: they have increased their membership, strengthened their mass base, enhanced their authority and political weight. The masses, and notably the youth, in the capitalist countries, the FRG included, show a growing interest in and support for socialism. In fact, this can no longer be ignored by the propagandists of the big business parties. In an attempt to counter the mounting influence of the ideas of socialism and peace and justify the arms drive, which serves the interests of the monopolies, they are stepping up their attacks on détente, spreading the lie about a 'growing military menace' from the socialist countries, conducting a slanderous campaign against the GDR and are trying to create a democratic halo around imperialist society, at the same time vilifying the socialist system (witness the demagogic Christian-Democrats' 'freedom or socialism' slogan in the last FRG elections).

Furthermore, on the plea of 'defending the free world,' 'freedom,' 'democracy,' 'Western civilization,' etc., (fine words to camouflage the avarice of monopoly capital) they appeal to the masses to 'tighten their belts,' 'cut down on consumption,' abandon the fight for higher wages, more low-rent housing, better schools, better transport services, defense and expansion of the people's democratic gains, their rights and freedoms, and for social progress.

But these appeals are meeting with a diminishing response. For more and more people are coming to realize that their authors are only emulating the demagogues of whom Heinrich Heine wrote more than a hundred years ago:

I know the tune, I know the words,
And their authors I well know, too,
In private they sit sipping wine,
Publicly, they preach drinking water.

In contrast, there is a growing response to the example set by existing socialism, which for the first time in history has not only proclaimed civil rights and freedoms, but has also provided the conditions for their exercise.

Socialism brings the peoples peace and security. The word 'peace' was enshrined on socialism's banners from the very birth of the new society, and this immensely accentuated the humanism of October. Lenin's speech at the Second Congress of Soviets and the Decree on Peace contained, in the basic outline, the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Socialism's policy has consistently been guided by these principles, and it is not the fault of the Soviet Union that this policy has not always attained its aims.

I well remember how, in December 1933, after the nazis had come to power in Germany, the CPSU Central Committee invited several states to join in a collective security system as a defense against aggression. If this system were formed, the peoples would have been spared all the horrible suffering and calamities of the Second World War. But the system was not established because of the imperialist powers' anti-Soviet attitude. In those days the forces of socialism and peace were not strong enough to put through a policy that was in the vital interests of the peoples.

The situation today is, of course, different. A united front of socialism, the international communist and workers' movement, the movement of all progressive, anti-imperialist forces, could impose peace on imperialism. When at the 25th CPSU Congress, which I attended as representative of my Party, I heard Comrade Brezhnev declare: 'Durable peace should become the natural form of life of all European peoples,' I recalled the words of Marx: 'The working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war.' That was said at a time when capitalism held undivided sway, and in its drive for profits, new markets and spheres of influence, involved the peoples in wars in order to exploit other peoples. But even in those conditions, in his article 'Can Europe Disarm?' Engels came out against the unrestrained arms race and called on the peoples to

fight for disarmament. For he was convinced that 'disarmament and thus guarantee of peace are possible.' With what greater optimism can we approach the problem in today's fundamentally changed world!

For today, thanks to the unflagging efforts of the USSR, other socialist countries and all the peace forces, it has already been possible to ward off the menace of nuclear war, making peace more reliable and durable. Important international agreements have been concluded: the ban on nuclear-weapon tests in the three environments, the non-proliferation treaty, limitation of Soviet and U.S. strategic weapons, the ban on stationing nuclear weapons in outer space and on the seabed, the prohibition and destruction of bacteriological weapons. These achievements are proof that disarmament is not a 'Communist fantasy,' but a very real reality. However, all that has been accomplished to date must be consolidated and carried further. This is a difficult task and one that brooks no delay, for the successes of socialism inspire fear, even fury, in the imperialist camp. Compelled to adapt itself to the new conditions and accept peaceful coexistence, imperialism, by its very reactionary nature, continues to cast a sinister shadow over the radiant hopes of mankind. Imperialism's aggressive proclivities are still there, though it employs modified forms and methods.

And there is ample proof of that: the blood shed in South Africa and in Lebanon; the Rhodesian racists' piratic attacks on Mozambique, condoned and encouraged by the capitalist powers; the bombs put in planes of socialist countries, etc. The aggressive faction is reacting to its defeat in class struggles, the loss of colonies, the withdrawal of more and more countries from the capitalist system and the growing influence of the Communist parties, by boosting the arms drive, building more war bases, inducing a militarist psychosis. What the imperialists want is to revive the 'positions of strength' policy and dictate to other countries and peoples.

As a West German Communist, I cannot but feel alarmed over one of the last acts of the outgoing U.S. Republican administration: its decision to increase substantially this year the number of aircraft in Western Europe, which will mean more U.S. servicemen in some European countries. The F-15 Eagle fighter planes will now appear at U.S. bases in the FRG. The Pentagon has publicized that fact, adding that it will give NATO a 'superior capability' over the Warsaw Pact. More, the Pentagon is using truculent language in an attempt to intimidate the socialist community. That this stands no chance of success is now becoming obvious to realistically-minded representatives of the capitalist world. A more sober view of the situation is gaining ground. It is based on the changed balance of world forces,

though the deteriorating economic situation in most imperialist countries plays no small part, too. As a soldier in World War I, Lenin's call for peace made an indelible impression upon me. It found an answering chord both among us German soldiers and the French across the battle line.

Lenin described disarmament as the 'ideal of socialism.' Today we must do everything for the Soviet humane appeal, which accords with the aspirations of the whole of mankind, to reduce armaments and achieve disarmament, the steps toward that goal set out in the CPSU 25th Congress Program of Further Struggle for Peace, the concrete initiatives of the USSR and other socialist countries, the road to peace and disarmament outlined in the final document of the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, to acquire the same magnetic attraction as the slogan of peaceful coexistence and become a reality of international life.

The position of the German Communist Party on this issue is absolutely clear. Together with other democratic and peace forces of the Federal Republic, it is combating the policy of state-monopoly capital, which is inimical to our people's interests and to European and world peace. 'International developments,' our Bonn Party Congress emphasized, 'confirm what we Communists have been advocating with the utmost resolve — a policy designed to serve the national interests of the FRG and the cause of peace cannot be implemented without account to the main trends of our time. The national interests of our country and the peace interests of its people require that the FRG actively participate in extending détente, reject any moves of a neo-colonialist character and unilateral links with the EEC and NATO, reject all attempts to set up a nuclear-armed "European defense community." The national interests of the FRG and the peace interests of our people require, above all, continued improvement of relations with the Soviet Union, the GDR and the socialist community, which now increasingly determines the main direction of international development.' Our Party believes that the Federal Republic must make a constructive contribution to armaments restriction and disarmament. And we have suggested a realistic beginning: a 15 per cent reduction in military expenditure. However, the battle for disarmament has lost none of its sharpness. For not only the monopoly groups and the military-industrial complex, but also some Social-Democratic politicians (Defense Minister Leber, for one) are boosting military spending, tying the FRG still closer to NATO and keeping alive reactionary chauvinism in the Bundeswehr.

Our fight against this policy is supported by many rank-and-file Social-Democrats and trade unionists, for they know that every step toward disarmament is a step toward détente and security and will,

moreover, release considerable means for the solution of pressing social problems.

The GCP welcomes the Warsaw Treaty Nations' Appeal to all other signatories of the Helsinki Final Act to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. This initiative accords with the national interests of all European countries. It is of special importance for the FRG, where the nuclear-weapon stockpiles are an ever-present danger to the population. We urge the FRG government to support the proposal, prevent our country from being turned into a nuclear arsenal, and pursue a constructive policy of détente and disarmament.

We consider our disarmament effort to be a duty to our people and our internationalist contribution to the common struggle of Communists and all progressive and democratic forces for peace, security and social progress. To this I would add that the humanism of socialism's slogans of détente, disarmament and peaceful coexistence does not run counter to the general development laws of the revolution discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin and confirmed in practice. Détente and peaceful coexistence come within the realm of state-to-state relations, they include acceptance of the territorial status quo and are aimed at precluding the possibility of military conflicts, fraught with a menace to the very existence of mankind. But neither détente nor peaceful coexistence should be equated with retention of the social status quo. The class struggle, the struggle for social and national liberation and against oppression, is the inalienable right of the working people and the exploited of every country. And to win in this struggle against the international force of capital there must be, as Lenin taught us, an international alliance, an international brotherhood, of the workers. Hence, international cooperation in the fight for peace, conducted on a broad democratic basis, is not a substitute for proletarian internationalism which, in our view, is the central objective factor essential not only to détente, disarmament and peaceful coexistence, but also to the entire anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-capitalist struggle for mankind's freedom and happiness. The German Communist Party considers solidarity in this struggle its internationalist duty.

It is right to say, I think, that the Communists are entering the new year, 1977, with sound plans and clear aims, with a concrete and mass-supported program of action for peace, security and social progress. Future historians will be justified in describing our times as times of great hope. For mankind is decisively turning from war to peace, from international tension to détente and peaceful coexistence. The continuous change in the balance of forces in favor of socialism, the upsurge of the working-class and national-liberation movements,

have made it impossible for the imperialist powers to impose their will on the peoples. The last links of colonial fetters are being destroyed. And yet only a few decades ago imperialism kept three-quarters of the world's population in fetters. The prospect is becoming increasingly realistic of closer economic and cultural cooperation between countries and peoples on such vital matters as the fight against hunger, poverty, epidemics, protection and improvement of the environment, etc.

For one who has been in the ranks of the workers' revolutionary movement for decades, it is gratifying to know that the ideas of socialism, freedom and peace are hewing a way for themselves in my country and throughout the world. Millions of men and women associate their hopes for peace, security, freedom, democracy and the happiness of their children and grandchildren with socialism — the real, existing and developing socialism that has been in power now for nearly 60 years — and with socialism as an aim of struggle, as the image of tomorrow's world. For these millions October and socialism are indivisible. And can one really imagine socialism today without the USSR, and the communist movement without the CPSU? In the hearts of millions of laboring people and in international politics these concepts have been inseparable now for nearly six decades, and this inseparable tie gains strength with every passing year.

Party experience

Alternative to monopoly policy

William Kashtan
General Secretary, CP of Canada

The capitalist world has entered a period marked by growing instability and continued crisis in the economic, political and ideological fields. Recovery, such as it is, has brought no significant declines in either unemployment or inflation. Both have become permanent features of capitalism. This is borne out by developments in Canada. Over the past three years consumer prices increased 32.2 per cent. Food prices rose 50.4 per cent, higher than the total food price increase of the past 20 years. Unemployment has been growing throughout most of the postwar period. In 1975 it stood at 800,000. Unemployment particularly affects young people, but also women workers, skilled and unskilled workers, blue- and white-collar workers. Some provinces are harder hit than others. In Newfoundland, for instance, unemployment is as high as 18, even 20 per cent, while in the Maritime provinces it averaged 11.6 per cent in 1975.

The government's anti-inflation program has led to a wage restraint and undermined collective bargaining and the right to strike, without curbing prices or profits. This has been combined with attacks by provincial governments on health, education and social legislation, and with a substantial tax increase, all in the 'interests of combating inflation.'

The widely held illusions that the so-called anti-inflation program would set things right have been dispelled. Over the past three years wages and salaries rose 32 per cent, while the cost of living rose 34.6 per cent. Corporate profits, before taxes, rose 111 per cent. The monopolies are appropriating an increasing share of the country's wealth at the expense of its working people.

The crisis of the Canadian economy has hit farmers as well as workers. The agricultural crisis, with its market upheavals, price instability and supply problems, is a source of further impoverishment and growing insecurity for many farmers.

The Trudeau government's anti-inflation program is doomed to failure. It is not possible to control the economy without controlling the multinational corporations in Canada. Only democratic control

over the multinationals and monopoly, over prices and profits, can curb inflation and unemployment. But the reactionary forces are opposed to any such control. By equating state intervention with what they call 'socialism,' they want to rally the petty bourgeoisie and middle strata in defense of 'free enterprise,' and strengthen the right-wing political forces. The latter consider the climate suitable for such a shift to the right, as do also the pro-U.S. forces opposed to even the timid and limited steps taken by the Trudeau government to Canadianize the economy.

This was the situation in which the 23rd Convention of the Communist Party of Canada was held last October to work out an effective policy and promote the advance of the working-class and democratic movement.

Depression of living standards resulting from growing unemployment, inflation and attacks on wages, has led to a growing working-class fightback. The strike movement has grown in all parts of the country. The labor movement is increasingly taking the offensive, as seen in the demand for action against monopoly and in the demonstrations on Parliament Hill in Ottawa, in the Québec Legislature, Montreal and in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, New Brunswick and other parts of Canada.

The workers are strengthening their unity, as evidenced by the stronger bonds among unions throughout the country and the formation of the Common Front in Québec. A demonstration of protest against the government's anti-inflation program, held in Ottawa March 22 last year, was joined for the first time by French-Canadian workers. This was the starting point of a new unity and solidarity in action between the French-Canadian and the English-speaking working class of Canada, proof of the recognition by the Canadian Labor Congress of the bi-national character of the working class of Canada. It arises as well from the consistent fight waged by the Communist Party for working-class unity that has penetrated the thinking and action of the workers.

Growing unity has been buttressed by the growth of the trade union movement and the entrance into it of new sections of workers. This demonstrates anew the ever pressing task of the organization of the unorganized as a means of further shifting the balance in favor of the working class and creating more favorable conditions for democratic advance.

While the fightback is still limited to economic issues, it tends to take on a more political character. The nature of the struggle is also creating awareness of the nature of the enemy — state-monopoly capitalism. This is noted by the Canadian Labor Congress when it refers to the alliance of the government and employers. There is a

closer link between the economic and political struggle, which was evidenced in the strike of Elliot Lake uranium miners who demanded that the government go back on its anti-inflation measures, the first strike of this kind in Canada. It is to be seen in the 10-point program of the CLC which goes beyond collective bargaining and advances an alternative program to the wage restraining policy of the government.

The National Day of Protest, held in response to the call of the Canadian Labor Congress, proved nothing short of historic. In dozens of cities workers went on strike in protest against the policy of the government which had shifted the burden of inflation and other crisis developments in the Canadian economy onto the working people. At the meetings and demonstrations that flared up throughout the country they demanded abrogation of the anti-inflation laws, an end to wage restraint and to curbs on strike action. The Day of Protest, which had the support of the Communist Party and numerous progressive organizations, was the largest action ever launched by the Canadian working-class movement.

The growing militancy and consciousness in the working class are seen as well in greater international solidarity and unity of action against the multinational corporations, in growing friendship and cooperation of Canadian trade unionists with the trade unions of the USSR, in increased participation of organized labor in the peace struggle, and not least in the historic decision of the CLC Convention for recognition of May Day as labor's day. The working class is at the center of the struggle against monopoly.

The fightback is as yet uneven. Some groups of workers think they can stay out of the fight in the belief that the crisis will not affect them. However, the growing monopoly offensive tends to widen the anti-monopoly movement and to bring new sections of working people into the struggle.

A central task today, it was said at the Convention, is to unite the struggle against wage restraints with the fight for full employment and against the austerity cutback program. This is part of the struggle to change government economic and social policy, shift politics to the left, strengthen the positions of the working class and democratic forces in federal and provincial parliaments, and curb the power of monopoly and of the multinationals.

This requires united action of the working class and anti-monopoly forces around a democratic alternative to the crisis policies of monopoly. Until the power of the multinational corporations and of monopoly is broken by an alliance of the working class and all those democratic, anti-monopoly and patriotic forces that want Canadian independence, until Canadian sovereignty is asserted in all fields,

until the basic economic and social rights of Canadians are secured, there will be no progress in our country.

To achieve this program there will have to be persistent and united efforts on the part of the working class and democratic forces, the creation of a democratic alliance that includes the Communist Party. It will not be achieved by jumping over stages, by concepts of 'instant socialism.'

A democratic alternative and a new direction for Canada, these are vital tasks today. This was clearly expressed by many delegates at our 23rd Convention. The U.S. imperialist drive on Canada increases day by day. Pressure is mounting to compel agreement by Canada to policies of continentalism and integration, especially the takeover of Canada's natural resources and energy. U.S. imperialism tries to convince Canadians that continentalism is profitable while independence means lower living standards. In theory and practice, continentalism and integration are the road to outright national betrayal for Canada.

The task today is the adoption of a new made-in-Canada constitution. It must be a constitution based on an equal voluntary partnership of the two nations, English- and French-Canadian, which clearly spells out the constitutional rights of the French-Canadian nation to self-determination, including the right to secede if her people should so decide. The struggle for Canadian independence, for a new made-in-Canada constitution and for national equality for French Canada, and the recognition of the right to self-determination, are today all linked together.*

Independent economic development, a truly Canadian culture with a democratic content, a foreign policy of peace, trade and disarmament, an independent, sovereign and united trade union movement, a new made-in-Canada constitution, all these are elements of genuine Canadian independence. The Communist Party of Canada and the New Democratic Party have a pivotal role to play in rallying all democratic forces to effect this program. And an overcoming of the differences in the approach to a number of political problems would only promote cooperation between these parties. The existing ideological differences should not be a barrier to such united action. However, to achieve united action there must be an end to cold war attitudes and to anti-Sovietism and anti-communism in NDP policy. Also an end to the attitude that unity of action is possible only if the

*The Québec election last November was regarded in bourgeois quarters as a victory for separatism. But the Communist Party believes that by voting against the Bourassa government the working people voted for a change, and not for separatism. They opposed a policy designed to shift onto them the burden of the crisis brought about by the evils of capitalism. Furthermore, the Québec election returns show the crisis of confederation has to be dealt with in real earnest.

Communists cease being Communists and adopt social-reformist positions. And in our own ranks unity of action requires an end to sectarian tendencies, which deny the need to seek allies in the struggle against monopoly and reaction.

The policy of the united front and of class alliances is an essential part of the strategy to bring about an anti-monopoly alliance as the pathway to socialism. Our Convention has again proposed the creation of an anti-monopoly coalition and the formation of a democratic government in which the Communist Party would take part. The Communists believe that such a coalition government could open the door to a radical remoulding of society along socialist lines.

This requires first and foremost unity of the working class itself. We try to win the working class for class struggle policies and for socialism. With this in mind, we work to overcome reformist illusions, help the workers understand the true role of the bourgeois state, of the mass media and of the right wing in the working-class movement. This is central to deepening the class consciousness of the workers.

Working class unity implies full equality for women workers, defense of the interests of young workers, equal rights for ethnic groups, and abolition of racism and discrimination.

These measures must go hand in hand with efforts for an independent, sovereign and united trade union movement as an indispensable part of the struggle to advance the interests of the working class and the achievement of real Canadian independence.

The Convention documents point out that Communists must work systematically for a worker-farmer alliance on a common program of action. This will require considerable effort and perseverance. Communists must work in the existing farm movements, particularly the National Farmers Union, and win support for the Party's policies. Above all, we have to build a strong Communist Party organization in rural Canada.

Of particular importance are the various democratic movements which have arisen in opposition to the policies of monopoly. They include the movements in defense of the rights of the Indian, Metis and Innuit people; against racism; for tenants' rights, senior citizens' movements; movements for equality for women, in support of training and jobs for youth, to defend and improve educational standards; to institute price control; the peace and solidarity movements, and movements for municipal reform.

All these movements, alongside the struggles of the working class, the struggle for Canadian independence and for a made-in-Canada constitution, are an integral part of a growing anti-monopoly front. Our task is to stimulate, support and participate in these democratic

movements, combining this with a consistent struggle for working-class and democratic action. As these movements, out of their experience, begin to fight for more radical solutions, conditions will ripen to bring about a democratic, anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist coalition.

Whether this struggle is going to be successful or not depends on how well we use the changing situation to strengthen the bonds between the working class and democratic forces and increase our membership. Since the 22nd Convention, the Party has made headway on a number of fronts. Communists have strengthened their links with the workers in industry, in trade unions, in neighborhoods. We can all take pride in the fact that the Party has begun to grow, unevenly as yet, it is true, but it is growing among workers, young workers, men and women. We can take equal pride in the fact that the press, particularly the *Canadian Tribune,* although this is equally true of the *Pacific Tribune, Combat* and the *Young Worker,* is being taken to the factories, the plants, mines and mills on an ever growing scale and is meeting with favorable response wherever this is being done. Every week the circulation of the *Canadian Tribune* in terms of distribution increases and has now reached the figure of 30,000. This is a big step forward.

All these efforts have won our Party greater prestige among working people; its opinion is being heeded more and more. But our growth should proceed much faster to meet the great new challenges and tasks before us. We continue to lag behind an increasingly favorable situation. It is this which must be corrected if the Party is to live up to its responsibilities.

We must begin to raise our sights and speak of building a mass Party and a mass circulation press. All our work must be related to achieving these central objectives.

The significant changes that have taken place in the world in recent years, it was noted at the Convention, have had, and continue to have, considerable impact on Canada and on the working class and democratic movement. The main feature of the world situation has been a further shift in the balance of forces in favor of peace, democracy and socialism. In practice socialism is showing itself to be vastly superior to capitalism in its ability to solve basic problems of society while systematically raising the living standards of its people and extending socialist democracy. The anti-imperialist forces have become ever stronger and are impelling imperialism to retreat and to recognize the principles of peaceful coexistence as the basis of relations between states. However, as Leonid Brezhnev pointed out at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, despite the more favorable international situation, 'world peace is not yet guaranteed.' The cold war-

riors in the capitalist world, centered around the military-industrial complex in the USA and in West Germany, as well as elsewhere, continue their efforts at undermining détente. The arms race continues at an accelerated pace in the USA and NATO. Over $300,000m. is spent annually on the production of armaments.

Canada, too, is involved in the arms race. Notwithstanding the sizeable increase in arms expenditures in our country, these are still not considered adequate by the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex. Continuing and growing pressures are being exerted on the Trudeau government to increase these expenditures and to enmesh Canada more closely in the strategic aims and ambitions of U.S. imperialism, through NORAD and NATO. The struggle to make détente irreversible and to complement political détente with military détente, is today a priority task for the forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU outlined a series of measures that could consolidate peaceful coexistence and advance the fight for peace and disarmament. These include proposals for a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The Communist Party of Canada supports this initiative. It also supports the Soviet proposals for a World Disarmament Conference, as well as all other steps to détente. In common with all democrats, we welcome the long-term trade, scientific and cultural agreements between Canada and the USSR. Such agreements are not only useful for improving the political climate, they create new jobs for many Canadian workers. This illustrates again why détente, which means peace and jobs, should be actively supported by all Canadian patriotic and democratic forces.

At the same time our Communist Party rejects the imperialist contention that the class struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the ideological struggle, are at variance with détente. State relations should not be confused with class relations. Détente can neither invalidate the laws of capitalism and of exploitation, nor deprive peoples of the right to freedom and independence. The climate of détente and peaceful coexistence profoundly affects social and political developments in the capitalist countries. It creates new and more favorable conditions for the struggle of the working class, for the growth of anti-monopoly movements. Détente has opened new prospects in the fight for social progress and creates more favorable conditions in the fight for Canadian independence.

The struggle for peace was given a powerful impetus by the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties. Though limited to European parties, it was of worldwide significance, first because Europe had been the center of two world wars in the past, and

secondly, because imperialism thought the Communist and Workers' Parties were so divided they would not meet, or if they did, they would not be able to come to agreement.

Our Party welcomes the document of the Berlin Conference which, together with those adopted by the Conference of the Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean and the Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Arab states, shows that the unity of the communist movement is growing. We shall continue to work closely with all Communist and Workers' Parties in fraternal cooperation on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The role of the international communist movement is decisive in the struggle for détente, for peace and social progress. Any weakening of the unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties hinders that struggle and makes it less effective. This is why imperialism does everything it can to undermine the unity of Communist and Workers' Parties. It has stepped up its anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign, exploiting every difference of views between some of the parties. The aim is to discredit socialism, isolate the Communists, cut them off from their allies, undermine confidence in socialism as the real alternative to capitalism. This is accompanied by efforts to integrate the Communist and Workers' Parties in capitalist countries into the mechanism of state-monopoly capitalism. Imperialist politicians pretend that peaceful coexistence also implies ideological coexistence. At the same time, however, they continue their attacks on the Soviet Union, particularly on the questions of socialist democracy and of proletarian internationalism.

With the sharpening of the class struggle internally and internationally, the 23rd Convention said, ideological questions have come to the fore in sharper focus than ever before. There can be no doubt that ideological work is of major importance to the Party and the working class. Any tendency to underestimate it, to show a disregard for theory, to be indifferent to deviations, to permissiveness or liberalism, must be firmly combated. Failure to do this can harm the cause of our Party and the cause of socialism.

The ideological struggle demands much greater effort to increase the circulation of Marxist-Leninist publications. Particular attention should be given to increasing sales of *World Marxist Review* and *Communist Viewpoint*. Some improvements have been made in this connection, but they are not enough.

In our ideological struggle we had to deal with three questions of principle. We have stated our position on these questions in the Draft Policy Statement adopted by the Convention. We have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of other parties. We have only

summed up our views. The first question is: What is the road to socialism? That road, as our Convention stated, can be peaceful or non-peaceful, parliamentary or non-parliamentary, multi-party or one-party. But for all their diversity, these forms converge on the central question: dictatorship of the proletariat, or as we call it in our Program, *The Road to Socialism in Canada,* the 'political power of the working class.' There can be no equivocation on this.

But there is another aspect: the ability of the working class to defend itself once it has achieved political power. Bourgeois-reformist 'pluralism' is sometimes used to justify an equivocal position. But there can be no equivocation on this question either. The working class and its allies must not only be able to win power, but also to defend it. Otherwise the situation might take a tragic turn, as was the case in Chile. So the road to socialism is not an abstraction. Our Program places the question quite clearly.

And still another aspect: the inference is made that the parliamentary road is democratic, while the non-parliamentary road is non-democratic. That this conclusion is absolutely unfounded was stressed by the Convention. The democratic character of the revolution, whatever its forms, is decided by the fact that the majority of the people are involved in it and, above all, by its aims, which are to win and uphold majority power.

The second question of principle which came up for debate was that of internationalism. Imperialism questions the independence of Communist parties. What worries it is not the independence of our parties, which are free and sovereign, but the way they apply the principles of proletarian internationalism.

There can be no objection to laying stress on the national peculiarities and traditions of this or that country, this or that working class. The creative approach to the specifics of one's own country is one thing. This needs to be developed to the maximum. But to place the national in opposition to the international, to the general, means to throw out that which is constant and permanent and thereby imperil the success of the struggle. Our Party has always firmly adhered to a position of patriotism and internationalism and will continue to do so.

There is another side to this question — the tendency to denigrate international solidarity or distort its meaning. Clearly, in the real world where imperialism is still powerful, where neo-colonialism still exists, where monopoly and the multinational corporations are still powerful and decisive factors, to ignore, play down or side-step international solidarity could be extremely dangerous. Imperialism remains an enemy of mankind, a threat to world peace. It remains the enemy of the working class and all working people in each capitalist country. Since imperialism's nature has not changed, since it remains

the same as before, the role of proletarian internationalism, too, remains the same. Indeed, as it was stressed at the 23rd Convention of our Party, at the present stage of the struggle, when the positions of the working class must be reinforced and widened on a world scale, the significance of internationalism has increased, not decreased.

We should not forget that proletarian internationalism is not only a question of international solidarity. It is above all agreement on the general laws of revolutionary change. And it is not accidental that the imperialist attack has centered on this issue, too, particularly on the fundamental question of the state and working-class political power. Marxism-Leninism has clearly established that to achieve socialism a socialist revolution is necessary, that is, the transfer of power from the capitalist class to the working class and its allies.

The third question of principle concerns attempts to renounce the leading role of the working class and its Party, including its basic principle of organization and activity, democratic centralism. As we understand it, a Communist Party is a free association of like-minded people organized to combat capitalist ideology and uphold and advance a definite world outlook, Marxism. Inability to uphold the class independence of the proletariat, opens the road to the liquidation of the Party. To succumb to liberalism, to a 'do-it-yourself,' ideology, individualism, factionalism, would not only wreck the Party, but also obstruct the working class struggle against exploitation and for socialism.

If we are correctly to advance the leading role of the Party, combine democracy and centralism to ensure maximum cohesion and unity of our ranks and the development of criticism and self-criticism, there must be a creative approach to, and application of, our policies in line with the changing situation, while strictly adhering to decisions once made.

Our Party has organized a number of seminars in different parts of the country on these questions. Obviously, we must go beyond that. We need more in-depth analysis of cardinal problems, always guided by the Party Program — *The Road to Socialism in Canada*.

Revisionism and opportunism are at this point the main dangers to combat. At the same time we must be alert to leftism and sectarianism, to dogmatic thinking, all of which would isolate us from the working people and prevent our Party from playing the role it can and must play in this period of great change.

The Communist Party of Canada bases itself on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the laws of revolutionary change. There must be no confusion between principles and tactics here. The decisions of the 23rd Party Convention have

shown that firmness in principle and flexibility in tactics will continue to be our immutable guideline.

We Communists have been called revolutionary optimists, and with good reason. Yes, we are historical optimists, for the world has entered an epoch of radical social change, and imperialism is powerless to alter this basic fact. The Communist Party of Canada will do its utmost for the Canadian people to be part of this historic process, opening a new chapter for our country and people — a truly independent and socialist Canada.

Reflections on the 1,000 days of Popular Unity rule

Volodia Teitelboim
Political Commission member,
CC, CP of Chile

Lenin took careful account of the lessons of the Paris Commune and the 1905-07 revolution in Russia to evolve on their basis the strategy and tactics which in 1917 led to the victorious October Revolution. Similarly, it is essential for Chileans to make a deep study of the 1,000 days of Popular Unity rule, in all the diversity of its typical and atypical factors and features, and draw proper theoretical and practical conclusions. By analyzing the highly valuable data at our disposal, we can — in a definite social microworld, within the bounds of a small country of 10 million — ascertain the characteristics of a political drama of universal significance. We can make a sober assessment of the achievements and miscalculations of the popular movement, of its correct moves and its mistakes. The evidence we have also makes it possible and necessary to study the enemy's methods and devices, to compile a veritable manual showing how present-day counter-revolution can strangle revolution.

To be sure, the only political value of such manuals is that they point to a specific example governed by general laws, with all the peculiarities of place and time that characterize every revolution and every counter-revolution.

We will endeavor to examine the past impartially and self-critically, suggest correctives to our activity and reveal the overt and covert lines of enemy action, all of which is bound to make for greater clarity regarding our strategy and tactics, as well as those of the enemy. This

will be the prologue to introducing corrections into our activity to transform the people's defeat into victory.

The role of elections and the 'peaceful path'

We think the events in Chile indicate, in the final analysis, that, given definite circumstances resulting from a complex course of historical evolution and from painstaking building up of forces and uniting all the strata striving for social change, it is possible to achieve through elections much more than an ordinary or even a considerable electoral victory and, on the other hand, much less than real power. Those events also show that no electoral victory holds a guarantee of its solidity. Such a victory can be a notable advance on a long and generally thorny path abounding in dangerous curves and crossings and often skirting a precipice. But unless victory in elections is followed up by a vast offensive of a popular majority to turn it into real power which the masses would be willing and able to hold and defend against all obstacles, against all attempts by enemies at home and abroad to ignore and do away with this power, the result may be, or is even bound to be, defeat.

Indeed, victory in elections brings power only in part. Being the beginning of a new stage in the revolutionary process and the completion of previous stages, it does not come overnight but is a result of the revolutionary process as a whole, of a growing structural crisis in the country stemming from the deterioration of the general crisis of capitalism. It is the ultimate result of the accumulation of preliminary factors reflecting the maturing of diverse forms of class struggle.

That was how a pre-revolutionary situation shaped up in Chile. The Communist Party regarded elections as a form of action in the struggle to transform society, and this required winning majority support.

'*Political majority*' means something more solid and complete than a relative or absolute majority of votes. *To a greater extent than an arithmetical (or mechanical) majority, it must be expressive of the existence of a representative social bloc of the greater part of the population.* Besides, it must be an *active majority,* one not only operating continuously (which is typical of any steadily developing movement) but realizing the need to uphold by every possible means the gains made.

Yet *during the growing revolutionary process in Chile, the forms of the struggle were considered as important as its goals. Form was exalted to the rank of substance, as it were, and an absolute was made of one path. This was undoubtedly a mistake,* for when the concrete situation changed, the masses found their hands tied. While the peaceful development of the revolution was in keeping with prevailing conditions and expressed the will of the popular move-

ment, it was far from being in harmony with the mood of an enemy ready to stop the revolution at all costs and by every means, including means that were anything but peaceful. This must be borne in mind. The enemy's bellicosity and aggressiveness should never come as a surprise to revolutionaries. The enemy will always do his utmost to put up resistance. He will grasp every chance to take up arms against the people!

Every phenomenon or development is dialectically influenced by diverse factors and every concrete truth has fundamental and secondary aspects. In the light of past events, we consider that in the case of Chile the political factor certainly played the main role in the interconnection of the political and the military factor. The latter factor is a part of the former, but an essential one. Hence the immense significance of the military policy of the popular movement. It implies more than merely adopting a definite position toward the army and establishing a solid alliance with its potentially democratic part. It implies forming a force that could make common cause, as far as possible, with the section of the army loyal to the revolution.

Experience has shown that our advance must be safeguarded not only by popular, but also by adequate military support. And the precondition for that is a constructive policy on this issue (with the Communists assuming special responsibility, of course).

Possibilities of changing the path

It is vitally important, therefore, to restore to the revolution (in our conceptions of it) its highly dialectical nature, always bearing in mind that this is a process that can change depending on the course of the struggle, and that at times its evolution can accelerate to the point of dictating other forms of struggle, as was the case in Russia in 1917. In other words, we must make no absolute of this or that path of the revolution, must not consider that the choice of path is final and may not be revised, or that one and the same principle should be used invariably throughout a long period of history. Switching from one form of struggle to another in other countries may not take place as rapidly as it did in Russia in the few months preceding the October Revolution. But our negative experience suggests that it is wrong in general to attribute an *unchanging* character to any particular form of struggle, to treat it as a *constant* making it possible to disregard changes in the situation, often abrupt ones, caused especially by political crises and growing contradictions.

'Peaceful path' is a correct term only in so far as it rules out civil war. But because of the many vicissitudes, it cannot bypass the law which says that violence is the 'midwife' of history. We should have always borne this in mind, should have remembered that the very act

of changing path presupposes 'changing horses' and continuing our advance. It is hard to change horses in mid-stream. But then it is harder still when no preparations have been made beforehand. Irrespective of how clearly the necessity for the change is realized, the very possibility of such a change and the ability to carry it out must certainly be guaranteed. This is not a matter that can be settled at the moment of change; it requires advance preparations, which may even take years, and this is what Chile's popular movement failed to do. The revolutionary vanguard marching at the head of the masses must be really prepared to adopt if necessary the most vigorous measures against a reactionary onslaught.

What happened in Chile under Popular Unity rule was that many regarded preparations for an eventual change of path and forms of struggle as absolutely unacceptable. Another lesson taught to Popular Unity is that an atmosphere of legality admittedly makes for stricter enforcement of laws and hence gives revolutionaries more strength and can, in the end, help them to make rapid progress but that in definite cases it can contribute to enemy plans for a rebellion or coup. Unless this is properly understood, legality itself may be used for tying the people's hands and making it even harder for them to exercise their right to legitimate defense. The people have no reason to feel bound hand and foot like a Gulliver by legality. They should regard it as a useful weapon in upholding their just cause, but never as a trap or gag.

In setting up the machinery of their conspiracy, reaction and fascism in Chile harped on absurd accusations against the Popular Unity government, saying that it had trespassed the bounds of legality. What they were after was to trample all legality underfoot (as if developing in their own way Odilon Barrot's statement, 'Legality is killing us,'* they set out to implement the slogan, 'Let us kill legality'). Developments showed, in particular, that they turned the arms control law into a trap for the people by using it to disarm and crush them.

All this confirms the need to respect a fundamental demand: reliance on the masses. We have said that the peaceful path is practicable only if the idea of the revolution wins the minds of the majority of the people and prompts it to act. When the forces favoring change have achieved overwhelming superiority no opportunities are left for a reactionary rising, let alone for its success. The idea of majority, which Lenin considered so important ('the majority of the people are

*Odilon Barrot, conservative politician of the French Second Republic. His statement 'Legality is killing us,' betrayed the intention of reaction late in 1848 and early in 1849 to provoke a popular rising, quell it and restore the monarchy. See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Sel. Works*, Vol. 1, p. 202.

for us,' he said in September 1917) retains its validity as a requisite of victory whatever the form of struggle.

Consequently, the alignment of forces is of decisive importance. We must always, I think, see to it that the front of advocates of change is stronger than that of their opponents and that this superiority is considerable numerically and organizationally, as well as in terms of political, ideological, cultural, propaganda and all other activities. In other words, this broad front would be stronger in regard to the quality and solidarity of the alliance, to the dynamism and effectiveness of its united action. Also its program must be the common denominator of all factors and the elements and forces making it up. On this basis, they must operate in coordinated fashion, on the principles of tactical and strategic unity, as they strike joint blows in one and the same direction. It is only in this way — by operating as a genuine coalition, avoiding the rise of opposed poles or disunited action inside the movement and by developing a common program line — that the enemy can be defeated. The preservation and extension of the scope and strength of the front and the consolidation of the majority are a vitally important factor, as experience has shown, for the advance of the revolutionary process.

I repeat: the enemy will use force for as long as he can! The revolution can do without bloodshed, but only if the majority can impose this and the minority cannot prevent it. This could have been true of the period our country went through in the closing months of 1970 and partly in 1971. However, the enemy will always do his utmost to regain his strength. Hence it is not a question of only one moment of danger, for there is danger as long as there exist reactionary forces and it increases when reaction succeeds in reversing the situation in its favor.

Consequently, the problem of the balance of forces makes it necessary to take account of its inconstancy and likely changes. It is not established once and for all except when the revolution, having consolidated its positions, overcomes this internal contradiction and eliminates antagonistic classes to build a classless society.

Throughout the period of Popular Unity rule, Chile was under a kind of dual power, which cannot, of course, be compared to the situation in Russia in 1917. In Chile there was a lawful popular government and, on the other hand, an unlawful reactionary power backed by all who earlier had dominated society. In addition to certain key economic and financial levers and the mass media, that reactionary power controlled a considerable part of the state apparatus. It skillfully exploited the miscalculations and incompetence of Popular Unity and the existence of different trends in it to bring the petty bourgeoisie into the effort to carry out reaction's plans. This large

social stratum is often undecided, being attached to its own values and frightened by the stories which the enemy's machinery of psychological terror continuously spreads. The enemy knew full well that he would get nowhere unless he won the support of the intermediate strata and influenced the heterogeneous group of people differing in political consciousness, ideology and behavior in the climate of hysteria cunningly created through the efforts of the CIA. If the oligarchy made certain gains through its strategy of winning over the masses it was only because it had the support of other strata not belonging to its class. It succeeded in this because there was no adequate counteraction from the other side, that is, because the popular movement had no policy linking up with the program of the movement and inspiring the intermediate social strata with confidence that they, too, would have a place in the new society.

Responsibility of the vanguard

The decisive factor for the outcome of the struggle in favor of the people is, undoubtedly, correct leadership of the popular movement, a leadership capable of giving the masses proper guidance, keeping them informed, mobilizing them for this or that necessary action and making this political majority fully aware of its responsibility and turning it into a totality of politically conscious and united forces. Needless to say, the Communist Party plays an essential role in this, as do the other popular front parties.

The Chilean popular movement doubtlessly has historic achievements to its credit and showed creative initiative throughout the period of Popular Unity rule. There developed rudimentary forms of democratic government that sprang from a people determined to change the class nature of the state, and that should be taken into account in the future as useful precedents of genuine democratic rule capable of keeping chaos under control.

However, Salvador Allende's assumption of the Presidency could not in itself alter the class nature of the state, the character of the armed forces, the police or the administrative machinery. This is why we stress that in any process following a peaceful course, it is most important to bring about an alignment of military forces in favor of revolutionary development. This is a key issue.

Popular Unity was faced with the pressing need to effect changes that would put the state apparatus under the people's organized pressure to the point of gradually placing it in the people's service. Furthermore, it was indispensable to promote active democracy involving the participation of the masses in the broadest sense of the term, strip the reactionaries of their spheres of domination and trans-

fer all real power to the working people, to the progressive social strata.

There is no denying that in the three years it was in power, the Popular Unity government won the active support of the masses. However, confusion over the objectives — democratic or socialist ones — and the introduction of ideas alien to its program, or based on sheer utopia made it impossible at any moment to give the initiative of the masses the right direction and secure majority support in solving every problem, as was the case with so patriotic a measure understandable to all as the nationalization of the copper mines.

Let it be stressed that the sad conclusion of this chapter of history should not minimize the significance of so evident a reality of the past as the fact that in less than three years, the popular government made tremendous progress by scoring valuable gains which live on in the people's memory and are part of a lasting political patrimony (even though they were subsequently destroyed by the fascist regime). They became a legacy that will again play an important mobilizing role when the country has overcome its present state. It would be wrong to underestimate this experience. We must give serious consideration to the vastly positive significance and great constructive contribution of a popular movement that was broken off so tragically.

However, we maintain that unless the masses are constantly schooled in political action and in assessing the political situation, they cannot by merely following their instinct rise to the level of social awareness needed to defeat the enemy and participate consciously in making history. Hence *it is a duty of the Marxist-Leninist political vanguard,* of the Communists operating at home or abroad, *to provide the working class and the popular movement with scientific leadership at any moment,* even in the dire conditions of fascist rule. In fulfilling its fundamental mission, the Communist Party, the leading party responsible along with other parties, its allies, for the development of the revolutionary process, must solve a dialectical equation consisting of two elements: the *quality of its unity* with other forces of a popular movement not free of contradictions that can at times grow to dangerous proportions; and *its independent role* in this movement as a party which can under no circumstances, even amid discord, renounce its duty to present its policy to the people and country with a view to strengthening and not weakening unity.

How present-day counter-revolution can strangle revolution

The positions of the representatives of the popular camp were undermined step by step, and eventually this became perfectly obvious and made for the success of the reactionary coup. Besides, there were

shortcomings in the implementation of the working-class policy of alliances and the balance of forces in both the political and the military spheres deteriorated noticeably in the closing months. For all this, however, the negative epilogue of this period of the Chilean revolution was not due, as has been said, to the people's will, but to the crippling forcible interference and violent change brought on by the fascist coup.

It is necessary that the revolutionary process be supported by a popular majority. On the other hand, while this factor is indispensable, it does not guarantee the success of the revolution, whose progress may be upset and its gains nullified if the popular movement is unable to support the resolve of the majority through effective defense measures.

We do not mean arms alone. To achieve political results, imperialism and home reaction launched their offensive first of all in the economic sphere, that is, a sphere in which they were particularly strong and in which they could do it all the more easily. The economic offensive was combined with individual terror, which by now has become a widespread daily practice of Latin America's political reactionaries. The resulting situation was one of utter chaos, described by some as very well organized. It was organized by the CIA, which did not hesitate to use for the purpose an all-out propaganda offensive. Perhaps it was the first time that counter-revolution had used the mass media so thoroughly, on so large a scale and with such force. This is another page of history worthy of most careful study. Reaction's plans were furthered by the government's failure to take coordinated and organized counter-measures. The existence of two parallel policy lines within Popular Unity contributed to the success of reaction's conspiracy. Besides, the conspirators continuously took advantage of the ultra-revolutionaries' talk about armed forces, which they did not have.

What we are trying to say is that a war in which no guns are fired requires a common, clear-cut policy that must constantly be spelled out to the masses. It is not merely a question of properly organizing intelligence and counter-intelligence. The task is to carry on a total political struggle aimed at disuniting the central forces of the conspiracy from top to bottom and in every respect — economically and psychologically, publicly and otherwise, but above all militarily.

Needed: a reappraisal of the issue of the army

These bloody events cast a stark light on the role of the armed forces. Underestimation of this issue translated itself into a new tregedy for the people. What we witnessed was not a mere repetition of the past

or a confirmation of the lessons of a long period of history. More than before, imperialism and its domestic allies are anxious to bring the army out of the barracks. This is due to the tacit admission that the development and growing strength of the popular movement more than ever endanger imperialist and capitalist control of society and the state. Revealingly, it is no longer a question of military actions, which have been numerous in the 150-year-long history of Latin America's republics, that is, of a conspiracy against a high-ranking adventurer, of a simple replacement of a power-thirsty individual in the government palace. As a rule, now it is a matter of outright action against the popular movement, taken above all when reaction has no other means of preventing a victory of progressive forces or abolishing their gains.

This prompts us to reappraise the military question from today's point of view. No new approach to it is conceivable if we overlook the important fact that imperialism persistently seeks support among Latin American armies, which it tries to influence as an inseparable part of the forces implementing the Pentagon's global strategy. According to an imported doctrine accepted by certain domestic military leaders, the chief enemy today is not outside but inside the country and is called 'internal subversion.' At a certain juncture, the U.S. military-industrial complex evolved the tactical principle of *Vietnamizing the war,* which expected 'Asians to kill Asians.' Its present motto in our country virtually expects *'Chileans to kill Chileans,'* which means that the armed forces must wage war against their own people. This would make it easier for the imperialists to assure their domination and plunder of Chile. In this context, Pinochet's statement in Uruguay that he had acted in the interests of imperialism was brazen tragicomedy. 'The United States,' he said, 'did not fire a single shot to remove communism from Chile. It was no Vietnam. No one was killed.' Indeed, no U.S. soldier was killed, but then many thousands of Chileans were. Pinochet disregards these deaths.

Certain Pentagon political and military strategists have said that their best investment is training Latin American officers in U.S. military academies and imparting Pentagon thinking. Indeed, this is what they have done. Senator William Proxmire announced in 1971 that between 1945 and 1971 the U.S. had spent $175,000m. on the training of 320,000 servicemen from 70 independent countries. In 1965, Robert Wood, then in charge of military aid, proudly said that almost all Latin American officers had received training in the United States or in the Panama Canal Zone.*

The imperialists are now reaping the fruits. In several Latin Ameri-

*See Fernando Rivas y Elizabeth Reimann, *Un caso de penetracion imperialista.* Ediciones 75, Mexico City, p. 7.

can countries, they have imposed reactionary military dictatorships in their service. And they are plotting to do the same elsewhere.

In learning the lessons of our own mistakes, we must therefore draw the following conclusion: to ensure that the revolution follows a peaceful course, we must prevent reactionaries in the armed forces from turning them into executioners and stranglers of the popular movement. In other words, we must see to it that the army stops playing the role of a super-police, that it does not operate as a domestic colonial force taking orders from the Pentagon, an insurance company of a pretorian guard protecting the interests of monopolies and latifundium holders.

One of the greatest weaknesses of the Chilean popular movement was that this question was posed inadequately, narrowly and shyly as it were, preferably at the level of individuals, to the exclusion of parties having deep roots among the people, to the exclusion of the masses. For a long time, men shirking their duties remained in charge of the army and the police. The sentiments of many high-ranking officers were little known (the case of Pinochet is the most striking, but not the only one). The information services, honeycombed with subversives were disastrously incompetent. Besides, everything was affected by lack of unity in the government over the support for General Prats when he headed the cabinet and after his removal as comander-in-chief. It is our sincere opinion that we Communists, too, are to blame for that historical miscalculation, which was a result of the weakness and untenability of our military policy and our attitude to the armed forces.

How can a favorable change in the army be brought about? It is a very difficult task but undoubtedly a feasible one. To answer this question as correctly as possible, we must analyze the social nature of the army, its class composition and the mechanism of its activity, its changing functions in the course of history and its present role in society — in other words, the dialectics of its behavior.

The armed forces of Latin American countries are not abstract institutions or sinister organizations destined inevitably and for ever to brutally supress their peoples. There is no need to stress here the special character of the revolutionary armed forces of Cuba, brought into being by a victorious socialist revolution. But even in the armies of those countries of the continent where there has been no revolution, we are witnessing developments that do not entitle us to a fatalistic interpretation of their role or to extreme pessimism. Karl Marx distinguished two currents in the Spanish army (historically speaking, it bore a certain similarity to the armies of the countries of one-time Spanish America in atmosphere and as a school for the training and indoctrination of troops). He saw two incipient alterna-

tives of social and political activity for it that manifest themselves to this day: an obtuse reactionary attitude and, at the same time, a potential for revolutionary initiative, as the rising led by Rafael Riego showed. This initiative can only manifest itself in periods of political crisis. Lenin pointed to the living connection between a developing revolutionary movement and its reflection in the armed forces, growing restlessness in the army. It must be admitted, however, that it was not this characteristic of the army that was the historic dominant, but the army's being the armed guarantee of a system based on oppression.

Chile had quite a few advocates of the theory of 'particularism' of the army, who claimed that at a definite moment it adheres to 'political neutrality.' It is only right to point out that the army always acts under the decisive influence of this or that class or movement. It would be utopian to think of the army as being politically 'neutral.' *Not so when, in a definite situation, a period of neutralization is brought about* as a result of struggle outside and within the armed forces to foil fascist plans aimed at involving the army in a reactionary coup. In this instance, the people can lean on those elements in the army that remain loyal to the constitution. Within the framework of the concept of peaceful development of the revolution, this *neutralization* can have a certain effect for a time.

A very important factor to be borne in mind is, of course, the class origin of the military. However, the fact that most members of the armed services come ultimately from the working class and poor peasantry manifests itself on a mass scale only under the impact of a revolutionary situation and provided there exists an organization in the barracks that is carrying on definite ideological work.

The point is that a false social consciousness and a false conception of public duty are imposed on the military, or at least on many of them, and that this makes effective ideological and political work on our part all the more necessary.

According to a view commonly held by students of this problem, there was evidence of three currents in the Chilean army prior to the coup. They are classified — without sufficient scientific accuracy — as follows: (1) patriotic servicemen, or 'constitutionalists'; (2) servicemen loyal to their professional duty, and (3) servicemen favoring fascism. This classification is more or less close to the truth and retains its validity. However, it would be mechanistic to overlook the changes subsequently brought about by the operation of internal and external factors. The struggle, including the ideological struggle, which, of course, is going on in Chilean society in spite of the monopoly of the mass media held by a totalitarian state, has its effect on the armed forces as well. The country's anti-fascist forces, its

popular and democratic movement, can and should contribute actively to this struggle.

There are objective prerequisites for this: a deep-rooted, disastrous economic crisis; a political vacuum around the junta, the international isolation of the regime, and the hatred which the vast majority of the population feel for it. Today, three years after the imposition of the dictatorship, various subjective factors are maturing too. The role of the working class has increased over the past year. The Communist Party perseveres in its guiding role, braving savage repression. Its organizations are active throughout the country. The major popular opposition parties are reorganizing at the national level. Discord within the ruling group is mounting. There is more and more evidence of vacillation in army circles, which daily witness growing condemnation of the junta by a population convinced that the military clique, far from solving any of the country's problems, has aggravated them. More and more people in the army condemn the unbridled terrorism and unprecedented brutality of the junta and the countless abuses of DINA. The activities of this agency, which depends directly on Pinochet, are marked by a sinister man-hunt and increasingly numerous lists of 'missing persons' containing the names of prisoners of Chile's gestapo whose arrest the regime refuses to admit.

We know that hastening the end of today's nightmare, of the people's suffering, depends largely on ourselves, on the activity of Popular Unity and the anti-fascist forces generally. In drawing numerous lessons from the Chilean experience, many of which are bitter while others are instructive, and all of which are equally useful, we consider that by carrying on a selfless, extremely dangerous but increasingly widespread and organized struggle, the people will pave the way for changing the situation. This will make it possible not only to return Chile to its people when the time comes but to contribute to the elaboration of certain pressing theoretical and political problems.

From the WMR Commission for the Exchange of Party Experience

Comrade Teitelboim's article is the first in a series of articles about the lessons of the Chilean revolution to be published in this journal by leading members of the Communist Party of Chile. *WMR* has already carried material on this subject but the Party is continuing to analyze events, their consequences, new facts and the urgent problems of the revolutionary process. Under an agreement reached with the CC of the Communist Party of Chile, further articles will deal with the following subjects:

— the relationship between the democratic and socialist stages of the Chilean revolution;

— problems of winning power and the experience of peaceful development of the revolution at this stage;

— the role of the working class in the Chilean revolution, the role of the Communist Party and the policy of alliances;

— the problem of holding and exercising power, and the causes of the temporary defeat of the Chilean revolution;

— new forms of resisting reaction, and the imperialist weapon of 'psychological warfare';

— external factors in the temporary defeat of the Chilean revolution, and the international character of the activity of revolutionary, counter-revolutionary forces.

The progressive program and working people's activity

Achutha Menon
Member of National Council,
CP of India;
Chief Minister of Kerala State

The 20-point program* announced by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi on July 1, 1975, has been rightly named an important landmark in the political and economic development of India in recent times. The Communist Party of India has welcomed the program and is mobilizing mass support for it. We have had considerable success in this in Kerala, where power is in the hands of the Left-Democratic United Front, and the coalition government has been headed by representatives of the Communist Party since 1969**

But so far as Kerala is concerned, many of the items of the program are not new. They are only a reiteration or a continuation of what we have been doing since 1969 and particularly since September 1970, when the prescheduled elections consolidated the positions of the United Front government appreciably. Such items as confiscation of excess lands from big landowners and handing them over to landless

*This program envisages measures to solve the country's acute social and economic problems. For more details see N.K. Krishnan, 'A sharp turn,' *WMR*, October 1975, and M. Sen, 'Positive trends gaining the upper hand in India,' August 1976. — *Ed.*

**For details on the situation in which the government of Kerala state is operating, see A. Menon, 'Left-democratic coalition in power,' *WMR*, November 1973. — *Ed.*

peasants and agricultural laborers, provision of house sites for the poor and landless people, and other items benefiting the poor, are contained in the minimum program proclaimed by the United Front in Kerala way back in 1967.

The Kerala government had passed a law abolishing bondage labor before this was announced in the 20-point program. And it went further than just raising the minimum wage for agricultural workers; it passed an act which provides some kind of stability of occupation for agricultural labor. There is also a clause for the creation of material aid and old-age pension funds.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the 20-point program accelerated the implementation of progressive measures in Kerala and added to our vigor, determination and possibilities. The parties forming the Kerala government now have a deeper understanding of the paramount importance of such measures in the struggle against reaction and of the countrywide significance of the policy they began to pursue long before July 1975.

I shall cite some facts and figures. For instance, during the five years and eight months, from January 1, 1970, to August 21, 1975, the total number of cultivating tenants and homestead builders on whom permanent rights of ownership were conferred was 967,100; whereas from September 1, 1975, to June 1, 1976 — a short period of nine months — the number came to 978,100. Or let us take another issue — the taking over of excess lands. From January 1970 to August 1975, 56,400 acres of land were taken over from big landowners in Kerala State, and in the following nine months another 36,400 acres were expropriated.

The implementation of the program depends to a very great extent on the political orientation of the masses, on their consciousness and organization. Now that the law is on their side and public opinion supports the government program, this objective can be achieved more easily. But merely because of these facts the program cannot get implemented automatically. Even in Kerala, where we have advanced far more than other states, there are serious lags in its implementation where the masses are not organized. For instance, the minimum wage law has been fully enforced only in areas where agricultural labor is properly organized, where they are conscious of their rights and will assert these rights. Whereas in other areas of Kerala where the workers are poorly organized, they have to make do with a wage that is far below the minimum prescribed by law.

Take another example. One of the items in the 20-point program is the abolition or scaling down of the debts which agricultural laborers, poor peasants, small holders, village artisans and other categories of working people owe to the landlords or money-lenders. The respec-

tive laws have already been enacted in some states. But it is not enough just to proclaim the abolition of debts. It is necessary and urgent to set up an alternative source of credit for the poorest sections of the population through cooperative or state credit institutions. Unless you set up such an organization, the poor man is once again in the hands of the money-lender who will give him credits at exorbitant rates of interest. This causes much suffering in many parts of India. The problem was discussed at length at a conference of chief state ministers in Delhi which previewed the 20-point program, and it was at that time that I, on behalf of the Kerala government, pointed to the urgent need for a source of credit for rural workers.

Since the question of credit is of vital importance to the mass of the rural workers, I should like to outline our experience in resolving it.

According to a survey conducted by the Kerala State Planning Board in September 1975, the total outstanding rural indebtedness in 1971 amounted to Rs. 1,000 million. As against this, lending by institutional organizations (nationalized and commercial banks, cooperative societies) amounted to Rs. 590 million. Thus the quantum of borrowings of rural households in Kerala from non-institutional (private) agencies has been estimated to range between Rs. 360 and Rs. 410 million. The quantum of outstanding non-institutional borrowings attributable to small cultivators, agricultural laborers and artisans may be in the range of Rs. 240 to Rs. 270 million. This would represent the minimum magnitude of credit gap vis-à-vis requirements of the above groups of the rural population. In other words, any arrangement to meet the credit gap of the weaker sections of the rural population will have to shoulder the responsibility of advancing a minimum of Rs. 240 to Rs. 270 million. This problem had to be tackled by the Kerala state government.

It was not possible for the government to advance this amount. The rural banks proposed by the central government, which are to be started in various parts of India, would also not be able to meet the situation. For the coverage would be so meagre as to be totally ineffective. For instance, Kerala would get only one — or at best two — of the rural banks to be set up the government of India, and that too would have taken a long time. It is to be noted that no bank has yet been started in Kerala although it is ten months since the announcement came. Even if the banks had been started, it would have been impossible to cover all the villages of Kerala by setting up branches throughout the state.

It was in this context that the state government thought of mobilizing resources through our own cooperative institutions. Kerala has a viable and strong credit structure in the cooperative sector with the Kerala State Cooperative Bank at the state level, the Central

Cooperative Banks at the District levels and Primary Service Cooperative Societies/Banks at the village level. This structure distributes the sums granted by the Reserve Bank of India and has been meeting the requirements of short-or medium-term agricultural loans of the rural population to a significant extent (Rs. 496 million in 1974-75). But according to the rules laid down by the Reserve Bank of India, its credit can be utilized only for the purposes of agricultural production, and adequate security must be given for those loans in the form of either land or standing crops. Therefore, two things emerge: First, even the small holder or marginal farmer who has some form of security to offer can get credit only for productive purposes and nothing at all for his personal and family needs which cannot altogether be avoided. Secondly, agricultural laborers, poor artisans, casual laborers, petty traders, etc. who have no sort of security to offer are completely denied any credit from this source.

However, the cooperative societies in Kerala used to fulfill the non-agricultural requirements of the rural people also to a limited extent by using their own resources which are called 'Owned Funds' of these cooperatives. The only way to meet these requirements is for the cooperatives to mobilize resources through deposits of their own.

It was under these circumstances that the Kerala state government, in consultation with the state's cooperative banks, evolved a scheme for deposit mobilization. It was thought possible to mobilize about Rs. 200 million by organizing a mobilization month in April 1976. An all-out effort was made by the Kerala State Cooperative Bank, 11 District Cooperative Banks, 41 Urban Cooperative Banks, and 1,000 selected Primary Cooperative Societies.

Organizational arrangements for efficiently conducting the mobilization throughout the month were made. Each Minister was put in charge of one of the 11 districts of Kerala. All of them worked very hard along with District Collectors, Members of the Legislative Assembly and other representatives of the people, Panchayat members, Cooperators, etc., to approach the people and canvas deposits. Instructions were given to approach every household through small squads and request them to deposit whatever little savings they had in the primary cooperatives, or in the District or State Cooperative Banks.

I am very glad to say that the program worked wonderfully well. The response of the people was spontaneous. The meetings held in the pursuance of the Deposit Mobilization campaign were a tremendous success. Thousands and thousands of people gathered at all these meetings among whom the poor sections, viz, the village artisans, the agricultural laborers, the small and marginal farmers, etc. dominated.

The final accounts are not yet in, but it is beyond doubt that more than Rs. 200 million worth of deposits have been collected.

Out of the total sum of mobilized resources, 65 per cent have been allocated for production purposes, and 10 per cent for consumption purposes — for meeting educational expenses, marriages (but not dowries), illness, etc. Advances to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes receive special attention; they are granted loans on favorable terms, including a concession in the rate of interest.

Thus Kerala's experience has shown that fulfillment of the government's 20-point program is inconceivable without concrete actions by the local authorities, without extensive explanatory and mobilization work among the working people, without the support of the people at large.

Now, it may be asked whether the administrative machinery is adequate for the fulfillment of this program, and whether any alterations of modifications to the existing machinery or a thorough overhaul of the entire machinery, will be required in order to implement the program fully. Kerala's experience may not fully correspond to the experience of other states, but I do not think that the situation in other states differs fundamentally from that of Kerala.

Taking Kerala's official organs as a whole, you cannot say that they are not imbued with a bureaucratic spirit, but at the same time it must be clearly stated that there are elements inside this machinery who are really eager to help implement the program. Certain district collectors, law offices, and the offices of agricultural and other departments are very enthusiastic in carrying out progressive measures. We held several conferences and seminars during the last few months, and we could see that some of these officials were in good rapport with the people. They could understand the problems of the people and are willing to help them; they could explain things to the people in their own language; in simple language they explained the government's schemes and told them how they could improve their position.

But although there are honest and energetic officials who sympathize with the people, the machinery as a whole is not adequate or really attuned to the carrying out of the 20-point program. And if we want to go ahead and include other programs to further develop our economy, the existing machinery is certainly going to be a hindrance.

After the announcement of the 20-point program, the question of setting up an implementation machinery was very urgent. And it was stated at that time by the Prime Minister as well as by the INC President that implementation committees would be set up (at state, district, block and other levels) consisting of representatives of political parties who are willing to carry out the program. We have set up such committees in Kerala, but not below the district level. Experi-

ence has shown that they can be useful and effective, but only to a certain extent, for they cannot act on their own initiative; they can only 'urge' the administration on.

I have heard that these committees are ineffective in some states, that they are seldom convened. Ours is a different situation. The Kerala government has laid down that the committees should meet at least once a fortnight to discuss current questions concerning the fulfillment of the 20-point program. Of course, differences arise, since many political parties are represented. But in most cases decisions are unanimous and binding upon all.

In all the development schemes or activities that we took up during the last five years or so, we found the panchayat, that is the popular machinery at the lowest level in our state, to be very helpful. Take, for instance, the housing scheme, under which every panchayat is to build a hundred houses for the homeless. The land was provided by the state government, but money had to mobilized on a big scale from the public. On the initiative of the Chief Minister, the state government set up a housing fund out of contributions from the public or government offices, from merchants, landlords, other well-off groups of the population. A big sum was collected. To spend this money judiciously, we asked the panchayat presidents to convene committees consisting of panchayat members who are willing and eager to help in the building campaign, irrespective of the parties to which they belonged. We also called on them to participate actively in the work of the building committees, which included, among others, representatives of political parties. The duty of the building committees was not only to select the plots, but also to supervise the actual construction work. In all such matters panchayat presidents took a very great interest, as did panchayat members, although differences arose between the representatives of political parties.

All this also applies to the construction of village dispensaries. Here too a lot of cooperation from the common people was necessary because what the government said was: if each panchayat gives one acre of land and promises to put up a proper building for the panchayat dispensary, the government will provide it with the required staff, equipment and medicines. This program was taken up by most of the panchayats very enthusiastically and they succeeded in implementing it. Land development and irrigation programs also enjoyed the energetic support of the population. So on the whole, as experience has shown, the mass of the poor willingly participate in such programs and their support is indispensable for success.

Of course difficulties do arise. The reforms being carried out in Kerala cause a clashing of class interests. The local landlords and the representatives of other propertied groups sometimes get a big section

of the population to follow them, and this hampers the progress of the reforms. So what we evidently need is democratic organization of the working masses so as to intensify their support for the government's progressive measures and, so to say, arm them politically for the struggle for their rights and interests. There would thus be broader possibilities for neutralizing the subversive acts of the reactionary circles.

In this connection I would like to note that we have set up land reform boards consisting of representatives of the people, and these boards have speeded up the implementation of the land reforms in Kerala. Organized actions by the working people are absolutely necessary in such a matter as countrywide enforcement of the minimum wage law. What have labor conflicts shown us? In a conflict situation the agricultural worker naturally goes to the labor officer. The nature of the settlement of the dispute depends largely on the subjective factor — the political convictions of this civil servant. If he does not sympathize with the worker, the latter is defenceless in the dispute. The only thing that the worker can do is to join a united and politically conscious organization which defends the rights of agricultural workers and promotes the land reform program.

To conclude, a few words about the conduct of the opposition organizations in our state, including the so-called parallel Communist Party, which sides with the right-wing parties. While not offering strong resistance to the implementation of the measures stipulated in the 20-point program, the leaders of that party try to question its progressive nature. They claim to have long ago put forward demands which go further than the items in the program, and that there is nothing 'revolutionary or extraordinary' in it.

Without delving into the soundness of these assertions, we affirm that what is important is not how long ago this or that goal was proclaimed, but what has been done to achieve it. We Communists are well aware of the limitations of the program. We know, for example, that it does not touch the industrial field at all, nor does it raise the question of equal pay for equal work. But at the same time we believe that it creates favorable conditions for progressive changes in the country's social and economic life — changes that would open the way to further advancement. And the important thing is not to argue, but to organize and inspire the masses to fight for the fulfillment of the program.

In the context of India, this is the most constructive approach, for it accords with the demands of the struggle for the unity of all patriotic and progressive forces who want to put India on the road of socio-economic reforms of a national-democratic nature. The Communist Party of India has been consistent in pursuing this line, and the

coalition government in Kerala state has proved its soundness in practice.

For a big mass Communist Party

Sebastian Zapirain
CC member, CP of Spain

In the past year, *WMR* has carried a series of articles on problems of building a Marxist-Leninist mass party and on the struggle to strengthen it and increase its influence.* Authors from the Communist parties of Argentina, Greece, France, Italy, India, the Soviet Union and Finland have exchanged views and compared notes. This is a further contribution to the series.

The Communist Party of Spain has never stopped fighting, not even in times of repression and persecution, which have been part of its 56-year-long history (except the few years of the republic and civil war). It has repeatedly set examples of staunchness and has never retreated before difficulties. It has resisted opportunism and extremism and, never deviating from its line, has invariably insisted that Spain is faced, as in the past, with the dilemma: either fascist dictatorship, or democracy.

In the days of the Franco dictatorship, when the slightest opposition to the regime was persecuted in a brutal, barbarous manner, our Party, operating in harsh illegal conditions, stressed the need to wrest from the dictatorship political and social rights for the working class and people. It was the first to call for 'freedom zones'* paving the way for those rights.

The struggle for 'freedom zones' has required much sacrifice and devotion on our part but now, in common with us, the whole democratic opposition accepts the orientation toward winning these 'zones' as a strategy of transforming Spain into a democratic state. The sacrifices made by members of our Party and the lives given in the struggle against the Franco dictatorship have not been in vain. We can say that the prestige of the Communist Party of Spain and its

*See *WMR*, April, June, July, November and December 1976.

**As the struggle goes on there develop conditions that constitute definite gains in regard to the right of assembly and demonstration. The democratic forms of activity that assert themselves as a result, while lacking official authorization, are not banned, either. This is what we call 'freedom zones.'

close links with the masses are an obvious fact and that a vast number of working people in town and country, intellectuals, women and youth consider us their most authoritative spokesmen.

All the political parties and alignments that have been officially recognized or operate in semi-legal conditions are striving to organize. We Spanish Communists, who have always worked to organize and expand our Party, are doing all in our power to win new members, strengthen the Party and extend our political actions for democracy and socialism on the basis of unity.

We are convinced that a strong and organized Communist party is needed to bring about changes and reforms in the Spanish state. We have won numerous 'freedom zones' and are effectively carrying on a policy which we define as 'coming to the surface,' in spite of the scepticism of those who did not believe our objectives to be attainable. Officially, however, our status is still illegal. This situation, arbitrarily imposed on us, will not be, and no longer is, an insurmountable obstacle to strengthening, developing and organizing the mass party we need.

Where local leaders of our Party have found and properly used flexible forms of organization, we have brought into being associations of working men and women that will provide the basis for moving on to a higher organizational stage the day we come out of illegality. A massive influx of new members will reinforce our Party's positions in the factories and on building sites, among various contingents of industrial workers; among farm hands, as well as farmers and stock-breeders, who are all ruthlessly exploited; among bank and government employees fighting for their demands; among members of liberal professions, among actors, students, teachers, and academics. Their struggle has shown the need to form organizations of a mass Communist party among cultural workers.

The Communist Party of Spain, the United Socialist Party of Catalonia (Catalan Communists), the Communist Party of the Basque Country and the Communist Party of Galicia had a very active part in recent strikes and demonstrations, with the result that in many cases throughout the country applications for Party membership were submitted collectively (at meetings or mass rallies). This was a big leap and we have reason to say that ours is becoming a mass party with roots in every public sphere, a militant and staunch party prepared for united action with other political forces and respecting the numerous currents, groups and parties that are willing to fight for democratic change.

No one in Spain today doubts our Party's strength or influence. Nevertheless, retrograde elements, the ultra-rightists, and the government which yields to the pressure of reaction, try to exclude it

from public life. We counter there attempts to continue the Franco regime without Franco by our resolute efforts to raise Party membership to 300,000 or more before long. Although some may not agree, for it is a question of almost tripling the membership, this can be done, as the facts show. On analyzing the methods used for tripling the membership of an already large branch organization in Barcelona Province, Catalonia, its leader listed the following factors: 'The Party's coming to the surface through lectures, press conferences and public meetings at which our policy is spelled out; utilization of the Party's spheres of influence, of legal organizations, mass movements, enterprises, offices, educational institutions, and so on.' He noted that 'at a steel plant which had a sizable organization already, half of the 60 workers attending a shop meeting joined the Party.' Lectures on Party policy is still another recruiting method: The Party branch of an enterprise, district or of members of liberal professions invites 50, 200, 300 or more people associated with mass movements and known for their anti-Franco views or for their integrity. Leading Party members who deliver the lecture acquaint them with our program, answer their questions, dispel their doubts. As a result of such dialogues a hundred or more people join the Party after a lecture. In this way, Party branches rapidly double or even triple their membership. Another method, used in the Basque Country, is 'long table' dinners at which social and political problems are discussed, with Communists explaining their policy and inviting the 'diners' to join the Party. This method has proved highly effective.

Mention should be made of the example of 150 labor (Workers' Commission) leaders of Catalonia, who have publicly revealed their membership of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia and called on the working people of that Spanish province to join the Catalan Communists' party.

To raise the Party's strength to 300,000, it is not enough to use the above methods. If we are to reach this target, every Party member should show initiative and use all his possibilities. He should feel that he is an organizer capable of taking steps of his own in addition to those recommended by the committee of his Party group or by higher bodies. The task is not only to expand our political, theoretical and organizing work among the masses, but to improve its standard. This will be achieved to the extent that our Party members go into the problems and preoccupations of workers in the enterprises, of men and women on neighborhood committees, of peasants, intellectuals and members of liberal professions, campaigning for their particular demands, of young people who insist on their right to take an active part in national life. To this we must add the need to appreciate and support the aspirations of the various ethnic groups and regions which

a bureaucratic centralist system brutally suppressed under Franco. The CPS regards the struggle for the rights and freedoms of these groups and regions as part of the struggle for democracy.

While doing our best to acquaint the masses with our policies and decisions, we must at the same time seek the cooperation of those who can help to fulfill these tasks. Many of the democratic-minded people invited to Party meetings or mass rallies are themselves capable of presenting our policy at lectures seminars, meetings, etc. We are bringing in new cadres and training them, but we must also make our propaganda more flexible and up-to-date. We must end narrow-mindedness and sectarianism where they persist and the erroneous notion that no one can do things better than we. Our motto is to proceed more boldly and show greater confidence in those who are willing to meet us half-way, seeing this as a possibility of correctly channelling their aspirations to fight for freedom, democracy and socialism.

Bearing these tasks in mind, the recent meeting of our Central Committee (held in Rome) decided to increase the CC membership on the understanding that every member should have a specific task, be directly linked with the organizations of his region and be responsible at his workplace for creative implementation of our policy.

As early as the period of the national revolutionary war, our Party demonstrated its capacity for organization and mobilization by working in all mass movements and in army units, by operating on both the war and home front. It demonstrated this by taking an active part in the political and educational effort, and in the work of labor centers. Now that the task is to win freedom by peaceful means, the Party is searching for new, flexible forms of organization making it possible for working people all over the country who are fighting for democracy to join the Party.

The CC meeting pointed out that the Party card can be a means of establishing close links with people who accept our program and policy. Accordingly, it decided to introduce a Party card and issue it to every Party member and to all who identify themselves with the Communists, thereby virtually becoming members.

In the period of transition from dictatorship to democracy and from illegality to legality, it is indispensable to use new forms of organization enabling whoever subscribes to the program and policy of the Party to participate in Party life and activity. We do not plan to create a party composed exclusively of activists. We realize that at first there will be those who will join the CPS merely because they accept its policies and principles; they will be issued a Party card, pay membership dues and attend meetings, probably no more than once a month. But we also know that every supporter of the Party is its potential

member or activist. Many a person becomes one by operating on a Workers' Commission or neighborhood committee or by performing other functions.

The CC also decided to move on from small, 'invisible,' clandestine cells to the formation of Communist groups that will meet to discuss political problems. These groups, in turn, can be subdivided into groups operating at workplaces — on the shop floor, in office departments or university faculties. Group meetings would also examine specific problems of the collectives concerned.

The decisions of the CC meeting are being carried out. In particular, the Madrid Party organization has committed itself to triple its numerical strength and raise it to 30,000 by late 1976. It has already admitted 4,500 new members. The Communist Party of the Basque Country, which has over 5,000 members, has pledged itself to increase its membership to 20,000 by the year's end. In Valencia, the Party membership has already doubled.

Without citing any further examples, of which there are many, for the movement involves the whole country, we can confidently predict that our Party membership — 100,000 — will reach and exceed 300,000 in the near future.

That will be both a quantitative and a qualitative growth, for the new people joining the Party have experience of struggle and are inseparably linked with the working class and other working people, that inexhaustible source of activity at meetings, in demonstrations and strikes, during which hundreds of thousands of working men and women and members of other sections of the population take to the streets. The CPS joins in these actions. Communists of diverse nationalities of Spain make common cause with other opposition forces in Democratic Coordination and Coordination of Trade Union Forces (Workers' Commissions, the General Union of Working People and the Federation of Labor Unions). It is important to note that these developments are indicative of the recognition by other political forces, not only of our power and influence, but of our right to play in multinational Spanish society the role we are entitled to under democratic rules, the legitimate right of yet another democratic party to take part in the struggle for new and larger 'freedom zones,' for genuine democracy in Spain.

---

viewpoints

Material basis of the socialist community

Paul Verner
PB member and Secretary,
CC SUPG

The latest Party congresses of the CMEA countries, including the Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (May 1976), have shown that closer economic integration is a key development trend of world socialism. Economic interlocking of the CMEA countries began in 1971 with the adoption of the Comprehensive Socialist Economic Integration Program. It paved the way for the dynamic growth of our countries and made for fuller use of the objective economic laws of socialism and its advantages by each country and the community as a whole. Cooperation in science and production helps the socialist nations to draw closer together in every sphere.

Implementation of the Comprehensive Program has given the CMEA countries a more mature pattern of mutual economic and political relations. This was facilitated by their common position on all fundamental aspects of the theory and practice of building socialism and communism. The tasks facing them now are essentially similar or even identical, which makes it easier to accomplish them through joint effort, by pooling material and intellectual resources and using them on a larger scale and more effectively for the benefit of each people and in the interests of the entire socialist community. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, defined this connection in his report to the 25th CPSU Congress, 'The ties between socialist countries,' he said, 'are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy, and public life. There is a gradual levelling up of their development. This process of a gradual drawing together of socialist countries is now operating quite definitely as an objective law.'

All the party congresses noted that socialism has strengthened its positions in the economic competition with capitalism since the Comprehensive Program was adopted. This is due in decisive measure to the increasingly close systematic all-round, cooperation among the CMEA countries according to plan. The results of their peoples'

devoted effort can be seen in rapid economic growth and new social achievements.

The CMEA countries have become one of the world's largest dynamically developing economic areas. In the historically short span of a quarter-century, their share in world industrial production has doubled. With a population approximating to 10 per cent of the world's and to 19 per cent of the territory of the globe, they supply almost 34 per cent of the world's industrial output.

The changes in favor of socialism that are continuously taking place in the balance of forces are due primarily to the tremendous achievements of the Soviet Union in building the material and technical basis of communism. It accounts for over two-thirds of the CMEA economic potential. The remarkable, and continuing, progress that has been made in this century would have been unthinkable without the strengthening of the Soviet Union.

The people of the GDR have contributed their share to the development of the socialist community. The progress made by the republic in the past five years, and summed up by the Ninth SUPG Congress, is evidence of the increased stability and prestige of our state, of its growing economic strength and of a tangible improvement in the people's living and cultural standards. By putting the decisions of the Eighth Party Congress into practice, more was achieved in that period than under any of the earlier five-year plans.*

An analysis of these gains will show that in recent years our economic progress has been most closely linked with tighter economic integration. There are many indications of this, in particular the fact that our exports to CMEA countries have been growing faster than our industrial output, with the share of specialized products increasing in both exports and imports.

Due to advances in the division of labor and in cooperation in science and production, trade with CMEA countries since the Eighth Party Congress rose by 83 per cent, reaching 70 per cent of the republic's overall foreign trade, which in 1975 stood at more than 10,000m. rubles, or more than the figure for the entire 1956-60 period.

To a greater extent than with any other country, the GDR is linked economically with the Soviet Union, the main force of world socialism and our chief partner in promoting fraternal cooperation among the CMEA countries. The more than 90 agreements signed by our two countries at government or ministerial level form the basis of an increasingly close intertwining of our economies. One-third of them are long-term ones.

*The achievements of the GDR between the two congresses have been described in detail by Werner Lamberz, Kurt Hager and Harry Tisch (see *WMR* July, September and November 1976. — *Ed.*)

In October 1975, the close alliance between the GDR and the Soviet Union was reaffirmed by the conclusion of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance which opened up new vistas for our joint activity. Article 2 of the treaty reads: 'The High Contracting Parties shall join efforts to make effective use of the material and intellectual potentials of their peoples and states with a view to building socialist and communist society and to strengthening the socialist community. In accordance with the principles and objectives of socialist economic integration and for the purpose of meeting the material and cultural requirements of their peoples more effectively, they shall strengthen and expand mutually beneficial bilaterial and multilaterial economic, scientific and technological cooperation, in particular within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.' This amounts to a vast program for growing all-round cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance.

The meeting which Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the CC SUPG, and Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, held in the Crimea in August 1976, proceeded in the same spirit. It concentrated on steps to further relations between the two brother countries in every sphere.

The Soviet Union will continue to hold a leading place in the foreign trade of the GDR, which, in turn, holds first place in Soviet foreign trade.

We are importing more sophisticated technology from the USSR. In fact we have retooled whole industries, such as power engineering, with Soviet aid. Of the 5,700m. marks invested by us in 1971-75 in the power industry, roughly one-third was spent on plant imported from the Soviet Union.

Soviet deliveries meet a substantial part of our demand for raw materials, machinery and plant. The consumer items we import from the Soviet Union help it expand production of raw materials and fuel and provide it with certain types of machines, instruments and plant. In recent years we have considerably increased our consumer goods exports to the Soviet Union.

New forms of cooperation are developing as mutual relations grow stronger. The GDR, like other fraternal countries, takes a direct part in the development of raw material and fuel deposits in the Soviet Union. Major joint projects include the Ust Ilim cellulose complex, the Kiyembai asbestos complex and a gas pipeline running from Orenburg to the western frontier of the Soviet Union.

Cooperation between the GDR and Soviet Union encompasses all economic fields and plays a particularly important role in the advancement of science and technology. At present, 80 per cent of all state plan assignments in science and technology involve collabora-

tion with Soviet organizations. As a result, the GDR, which cannot work in every field of science or technology simultaneously because its material and manpower resources are limited, has access to the scientific and technological achievements of the Soviet Union and can concentrate on aspects of the scientific and technological revolution that are more in keeping with our economic pattern and possibilities.

An indication of the fruitfulness of this cooperation was the Soviet Soyuz 22 spaceship experiment. The successful use in the experiment of the multizone MKF6 camera made by our state-owned Carl Zeiss firm is evidence of the fruitfulness of the collective effort of the two countries. Erich Honecker spoke highly of this example of close cooperation, which led to a major scientific achievement.

This combination of the scientific potentials of the GDR and Soviet Union greatly benefits both countries. Also gaining in importance are such forms of cooperation as joint research (there are already 30 teams) and joint designing.

Bilateral agreements between the two countries are supplemented by multilateral agreements in various fields of scientific and technological cooperation, which likewise contribute to our country's potential. The GDR is participating, as a CMEA member, in 44 coordinating centers working on highly important complex problems.

Our Party and people appreciate the contribution which the CPSU, the Soviet government, the working class and other working people of the Soviet Union make to socialist economic integration. We see this as a further expression of the internationalism of the CPSU and the Soviet people as a whole, of their sustained effort to build up the political and economic might of socialism and of each socialist country.

Our people regard the 25th CPSU Congress guidelines for laying the material and technical foundations of communism as an earnest of closer socialist economic integration.

Bourgeois ideologists, deliberately misrepresenting the facts, accuse the Soviet Union of 'abusing' its economic power in the integration process. Accustomed as they are to thinking in capitalist economic terms, they accuse the Soviet Union of securing 'unilateral' advantages at its partners' expense.

The GDR has been cooperating witht he Soviet Union for more than 30 years. Our experience disproves those anti-communist accusations. The close interlocking of the national economies of the socialist community is of immense benefit to all participants. Integration processes under socialism follow the principles of equality and deep respect for the interests of each country. This stems from a common ideology, Marxism-Leninism, and common socio-economic

foundations. In these circumstances, fraternal cooperation in every field is a prerequisite of economic and social progress.

We have every reason to say that we have made appreciable progress. It is obvious, however, that we will have to make still greater and better use of the opportunities afforded by fraternal cooperation.

The Party congresses carefully evaluated achievements and decided on further steps to attain their common goals. That is blueprinted in the important decisions adopted by the 30th CMEA Session (Berlin, July 1976). They envisage, first of all, the drafting of specific long-term programs for the solution of important economic problems in the next 10 to 15 years. This will assure the CMEA countries continued dynamic economic growth.

Our Party's activities are invariably based on the principle that close interaction with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries is a decisive condition for the economic and social progress of our republic. This will also determine our future line. 'We are firmly convinced,' said Erich Honecker at the Ninth SUPG Congress, 'that the further strengthening and deepening of socialist economic integration will become, to a still greater degree than in the past, a decisive prerequisite of the steady and planned development of our and other socialist countries.' This statement specifies the main line of our Party's effort in the given sphere.

In the current five-year period, our Party sets higher targets than in the previous five years. The new social and political program continues the line of steadily raising the people's living and cultural standards. We realize that these tasks can only be fulfilled in close alliance with the countries of the socialist community. This is why the targets approved by the Ninth Party Congress for 1976-80 are based on plans coordinated with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. We specified the main imports needed to carry out our plan and long-term exports to the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries.

The task now is to systematically implement the agreements reached, including the one on exports and imports. With the ever closer interlocking of the CMEA countries' economies, the internationalist responsibility of each country increases, for national plans include also export commitments — other countries' plans are tied to prompt deliveries from their partners.

Accordingly, we consider it very important to meet our republic's commitments, especially those arising from its participation in projects on the territory of the Soviet Union or other CMEA countries, whose purpose is to increase our common supply of raw materials and fuel. Developing new raw material and fuel deposits requires ever greater outlays. It is only natural that all members of the socialist

community take part in major projects of this nature, which include joint geological survey, cooperation in research, and direct investments in mining and drilling capacities and in transport.

In the current five-year period, under treaties signed with CMEA countries, the GDR will, as a participant in investments, supply machinery, plant and materials worth from 7,000m. to 8,000m. marks. This calls for higher labor productivity in heavy machine-building, chemical and electrical engineering, electronics and other industries. How this will pay off can be seen from these figures: Soviet deliveries to the GDR in 1976-80 will comprise 88.2 million tons of oil, 21,600 million cubic metres of natural gas, 15.9 million tons of rolled ferrous metals and 375,000 tons of cellulose.

The economic development guidelines for 1976-80 envisage notable advances in production specialization and coordination with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. This will play a big role in intensifying the economy by laying a durable groundwork for quantity production and, consequently, for higher effectiveness.

We are buying more specialized goods. The growing production potential of the CMEA countries in machinery, chemicals, electrical engineering and electronics creates opportunities for fuller use of the advantages of international division of labor and international cooperation. Our demand for basic plant for thermal and atomic power stations, powerful diesel locomotives, heavy tractors, tramcars and buses is being met by deliveries from the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. Machinery imports from the Soviet Union in the 1976-80 period will increase by more than 80 per cent. Nearly half of reciprocal deliveries of these items, are stipulated by long-term specialization agreements. This helps to continue intensifying production and make concentrated use of the republic's research and production capacities in carrying out economic assignments.

Growing production specialization, coordination and concentration, for all their economic benefits, have never been an end in themselves. The primary purpose is to meet the country's requirements more effectively and improve its export opportunities. This makes them an important basis for the planned expansion of foreign economic relations, including relations with developed capitalist and developing countries.

Increasing specialization and coordination should help to produce high-standard items attractive to the buyer, which is the basis for lasting long-range export relations. And we must work for ever higher standards. That is the only way to make full use of the advantages of socialist cooperation, which has proved its value to all our countries.

Science and technology today are the main factors in raising productivity. To accomplish the tasks facing us in this sphere, our

scientific and technological potential must interact still more closely with those of the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. This is the shortest and best road to attaining the potential we need, achieving serious results in science and technology and putting them to use.

Rapid scientific and technological progress makes it ever more imperative for big research teams to cooperate on a multilateral and planned basis. Accordingly, besides coordinating their economic plans for 1976-80, the CMEA countries drew up, for the first time, a comprehensive plan for the development of science and technology. It specifies the more important problems which ministries, research institutes and economic combines will jointly solve by 1980. The list includes fundamental research in power, coal and chemicals, chemical engineering, electronics, machine-tools, construction and building materials.

Thus, direct coordinated cooperation in research will expand considerably by 1980. Exchanges of research findings will be increasingly complemented by joint work on major economic problems.

To achieve the highest possible economic effectiveness, research and production must be brought still closer together. Now as never before, it is important to ensure that the results of research and designing are quickly and effectively applied in production. This means that as early as the stage of research and designing, it is necessary to take into account the long-range production requirements, primarily future specialization and cooperation measures that can steeply increase efficiency.

Bearing in mind the need to strengthen the socialist community, we attach great political and economic significance to the drafting of the specific long-term programs mentioned earlier. These envisage long-range measures to solve raw material, fuel and power problems, improve the supply of highly efficient machinery and plant, develop agriculture and transport and increase consumer goods production to meet the growing demand. In other words, the plans are aimed at solving problems on whose solution the further progress of each CMEA country and the socialist community as a whole largely depend.

These programs carry forward the general line of cooperation in planning laid down in the Comprehensive Program. This cooperation is the principal method of furthering the socialist division of labor and cooperation in production. By drawing up these programs, the brother countries have for the first time gone beyond coordination for a five-year period and set out to coordinate their efforts in achieving long-range objectives. This provides a new basis for long-term planning. Now that we are doing this, we can take account of all growth factors in the increasingly close intertwining of the CMEA countries'

economies. This is also important politically, for it demonstrates the advantages of the socialist economic and social system.

In these conditions, demands in regard to the work and cooperation of planning agencies are mounting, for elaboration of a common strategy should be closely linked with the drafting of five-year and annual economic plans. This is the first time we have had to solve such long-term overall planning problems. And their solution requires that government and economic bodies show a high degree of responsibility and competence.

The fact that we can now set ourselves such ambitious tasks and look far ahead is a sign of the advanced relations between socialist countries. The domination of socialist production relations, the high development level of the productive forces achieved by all CMEA countries, and a common world outlook based on Marxist-Leninist theory, provide the objective prerequisites of solving major problems jointly and effectively.

The latest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries (Bucharest, November 1976) stressed the brother countries' determination to continue 'developing bilateral and multilateral cooperation in every economic field, in the utilization of scientific and technological achievements, to bring about a further improvement in their peoples' living and cultural standards, contributing in common with other CMEA member countries to the growing materialization of the Comprehensive Program and to the execution of the decisions of the 30th CMEA Session concerning the joint drafting and implementation of specific long-term programs.' Growing cooperation among the member countries will undoubtedly enhance the international prestige of the CMEA and the appeal of its example.

We are well prepared to fulfill socialist economic integration tasks. The Ninth SUPG Congress specified the next steps to be taken in this direction. The Second Plenum of the CC SUPG (September 1976) summed up the results achieved by the country since the congress. We noted with satisfaction that the republic's stable and steady development continues. In spite of certain difficulties due to unfavorable weather conditions that told above all on farming, we are making good headway in carrying out plan assignments for 1976. This also applies to scientific and technological progress, a key factor for continued economic growth. Speaking at the plenum, Erich Honecker pointed once again to the important role of the CMEA countries' cooperation in research and production aimed at speeding scientific and technological progress.

Our Party devotes and will continue devoting the closest attention to this matter and, in general, to the fulfillment of commitments. This

means that we will honor our pledge to the Ninth Congress to ensure that the GDR unfailingly contributes its share to closer economic, scientific and technological cooperation among the fraternal socialist countries.

Will of the unsubdued people of Cyprus

Ezekias Papaioannou
General Secretary,
Progressive Party of the
Working People of Cyprus (AKEI

The situation in Cyprus after the dramatic events of July 1974 [1] objectively helped in formation — at least in that part of the country ruled by the lawful government of President Makarios — of a new socio-economic relationship, creating conditions for establishing and strengthening cooperation of all patriotic and democratic elements in the struggle against reaction and imperialism.

On the social level this cooperation embraces not only such traditional allies as the workers and peasants, but also progressive intellectuals, patriotic elements of the national and petty bourgeoisie. Politically, it extends to the democratic parties, trade unions and peasant organizations that support the government and its patriotic course.

Last year's September 5 elections were a concrete and convincing illustration of the positive changes that had taken place in the political situation. Their results are particularly important.

Two lines clashed during the September elections — the anti-imperialist line of liberation struggle for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus, and a non-aligned policy, the island's demilitarization and a settlement of the Cyprus issue within the framework and on the basis on UN resolutions. This was the line followed by three parties cooperating on this basis during the election campaign — the working-class party, AKEL, the newly established Democratic Front Party headed by former Foreign Minister Spyros Kyprianou, and the socialist Unified Democratic Union of the Center Party (EDEK) headed by Vassos Lyssarides.

The other was the line of capitulation, of acceptance in effect, of the situation caused by the aggression against Cyprus, seeking a settlement for Cyprus within the framework and in the interests of the imperialist NATO bloc. This was the course of the 'Democratic

Alarm' an extreme right-wing coalition formed by Glavkos Clerides — former President of Parliament. With the extreme right also was the fascist EOKA-2[2] organization.

AKEL, the oldest and strongest party in Cyprus, which last year marked its 50th anniversary, played the central role in organizing the union of three democratic parties and mobilizing the people in support of its program.

The Third Plenum of the AKEL Central Committee clearly outlined the Party's election tasks: 'Cooperation with all democratic, patriotic, anti-imperialist and anti-putschist political forces supporting President Makarios's policy, working to purge the state machinery of putschists, prepared for a common struggle for a just, peaceful and democratic settlement acceptable to our people as a whole. Guided by the interests of our people in their severe and difficult battle, the Party will participate in the elections not to attain political hegemony, but to strengthen the union of all healthy and active patriotic forces, unite them around our country's democratic and patriotic political leadership headed by President Makarios. Our Party will work for a new Parliament which would express the genuine aspirations of our country's sound, consistently patriotic and democratic forces.'

AKEL's campaign slogans reflected the interests of all our people, Greek-Cypriots, Turkish-Cypriots, Armenians and Maronites,[3] of all patriotic-minded social strata. However, it was no simple task to achieve cooperation of the three democratic parties at the elections. And to this end AKEL agreed to all reasonable concessions, seeking to achieve the broader political goals as stipulated in the decisions of its Central Committee. Despite the furious campaign launched against it by the reactionaries, despite the malicious anti-communist propaganda and cries of a 'red danger' the people of Cyprus showed their trust in AKEL and its allies and strongly condemned those who called for a change in the country's policy in the interests of the imperialist monopolies and the NATO countries.

As is known, the parties of patriotic and democratic cooperation won the elections, obtaining close to 75 per cent of the votes and all 35 seats allotted to Greek-Cypriots in the House of Representatives. The remaining 15 seats, under the Constitution, belong to Turkish Cypriots. But they walked out of the House in 1963 and to this day have not returned.

By prior agreement of the three parties, 21 seats went to the Democratic Front, 9 to AKEL and 4 to EDEK. The remaining seat was given to the Greek Cypriot representative at the inter-communal negotiations, Tassos Papadopoulos, an independent.

AKEL, which in the previous Parliament had nine seats, could have won many more had it acted independently. It preferred, how-

ever, to restrict itself to nine in the interests of cooperation during the elections with the other democratic parties. This made possible the isolation and crushing defeat of the extreme right and fascist forces.

The 'Democratic Alarm' accounted for about 24 per cent of the votes, but due to the 'majority' electoral system, and because of the overwhelming superiority of the three cooperating democratic parties, it was left with no seats.

By their vote the unsubdued people of Cyprus made absolutely clear their rejection of all those responsible for their suffering, for their tragic fate. The House of Representatives, now cleansed of avowedly rightist and pro-NATO elements, is more democratic.

The election victory of the democratic, progressive and anti-imperialist forces is important not only to Cyprus and its liberation struggle, but for the entire region of the East Mediterranean and the Middle East. For since the cold war days, imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism, has been conducting subversive activities in Cyprus to influence a 'settlement' of the Cyprus problem in its own interests and turn the island into an air force and rocket base to control this region. And these activities were stepped up after independence was proclaimed in 1960.

Imperialism could not accept the existence of an independent, non-aligned state with a strong working-class party — AKEL — in the East Mediterranean, and the U.S. ruling circles devised and launched their notorious Acheson Plan to split Cyprus and turn it into their operational base. This was to be accomplished by neutralizing President Makarios and AKEL, for the authors of this plan were well aware that they were their greatest obstacle. In its anti-Cyprus policy U.S. imperialism cooperated closely with British imperialism which has bases in Cyprus, and with its accomplices in Turkey and Greece.

The CIA, that criminal U.S. spy organization, spent millions of dollars on anti-Communist activities in Cyprus and on preparing the July 15, 1974, fascist putsch (according to CIA agent Hafner, 60 million dollars were spent in 1973-74 alone). It has been reliably established that the CIA and U.S. imperialism inspired the junta military coup and the Turkish invasion.

During the September elections Clerides's 'Democratic Alarm' was backed by U.S. and other NATO imperialists, putschists and fascist elements, and its defeat was a defeat for all anti-communist, and anti-Soviet and pro-NATO circles.

AKEL believes that cooperation between the three democratic parties should not be restricted to the election period but should continue in and outside of Parliament on the common problems of the liberation struggle and on the particular problems caused by the junta putsch and the Turkish invasion.

The struggle to expel the Turkish and other foreign troops from Cyprus, for refugees to return home, learn the whereabouts of missing persons, for an independent, sovereign, non-aligned and demilitarized Cyprus and for its territorial integrity, for a settlement of the constitutional aspect of the Cyprus issue and fulfillment of UN resolutions, unites the people and requires strong and broad cooperation of all patriotic and democratic forces.

On the domestic political scene there are also serious problems whose settlement likewise requires such unity. These are, first of all, the need to improve the state apparatus and the Republic's security bodies, purging them of putschist elements (some still occupy important posts). Many, if not all, of these elements are continuing their sabotage. The internal reactionary forces, even after their crushing election defeat, should not be underestimated. The government has already tabled a draft bill in Parliament on the procedure for disciplinary measures against government employees who took part in the putsch. AKEL declares that the purge must be carried out to the end, for this would be the only way of strengthening the internal-political front and for this the three democratic parties must continue cooperating.

The economic situation must also be improved, for without this our people's liberation struggle will not have a strong material base. The wealth of the country must be mobilized in the same way as our youth is mobilizing to defend the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus. The fascist putsch and Turkish invasion have done serious harm to the economy.[4] Nevertheless, in the two-and-a-half years since the putsch and Turkish invasion, a veritable feat has been accomplished: though the enemies of Cyprus expected the economy to fall apart, actually, thanks to planning, to the sacrifices which the trade unions persuaded the people to make, thanks to the patriotism demonstrated by the people, production has been restored and is close to the 1973 level, the eve of the putsch and invasion.

Today, the working people, through their trade unions, are justly demanding that the 1973 level of wages and social gains be restored. Not only the working people should suffer hardships. The economic difficulties should be shared in corresponding measure by all strata of the population and the national income should be more justly distributed. For this reason AKEL insists that the main burden of the difficulties should be placed on the more well-to-do sections of society, that taxes should be increased on high incomes and big profits, on accumulated wealth, on frozen capital and that the problem of refugees and the poorest sections of the population should be urgently dealt with.

We likewise believe that on the economic front the three cooperat-

ing parties could work together in and outside of Parliament for the good of the people.

Another urgent problem is the question of strengthening our defense capacity. This also requires an alliance of patriotic and democratic forces.

The supreme expression of such an alliance, in line with the proposals made by our Party, should be formation of a representative government[5] which, as an expression of patriotic cooperation, would launch efforts for the salvation of Cyprus on the basis of a joint minimum program, would win its full independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and demilitarization.

Our Party will work untiringly for the results of the September 5, 1976, elections, which brought victory to the patriotic and democratic forces, to be transformed into the salvation and liberation of Cyprus.

The progressive forces of the world are with our people. We are greatly encouraged by the support of the international communist and workers' movement. The Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties firmly stated its support for a settlement of the Cyprus problem as demanded by its people and by the most consistent fighter for its interests, the working-class party, AKEL: 'The participants in the Conference express their solidarity with the people of Cyprus,' the Conference went on record as stating. 'They call for the implementation, without further delay, of the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus which provide for the respect of the independence and sovereignty and territorial integrity of the non-aligned Republic of Cyprus, for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus, the immediate return of all refugees to their homes under conditions of safety and for the peaceful solution of the Cyprus problem by meaningful and constructive negotiations between the two Cypriot communities under the auspices of the United Nations, to be conducted freely on an equal footing for a settlement serving the interests of the two communities of Cyprus, Greeks and Turks.'

Such a settlement would be fully in the spirit of the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

Our people are waging their liberation battle under the slogan: 'Cyprus will be saved! Imperialism will not pass.' Thanks to the people's uncompromising struggle and unity and international solidarity and support, particularly on the part of the Soviet Union, this slogan will be carried out.

1. A fascist putsch took place in Cyprus on July 15, 1974, followed on July 20 by Turkish invasion and occupation of part of the island. See article by E. Papaioannou 'For a sovereign and united Cyprus,' *WMR*, March 1975 — *Ed.*

2. A terrorist organization pledged to unite Cyprus with Greece (Enosis). — *Ed.*

3. The Catholic community. — *Ed.*

4. On the economic situation in Cyprus today and on the AKEL proposals in connection with this see D. Konstantinou, 'Program of courageous emergency measures,' *WMR*, July 1976. — *Ed.*

5. At the present time the leaders of political parties and certain prominent statesmen are members of the National Council, a government consultative organ. — *Ed.*

Communist internationalism: a factor we can rely on

Carlos Rocha
Political Bureau member, People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA)

Carlos Rocha led the MPLA delegation to the Eighth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party. Following is an interview he granted to *WMR* in Lisbon.

Q. The Eighth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party opened on the first anniversary of the declaration of Angola's independence. That was a coincidence, of course. But it may be said to symbolize and stress the connection between revolutionary changes in Portugal and gains of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Portugal's one-time colonies. Could you draw on Angola's experience for a definition of the mechanism, so to speak, of that connection, or interaction?

A. I don't think I can answer your question without first stating certain facts although they are known widely enough. If I said nothing about them my definition of the 'mechanism' wouldn't be specific but very general and even abstract to a degree.

It is worth recalling, for example, that relations between the freedom fighters of Angola and the democratic forces of Portugal were built up over several decades, in particular through close personal contacts. Comrade Agostinho Neto, now President of Angola, established such contacts as early as 1947, when he was here in Portugal. Many Angolans who came here to work or study joined the ranks of active anti-fascists and worked in democratic organizations.

In 1956, the MPLA was founded. That gave the Angolan people's will for national independence precise political and organizational

shape. However, it not only provided new opportunities to foster our cooperation with Portugal's democrats but created certain problems. The point is that there was no unity of views in the Portuguese democratic movement on the future of the colonies.

Q. In other words, not all those who were against the fascist dictatorship were for granting freedom to the colonies?

A. Not all by far, especially in the early period when a broad democratic opposition to the Salazar regime was only just in the making.

In those conditions, an event occurred which played a tremendous part in the growth of the revolutionary struggle in both Portugal and its colonies. The Fifth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party made a statement recognizing wighout qualification the colonial peoples' right to immediate and full independence. To make such a statement in the atmosphere of 1957 was to show uncommon courage. After all, it is a fact that no other party or anti-fascist force could bring itself to do as much.

Afterwards, numerous democrats adopted a similar position but they did so only afterwards and only under the influence of the Communist example. Anti-colonialist ideas began gradually to win recognition among the most diverse social strata and political circles of Portugal and gained much ground among the students. Many of the students who were called up undertook to spread these ideas among the troops. Due largely to their effort, colonialist and militarist tendencies in the armed forces were defeated.

In 1969, the colonies' right to freedom was recognized by the Aveiro congress of the Portuguese democratic opposition. Indeed, the Caetano government was no longer in a position to ban the congress or prevent it from passing anti-colonialist resolutions.

Be that as it may, I must stress that the Communists' initiative played a decisive role in that awakening. The Portuguese people owe it primarily to the PCP that they grasped the meaning of the colonial problem and came near to seeing the only workable way to solve it.

This is why, leaning on the solidarity of Portugal's democrats in our liberation struggle, we always remembered that the Communists were our staunchest and most consistent friends. If there was general democratic solidarity on the part of the Portuguese with the peoples fighting for liberation from colonial bondage, the pivot around which it took shape was the thoroughly internationalist position of the party of the Portuguese working class.

Incidentally, genuine internationalism at times implies readiness to risk certain temporary political reverses in the interest of the main strategic line. The PCP did risk that in 1957, for there was no guarantee that other anti-fascists and democrats would respond to its initia-

tive, that it would not be misunderstood and find itself all alone with its far-reaching appeals. It is obvious now that subsequent events justified the step and showed it to be principled and hence far-sighted.

Q. Do you mean the events of April 25, 1974, and later?

A. Yes. But I must point out again that even in the new conditions created by the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, cooperation between Portugal's democrats and the freedom fighers of the colonies was rather a complicated process. Sometimes there was no mutual understanding, let alone cooperation. This was true above all of Angola.

Indeed, Lisbon's official policy toward Angola as distinct from other colonies was aimed, even after April 24, at preventing full national independence. The first provisional government appointed Silvino Silverio Marques governor of Angola. He had held the post earlier, under Salazar, and his reinstatement was marked by brutal punitive measures and massacres.

It was not until after vigorous action by the Angolans, including a series of impressive demonstrations, that Lisbon removed Marques. The post went to Admiral Alba Rosa Coutinho. He was a democrat and played an essentially positive role. But he couldn't do much. He was resisted by both a substantial part of the army and reactionary Portuguese settlers. When a transitional government of Angola was formed leaders of the FNLA and UNITA insisted on Coutinho's resignation. His functions were assumed by General Silva Cardoso, made High Commissioner.

A very hard period followed. Many people still wonder who was in charge in Angola at the time or what the transitional government's policy was. But surely all talk about government or policy is irrelevant in this case. The government as such was, in effect, unable to provide any leadership because the FNLA and UNITA men in it did nothing but plunder the country through the ministries they controlled. It was monstrous. Those were real gangsters with ministers' portfolios. The limit was certainly reached when, one day, the FNLA Minister of Health pulled up at a bank in a truck carrying troops and forcibly withdrew 100 million escudos. Nobody has seen the money, the truck, or the minister since. Much the same went on in the Ministry of Foreign Trade, headed by an FNLA man. If our country escaped an irreparable economic castrophe, it was only because the Ministry of Finance was in MPLA hands.

Everybody knows what imperialism and home reaction were after in Angola from the spring of 1975 on. They planned to expel the MPLA from Luanda and seize the capital by November 11, the date fixed for the declaration of independence. I suppose I don't have to remind you of the general trend of events. The outcome is well

known. But it may be useful from the point of view of the subject we are discussing to stress that throughout the period of struggle, which ended in the complete liberation of the country in March 1976, we were unfailingly backed and really aided by our traditional allies outside Angola.

We owe a debt of infinite gratitude to the Soviet Union and Cuba for their tremendous contribution to our victory. We will always single out and emphasize the role of the peoples of both socialist countries in our fight. But we are also deeply grateful to other friendly countries, such as the People's Republic of the Congo and the Guinean Republic, which have a lesser capability but did all in their power to identify themselves effectively with Angola's patriots.

As regards Portugal — and I mean the new Portugal which by then had travelled a road 18 months long (after April 25) — the social and political antagonisms of Portuguese society and the Portuguese revolution, and hence serious differences in the attitude to us and to the goals of our fight, made themselves felt.

Let us not speak of the rightists, of those who, like the High Commissioner, Cardoso, refused on November 11 to surrender power in Luanda to the MPLA government. (However, his attitude didn't matter any longer because power was in our hands anyway). The rightists' attitude was clear. But we also had to deal with influential political circles that represented Portuguese democracy and yet did not become our allies.

They may be said to have taken an intermediate and most hesitant stand. They didn't explicitly oppose the MPLA but advised us, for example, to merge with UNITA. They said UNITA was 'better' than the FNLA. We argued in vain that there was no reason to prefer one group of imperialist puppets to another. In short, they didn't understand Angolan realities even though they tried to justify their vacillation and indecision by invoking 'realism.' They said we must be 'realists' and so discard the illusion that the United States would allow Angola to be freed, hence it would be unrealistic to back the MPLA's struggle for full independence.

Why did Portugal's democrats — and we are speaking of the democrats, of course — talk and act in such a way as to play virtually into the hands of the enemies of our people's freedom? Precisely because they were democrats, not revolutionaries. This distinction stands out all the more when their attitude is compared with the policy and activity of the Portuguese Communists.

At the Eighth PCP Congress, we stressed again how very greatly free Angola values the firmness and consistency of Portugal's Communists, who invariably and most emphatically demanded recognition of the full sovereignty of our republic. We never forget that the

Portuguese delegation which greeted us in Luanda on liberation day, November 11, was sent by the Portuguese Communist Party.

History repeated itself in a sense, for on that occasion, too, the PCP set an example which other political forces of Portugal followed because they had to. Nor did that come at once. We had already been recognized by Sweden, Norway, Italy, France, Brazil — 87 countries in all — and Portugal turned out to be the 88th state on the list.

Q. How are relations between the two countries shaping up now? What are the prospects? Angola still has no embassy in Lisbon, does it?

A. No, we really have no embassy here yet. But there's nothing political behind this. Portugal has an embassy in Luanda and as for us, we are simply short of trained personnel. This is one of the consequences of our colonial past.

On the whole, there's every opportunity now for the development of sound Angolan-Portuguese relations. We do all we can for them to be based on mutual respect, equality and non-interference.

Speaking of the prospects, they will certainly depend, among other things, on how well we achieve our aims in Angola and how the process of social change goes on in Portugal.

At the threshold of the first anniversary of independence, Angola confiscated the property of two major banks, the Bank of Angola and Commercial Bank of Angola. Two new banks, the National Bank of Angola and People's Bank of Angola, were founded instead. In this way, our people exercised their sovereign right to dispose of their own finances.

In deciding on the measure, we proceeded from Marx's and Lenin's ideas, from what they said about the importance of banks as levers of economic power which the revolution must not leave in private hands. The banks have also been nationalized in Portugal. It is a big revolutionary gain for its people. Obviously, these similarities in the development of the two countries strengthen, and will go on strengthening, the basis for their mutual understanding and cooperation.

However, we must fight if we want this cooperation really to assume vast proportions and bring both peoples the greatest benefits. The slogan of our movement, 'The struggle is continuing,' also applies to this field. And since the struggle is continuing, we again regard Portugal's Communists as our most loyal allies.

We speak a common language, both literally and politically. Both aspects of this reality are important. We must eliminate illiteracy, which affects 85 per cent of the population. Besides, the lack of trained personnel is an acute problem with us, as I've said. But in striving to give the people an education and special knowledge, we

want their schooling to include the acquisition of a revolutionary political world outlook. And from whom do we get prompt aid, for example literature that doesn't have to be translated, or teachers who don't have to learn a foreign language? From Portugal's Communists, of course. We are now working to organize a steady flow to Angola of books and periodicals which are published by the PCP and treat from Marxist-Leninist positions problems of interest to our people.

Q. Does that also apply to the Portuguese edition of *Problems of Peace and Socialism?*

A. Certainly.

All in all, life has shown very clearly that the policy of proletarian internationalism, whose principles have been tested over decades of revolutionary practice, is a fruitful policy. This means that our internationalist alliance with the Portuguese Communist Party has always been and will remain the most dependable basis for the cooperation and interaction of all revolutionary and democratic forces of Portugal and Angola.

French imperialism on the world scene

Martin Verlet
Foreign Policy Department,
CC French CP

Finance capital has laid its imprint on widely different aspects of French life and foreign policy. But the monopoly system, the very essence of imperialism, is undergoing a long and all-embracing crisis. It affects the power structure and imperatively demands other, democratic and socialist policies and institutions. That is the meaning of the ever sharper class battles in France.

French imperialism has undergone deep change since the days when Lenin rightly exposed it as usurous, parasitic imperialism. The restructuring of French industry, chiefly manufacturing, begun in the 50s, was greatly stimulated by General deGaulle's coming to power in 1958: by the close of 1972 industrial output had tripled; GNP has been growing at an annual average of 5.5 per cent; employment increased from 60 per cent of the active population in 1952 to 80 per cent in 1972. Industrial and financial concentration has been progressing apace: in 1970, 0.5 per cent of enterprises employing 38 per cent of industrial workers, accounted for 45 per cent of trade turnover and 68

per cent of investment. Economic concentration and reorganization has gone hand in hand with internationalization of production, trade and capital.

These changes are taking place against the background of the growing and all-embracing crisis which is weakening imperialism as a whole, contracting its sphere of influence and reducing its domination potential. Forced to retreat under pressure of continuing reverses and mounting difficulties, French imperialism is making an all-out effort to 'regroup its forces' and adapt to the new conditions. The powerful offensive of socialism has pierced the system of imperialist domination, and imperialism has proved unable to fill the breach. France's vast colonial empire, the world's second biggest, with an oppressed population of 70 million in countries covering 12 million sq. kms., was destroyed by its insurgent peoples in Indochina and in North and Tropical Africa.

Centralization and concentration of capital, as well as its internationalization, usually take the form of powerful multinational companies, whose activities are having an oppressive effect on the country's economic and public life. Though French imperialism is somewhat backward and has its structural defects, aggravated by the crisis, it cannot be described as a weak imperialism. France holds fifth place in the world in GNP and in 1973 advanced to third place in exports, sharing that position with Japan.

A tight group of financial monopolies have built up a veritable empire of their own. They did so by concentrating and channeling a massive amount of capital, ruining whole sectors of the productive apparatus in the process, pilfering the public exchequer and national wealth, breaking up the social structure of society.

French imperialism commands important political and military means to support the monopoly drive for domination and exploitation. France is a permanent member of the UN Security Council; the third biggest nuclear power, the only European capitalist country with a diversified strategic and tactical nuclear arsenal; the capitalist world's second biggest armaments merchant. Clinging to what remains of its colonial positions and imposing neo-colonial domination on a number of countries, it has built military bases in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, Africa and the Caribbean, as links in imperialism's strategic system.

The financial oligarchy has its own political apparatus: a coterie of business tycoons and top government officials and an authoritarian centralized government capable of promoting its interests on all national and international issues.

Nor is that all. French imperialism is exploiting what is rightly the property of the entire nation. France's industrial, technical and

scientific base could help strengthen its independence by promoting cooperation with all countries. But imperialist policy, which has plunged the country into a crisis, is undermining that base.

In fact, expansion of the top French industrial and financial groups is the main goal of President Giscard d'Estaing's policy. The working people are combating that policy, for they have to carry the burden of the celebrated regrouping policy. Hundreds of factories are closing; economic growth rates are slowing down; 1.4 million are unemployed and 700,000 teenagers are looking for work. On the other hand, whole branches of the economy have been thrown open to foreign capital. Indeed, some -- computers, nuclear energy, high-quality steel — are all but owned by foreign interests. A number of industries are doomed, and yet factories are being transferred to other countries. Wage rises are being held back while inflation continues to grow. The people's purchasing power has declined, and 16 million are living on or below the official poverty line. The social services are getting far less than they need. Intransigence and repression seem to be the reply of the government and employers to the workers' demands. The government wants to impose an austerity economy, and a horrendous example of that is the Barre plan introduced in September 1976.

The new supranational orientation of French monopoly capital is being carried out against the background of sharper imperialist rivalry, on the one hand, and an intensified process of integration, on the other. This is expressive of capitalism's historical doom, of its inability to solve the problems posed by the internationalization and socialization of production. The methods it used to resolve the crisis are only exacerbating it, for they lead to the squandering of available means, inefficient use of the productive forces and irrational use of labor power. All this is leading to social degradation, jeopardizing national independence and impeding international cooperation.

Export of goods and capital is being given top priority, while at the same time, the government is encouraging, indeed stimulating, the penetration of foreign capital, which now controls 6 per cent of industrial enterprises and accounts for 25 per cent of the trade turnover and of investment. One French worker in five is employed by a foreign-based international monopoly.

Though some French-based multinationals are becoming stronger, their links with foreign-based concerns are steadily increasing. The result is a close intertwining of capital, a new impetus for capitalist integration, particularly within the EEC, but also throughout the capitalist world.

French imperialism is trying to find a niche for itself under the wing of the most powerful imperialist states. The turn toward Atlanticism begun in 1968-69 with concessions to the dollar, rapprochement with

Bonn and the Nixon-de Gaulle talks, was carried further by Pompidou and sharpened all aspects of the crisis. The Giscard d'Estaing government, as our 22nd Party Congress emphasized, is fully committed to Atlanticism: 'Giscard d'Estaing's international policy (the Congress declared) scrupulously follows the world strategy inspired and implemented by the United States. The fig-leaf of "universal character of French policy" cannot hide the fact that this policy is nothing but a "new Atlanticism".' It will thus be seen that the present government is one of the main motive factors in the policy of blocs and is placing our country and its economy in a dependent position. Of course, French imperialism encourages the ambitious plans of the French-based multinationals, but its actions do not go beyond the interests of imperialism as a whole. It plays an active part in strengthening the political, economic, social and military contacts between the main capitalist states, which find themselves obliged to restructure their international relations.

This policy is being operated at a time when imperialism is fully aware that its positions have been undermined. The imperialist system of domination is crumbling. The world is changing at an increasingly rapid pace. The forces of socialism are going from strength to strength. Today a third of the human race is building socialism, which has achieved a high level of social and economic development. Its military might is capable of administering a fitting rebuff to the military forces of the capitalist countries. It is taking more and more peaceful initiatives. It is scoring new successes in the economic, scientific and technical fields.

Democratic demands are being pressed in all capitalist countries. Fascism has been overthrown in Portugal and Greece and shaken in Spain. The peoples of the capitalist countries have become markedly more active, since the crisis affects every one of the them. The struggle now unfolding against the more onerous consequences of the crisis is more frequently being directed against the system itself, against imperialism. The liberation movement is making impressive headway, as evidenced by the epochal victory of the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos over U.S. imperialism. The liberation movement is acquiring a new quality with the growing and widely supported demand for economic emancipation. The changes in the international situation and the new relation of forces, which is to the disadvantage of imperialism and to the advantage of the peoples fighting for democracy and socialism, found expression at the Helsinki Conference.

Such is the international situation in which the Giscard government is pursuing its foreign policy. It is tying the destinies of France to the new American strategy. Its first official act was the June 1974 declara-

tion on the 25th anniversary of NATO (the so-called Ottawa Charter). It gives the United States the right to interfere in the affairs of Western Europe through 'consultation' whenever a serious problem arises. Besides, it extends NATO's sphere of interference to regions not even mentioned in the 1949 NATO Treaty. The meetings on Martinique and at Rambouillet and Puerto Rico, the President's visit to Washington and his frequent talks with the Secretary of State are indicative of the close ties with Washington, formed, moreover, at a time when the U.S. government is more than ever determined to play a dominant role. France is also facilitating NATO activity in many different fields, though it does not belong to the NATO military command.

To believe the present government, France's future, the guarantee of her independence, depends — besides close relations with the U.S. — on the establishment of a united capitalist Europe.

'France's social and economic development is linked with progress in building Europe,' says the official report on the seventh socio-economic plan. And by way of amplification, the president of the National Employers Council declares: 'Europe, as it now exists, is of vital importance for France ... We are faced with the problem of Europe's political organization, and I feel that there is no alternative to a European Union.' And at a time when the European Economic Community is being shaken and disorganized by the continuing crisis, Giscard d'Estaing is out to accelerate its political integration. Toward that end he is campaigning for early elections to a supranational European parliament, though the EEC is becoming increasingly subject to West German imperialism, which is persistently pressing its claim to leadership. The Bonn government is doing everything to establish its political hegemony in capitalist Europe. Working in full agreement with U.S. imperialism, it is using pressure tactics to influence the political evolution of the Mediterranean countries. More, it wants to impose on all EEC nations its demands in industry, finance, social policy and agriculture. It wants France to renounce its sovereignty, consent to political and social regress and suppress democracy.

The Giscard government relies heavily on its alliance with the most powerful imperialist states, the U.S. and the FRG. It is also active in the Middle East, the Mediterranean and Africa, using its advantageous positions there is to act as imperialism's vanguard. It is convening in Rambouillet what can only be described as a directorate of capitalist powers, enabling U.S. imperialism to impose its concepts.

The class character of this policy is obvious. It highlights antagonism between the financial oligarchy, on the one hand, and democracy and growing socialism, on the other. It is a policy dictated

by the financial oligarchy's fear of the growing desire of the young states to achieve unhampered political sovereignty and economic independence. It is imbued with fear of democracy, now hewing a way for itself in France, and of the changed alignment of forces which does not favor the financial oligarchy and challenges its continued domination. Attempts by the French government and big business to expedite European political and economic integration are thus aimed at involving the French people in a web of dependency, halt their advance and bar the road to socialism. The government is determined firmly to entrench itself in the Atlantic bloc and, with the help of its powerful patrons, tie France's destinies to those of imperialism. This integration policy, the characteristic features of which were exposed at our 22nd Party Congress, would place France in a position of feudal dependence on Washington and Bonn. It would worsen the crisis, weaken the country, restrict its sovereignty. This policy is exacting a high price from the people and is menacing their freedom.

French imperialism is impeding and relegating to the background relations with the socialist countries. Its position is tantamount to factual renunciation of the policy of General deGaulle after 1966, when a new start was made in relations with the Soviet Union. The present government, in contrast, is trying to softpedal political relations with the socialist countries, hold back the process of disarmament and détente and slow down economic and technical cooperation. Insecure relations with the socialist countries is a myopic policy and contradicts France's genuine interests.

French imperialism is seeking to shift all its difficulties on to the young states and bring more pressure to bear on peoples fighting for independence and social progress. Its aim, in short, is to build up a network of reactionary political alliances, from Brazil to Iran, from the Ivory Coast to South Korea, not forgetting, of course, South Africa, Indonesia and Morocco. It has come out against the MPLA in Angola, is supplying nuclear weapons and technology to the South African racists, demonstrating its hostility to progressive Algeria, building up its military potential in the Mediterranean. It is helping Washington harden the backwardness of the young states in order to enmesh them in insoluble economic and financial difficulties. It regards countries that have broken out of colonialism, for example, in Latin America, as a happy hunting ground for the multinationals. The present French government's aggressive and reactionary policy vis-a-vis countries trying to overcome economic backwardness and strengthen their independence, was trenchantly condemned by the leaders of 86 non-aligned countries at their Colombo Conference in August 1976. Such a policy, which only isolates France and harms its

reputation, has nothing in common with the interests of our country and its people.

Still another area in which French policy is having a ruinous effect is disarmament and the promotion of peace. And here a disparity between word and deed, so characteristic of the present government, stands out in full clarity. The government has repeatedly and resolutely reaffirmed its intention to use every means at its disposal to reduce world tension and promote détente. Actually, it even declines to participate in international conferences to discuss these problems. More, pleading that this is a 'grim' and 'dangerous' world ridden with conflicts and disputes, it does not preclude the possibility of using force to settle international disputes. It continues its program of building up a thermonuclear strike force directed against the socialist countries. It specializes in the sale of weapons to reactionary regimes; though it feigns concern over the proliferation of nuclear weapons; it has not hesitated to take the risk of facilitating such proliferation, for it has agreed to export nuclear technology without any guarantees that it would be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. And so, the French government, which has not acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, is assuming a very grave responsibility to mankind.

In sum, French imperialism is obstructing détente, hampering the working out of measures for international disarmament, is opposed to national independence, is narrowing its international cooperation, is imperilling the cause of peace. And with the accentuation of such features of imperialism as oppression, violence and exploitation, there is a growing desire among our people to get rid of it and achieve socialism by democratic means. The time has come for a new policy for France.

France needs a foreign policy that would uphold its national independence and its freedom of decision-making, a policy of peace, security and disarmament, international cooperation and friendship among the peoples. The French Communist Party has considered and drawn up the basic directions of such a policy in its documents, *Change of Course*, and *The Democratic Challenge*. They were widely discussed and in 1972 became the basis for the Common Government Program of the Left. They were forcefully reaffirmed at the Party's 22nd Congress in February 1976.

The world balance of forces favors the struggle of the French workers and people for social progress, democracy and socialism, and at the same time, makes for further positive changes in the balance of forces itself. The basic principles of peaceful coexistence, détente and international cooperation are, at one and the same time, the battlefield of the struggle, its aim and earnest of success. As the

demand for democratic change gains in scope and momentum, the masses become increasingly conscious of the international implications of the political struggle waged by the working class and its allies.

The Communists want France to follow an active foreign policy commensurate with the role it could and should play in promoting world peace and cooperation. Its international policy must be carried out in the full view of the people, and framed and implemented in a democratic way. One of the main conditions for this is that France should, under all circumstances, be able to speak with its own voice and make its own decisions. That is what we have in mind when we demand that French policy be decided upon in Paris and not in some other capital. The world does not need a France tagging along in the wake of some other power. It needs a France that is master of its policy and actions, and as such can accomplish very much indeed. This lends special importance to an independent security and cooperation policy, free of supranational strings and foreign interference. For a people like ours national independence is an essential condition of freedom and social progress. And the French learned this from their own experience: at all crucial moments of our history the popular struggle for social progress was closely tied in with the struggle against foreign-supported reactionary gambles. Our nation must be sovereign and independent in managing its affairs.

We are fighting for national independence and can therefore fully appreciate the efforts of other peoples to uphold their sovereignty. Every success they score contributes to the common cause of social emancipation and narrows the action-area of our common enemy, imperialism.

Since French independence is of such great importance for our advance to democracy and socialism, we attach special importance to dismantling military and political blocs. For the fact is that imperialism is not only holding back the détente process, but is using the policy of blocs also to maintain the economic and social status quo and interfere in the affairs of other nations. That fully applies to NATO, which on the pretext of warding off the fictitious 'menace from the East' is assuring U.S. imperialism a dominant position and jeopardizing French sovereignty on issues that directly affect its future. That is why the Communists have exposed and combated France's return to NATO.

The French Communist Party agreed for the Common Government Program not to insist on France's withdrawal from NATO. The Party attaches much importance to the fact that, on its initiative, all the left forces have reaffirmed their resolve to make the country independent of all military blocs. We do not advocate withdrawing from one bloc to join another. What we do advocate is the simultaneous dissolution

of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, an end to the very existence of military-political blocs. Pending that and the creation of a collective security system, we shall favor observation of existing allied commitments, but in conditions of independence. Thus, for instance, NATO must not go beyond the obligation of mutual assistance in the event of an external threat or pressure. As for the plans to set up a united Western Europe, our main consideration is that France should retain freedom of action. Accordingly, the French Communists are against attempts to set up a European military-political bloc or a regional unit of the Atlantic system under the signboard of a 'European political union.'

This should not be taken to mean that France should stay in its own shell, in some kind of national autarky. What we need is a new policy attuned to the requirements of national independence and international cooperation. It would not lead to isolation, nor make France more vulnerable. On the contrary, it would assure genuine security under all circumstances. For French security requires, above all, an active role in promoting détente and initiatives in establishing a collective security system, which would guarantee the security of France and of all other European countries in conditions of independence and equality. In this context, the ten principles governing relations between the 35 states represented at the Helsinki Conference in August 1975 are an important step forward. Fulfillment of all the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act would carry us a long way toward a stable and durable European collective security system and would expand cooperation between its countries.

Complete, universal and controlled disarmament is now the prime objective in assuring the security of France and world peace. And here the popular struggle acquires exceptional importance. The French Communist Party believes that to promote disarmament France should lose no time in actively participating in the Geneva and Vienna negotiations, accede to the relevant international agreements, notably the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and, without waiting for an overall nuclear weapons ban, undertake never to be the first to use nuclear weapons, France must cease the sale of weapons to fascist and racist countries and also to aggressor countries.

France's security rests also on its policy of national defense which should have only one single aim, namely, defense of our national territory against any possible aggressor. Such a policy must preclude obligations likely to endanger French sovereignty in military matters. Our defense policy should not be built around the priority for nuclear weapons. Our military establishment should take the form of a modern democratic army organized on the basis of national service.

And so, a policy of national independence, peace and security, but

at the same time a policy of broad international cooperation, for independence and cooperation go hand in hand. The task is to assure France's security and independence and elevate to a higher level its international contacts in all fields, political, economic, scientific and cultural. Developing cooperation with all states without discrimination or restrictions, on the basis of equality, non-interference, respect of sovereignty and mutual advantage — such is the dictate of the times.

The future democratic France will extend and enrich its relations of cooperation and strengthen its friendly ties with all countries. Cooperation will rest on an initiative policy designed to uphold the independence of the peoples and promote peace and friendship. It is only in this way that France can contribute to the adjustment of aggravated conflicts, particularly in the Middle East, through liberation of the Arab territories occupied in 1967, recognition of the national right of the Palestinian people and the right to existence of all the states of the region. France must share in the UN sanctions against the racist states of Southern Africa, cease all military cooperation with them. It must recognize the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Our people have demonstrated their active solidarity with all nations striving for freedom, with the victims of fascism, foreign intervention, colonialism and neo-colonialism, with the peoples of Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. We have displayed our solidarity with the peoples of French overseas departments and territories still under the iron heel of French colonialism, with their struggle for genuine democratic freedoms and for the right freely to shape their destinies.

France should devote special attention to assuring genuine security in the Mediterranean. It should play an active part in the UN and various international organizations dedicated to world peace. It should contribute to the establishment of a new international economic order, and more just political and economic relations between states, irrespective of their level of development.

Cooperation with all countries must be free of discrimination, should strive to break the stranglehold of the big industrial and banking monopolies on the newly independent states, and promote closer relations with the socialist countries. It should also develop relations with various European and non-European capitalist countries, in particular with such big industrial powers as the United States and Japan. This is possible only on the basis of mutual advantage and respect for the sovereignty of all, as Georges Marchais emphasized during his visit to Japan.

Cooperation with the EEC countries will continue, along democratic lines, in the interests of the working people, and to free it of all

monopoly control. In this sense, there can be no real freedom where there is supranational control. For the freedom of each people to decide its future, promulgate its own laws, fashion its social and political structure, is an essential element of democracy. That is why we are categorically opposed to renunciation of national interests, particularly the transfer of certain functions of national parliaments to the European Assembly and expansion of its prerogatives under cover of general elections.

Throughout capitalist Europe, in the specific conditions of each country and people, the workers encounter one and the same class enemy. Our struggle helps to weaken his forces and helps our advance. Today and in the future, that struggle can rely, at one and the same time, on working class and popular actions in neighboring countries. In this sense, the Brussels conference of Communist and Workers' parties of capitalist Europe was a very important landmark; it facilitated joint action of the vanguard parties of the working class and the people in this part of the continent.

Our struggle for a policy worthy of France, a policy of independence, peace and cooperation, accords with the interests of the French people. It accords also with the traditions of freedom, social emancipation and internationalism that have always been a part of the working-class and democratic movements. Our struggle helps unite all the oppressed sections of the nation into a union of the people of France against monopoly rule. And though directed against imperialism, our struggle is a component part of the peoples' desire for peace, sovereignty, security and social progress.

A journey into inflation

After a fairly long stay in Prague I made a return journey home to Northern Ireland where I spent two months, and I would like to share some of my impressions with readers of this journal.

Belfast, the capital of Northern Ireland, is the center of the turbulent political life of the entire province, an arena of police violence and unending clashes between armed extremists from among the Protestant majority and Catholic minority. I have already had occasion — and probably will still have — to write about this aspect of Northern Ireland's life in this journal. But Belfast is also a big industrial city with a population of 400,000. Its inhabitants suffer severely

not only from extremist outrages, but also from the consequences of the capitalist crisis, economic dislocation, mounting unemployment and runaway inflation. When I began to stock up my home larder and to pay for services, etc., I realized just how much the cost of living had gone up in the short time (less than a year) I had been away and how deeply inflation had become part of our 'way of life.'

The flight from Prague to Belfast, taking only a little more than three hours, turned out to be a journey to the reign of inflation, as it were. It seemed like a fairy tale in reverse.

In the short space of time I had been away from home the cost of ten Belfast Citybus tokens had increased from 50p to 90p; the journey from the Belfast Airport into the city center from 50p to 70p; and a three-day rail ticket to Dublin had been inflated to £6.65 — for a week or more to £10 return fare! The quarterly charges for Belfast city gas had gone up considerably and, even if one did not use one cubic metre in the quarter, one was required to pay a charge pf £3. My neighbor warned me not to use any electricity, if I could help it, and especially not to use the electric water heater. There was much talk of rent increases. I was able to avoid these because of the rent rebate system for publicly-owned housing and the fact that I am a pensioner. (There is also a rates rebate system which I have been able to take advantage of — but one does not know, with the cuts in public expenditure, how long these will last).

When I came to the business of buying food I was really taken aback. The price of a pound of butter before I left in November 1975, was about 25 to 27p — depending on where one shopped. While I was at home — from August to October — the price was 38p and went up each week by 2p until it scaled 50p per pound. Stable foods such as porridge oats, potatoes, bread, etc., are reaching the 'luxury class.' One paid 55p to 59p for seven pounds of potatoes — more than twice as much as the previous year. A 3-pound bag of porridge oats had been increased from 35p to 53p. Bread, a 28-ounce loaf, had gone up from 17p to 20p and, in the two months I was at home, went up three times in price to $23^{1}/^{2}$p.

The prices for meat and fish had gone up beyond all knowing. The most popular and cheaper kinds of fish ranged in price from, 50p per pound, 60p, 70p and over 80p. Frying steak, which had cost about 75p to 80p per pound, was now up to £1.50. Even the humble sausage and sausage meats had been increased from 44p to 60p per pound. The price of pork meat, depending on how one bought it, could cost up to £2 per pound. (It was thought, when meat prices began to rise before entry into the EEC, that chickens would be a family 'standby' — but that hope soon evaporated.)

Fruit and vegetables are now sold by weight, and one can pay as

much as 12p for a small turnip, carrots nearly 16p each and onions, which had averaged about 6p per pound, are now in the region of 14p per pound. Apples, oranges, etc. — one needed them very much before deciding to purchase. Tomatoes, in one week, increased in price from 12-15p per pound to 40p, and this at the height of the tomato season! (One finds that at weekends when the main shopping is done for the family, prices can increase considerably and I therefore learned to shop during other weekdays.)

The cost of tea — 44p per pound before I left Belfast — had gone up to 60p per pound. The price of ground coffee, which had been around £1 per pound, is expected to go up to £2 per pound before the year is out. The cost of 'instant' coffee, in ounces, beggars description. Eggs, which formerly sold at 26p to 30p per dozen, had reached 54p by October last.

While I was at home, the Dublin government, at the EEC talks on meat and bacon prices, was able to obtain a devaluation of the so-called Green Pound. This meant for farmers in the Irish Republic an increase of 5p per pound for pork or beef, or £10 extra for pigs and up to £25 for a cow. The British government did not want such devaluation as it would have added to the price of food. For farmers in Northern Ireland this was not satisfactory and pigs and cows began to be 'smuggled' over the border to get the higher prices. The six Northern Ireland bacon and meat processing factories (employing directly 2,500 workers and, indirectly, many more thousands) were left without one pig or cow to process in a whole week. The factory owners stated that all workers would be laid off. The London government was forced to step in and make good the price difference. Needless to say, during that week, prices for meat and bacon escalated still further in the retail shops. Cattle were being rushed to Britain from elsewhere.

The drought during the year also brought its problems in the potato market. Farmers in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic began to 'smuggle' potatoes out of Ireland into the British market — to get the 'price.'

The price of milk had gone up from 5p per pint to $10^{1}/^{2}$p — and is expected, after EEC decisions, to go up another 2p per pint before the winter is over.

The prices of manufactured goods had also risen. One needed batteries for one's radio. In November 1975, the cost of a PP7 battery was 35p. The cost in August 1976 was 58p and was increased to 61p a week later. For a small Bush radio, which requires two batteries, the cost had been 54p for two — in August 1976 it was inflated to 51p for one battery!

(I was fortunate in that, before I left Belfast in November 1975, I

bought soap, soap powders, etc. Otherwise my saga of price increases might have been much longer and more woeful.)

One of the most disturbing things that one found when at home was the feeling of the people that there was little or nothing they could do about the high prices for goods and services. The propaganda of the British government, as is the case of all governments in the capitalist world, creates the illusion that all our troubles stem from 'international conditions' over which the government can exercise no control. The government, backed by the mass media and the economic 'experts,' is therefore absolved from all blame or responsibility for the unprecedented inflation. Yet the official retail price index for October (Britain and Northern Ireland) had increased by 1.8 per cent from the previous month. If this rate is maintained — and one sees no indication that it will do otherwise — the annual rate of inflation will go up to 22 per cent.

In capitalist society there are those, even in the ranks of the working class, who are receiving high wages and can afford to pay the prices asked for. How long this will last one would not attempt to hazard a guess. Needless to say, those on fixed incomes, pensioners, the sick and unemployed and in the low wage and salary brackets, find it impossible to purchase the goods and services they require.

I returned to Prague to find all was as I left it — with the great exception that prices for many fruits and vegetables had gone down! The shops were crowded with people already buying gifts for Christmas. And I remembered an article in our journal by a Czechoslovak Minister which cited striking figures showing that the retail prices of staple foods had not changed in the country for a whole decade.*

I have made two 'return journeys' in a short space of time. One home to Belfast and one back to Prague and they have taught me much. And I thought: what would those people in Northern Ireland, who looked askance at what I had told them about the stability of prices in the socialist world, have said had they seen the life of socialist Czechoslovakia with their own eyes? And another thought occurred to me: how important it is for us Communists to be able to presuade the common people in capitalist countries to listen to the truth that socialism with its planned economy makes people confident of the morrow, eliminates their fear of the future and protects their everyday life.

Betty Sinclair
Representative of the Communist
Party of Ireland on the journal

*To those who may take an interest in this question I would recommend a very interesting article by Michael Sabolcik 'Price policy under socialism,' *WMR*, March 1975.

The social purpose of artistic creation

Rasul Gamzatov
Soviet writer

Nowadays when bourgeois authors write (and at great length) about the freedom of artistic creation, one is struck by their abstract and scholastic approach. The personality of the artist is regarded out of context of time and place. Indeed, one is often led to think of him as a robot, with only the cold surface of his metal shell keeping him 'in touch' with the world.

But then, what talk can there be of freedom? For the free flight of creative fantasy is inconceivable without close involvement with the world around us, its affairs and concerns. Consequently, the problem of creative freedom cannot be solved in isolation from another problem, the social purpose of art.

It is on this point, I think, that bourgeois authors and we, Soviet writers, artists and musicians, differ in the approach to creative freedom. And this has to be taken into account if one really wants to work for freedom of artistic creation and for the free exchange of cultural values created under different social systems.

In a socialist society, the artist's social involvement is an inalienable element of his creative freedom. That is the subject I propose to discuss in these notes without, however, laying claim to complete coverage, for I am a writer and not a specialist in aesthetics. And I shall concentrate on poetry, a sphere of creativity most near to me.

For the Soviet poet there is no barrier between creative freedom and the social purpose of his work, which he regards as a civic duty. The fusion of the two is so organic and natural, that in his work the poet is not inclined to reflect on whether or not he is free, on whether his work is hamstrung by the 'social contract' he assumes voluntarily as part of his feelings and conscience. Of course, there are poets who compose mediocre verse 'to order' with scant regard to their artistic value. But I am not discussing that type of poet, but rather poets with a high sense of civic duty that determines their understanding of their creative work, and their place in society, which for them is synonymous with freedom.

The calling of the poet resides above all in his sincere, deep-felt

need to serve the people. And he is so conscious of his duty to the people that such lines as these of Mayakovsky, 'My verse is born of kinship with the fighters and the country; it is born in my heart,' come just as naturally as breathing.

The artist trained in the traditions of bourgeois culture questions the social purpose of art: every calling implies a duty, an obligation, dedication, and can a poet create freely and unhampered if he is weighed down by a duty?

The question is as old as poetry itself and, it would seem, has long been resolved by the experience of Soviet literature and of the great writers of the past. Nevertheless, it is still being hotly discussed by the exponents of 'absolute freedom' of creativity, by those who subscribe to the elitist interpretation of art. The ideal of the socially committed poet is less than popular with them. On occasion they are prepared to concede that in the past that ideal did command attraction. In the past, but not today. Because, they argue, ours is a different age: there is more unfreedom of the personality, in particular of the creative personality. In this age, we are told, man is doomed to self-isolation, to all his creative and spiritual potentialities finding expression in the personal sphere, or to use the elegant euphemism, in 'pianissimo.' One can understand the sources of this hopeless philosophy in a bourgeois society. It stems from the decadent degrading sentiments cultivated by bourgeois art. But its exponents are seeking to convert poets of the socialist world to their creed.

In my travels in the capitalist world I found that such views were held even by some serious artists, poets and musicians. And I could not get away from the feeling that someone was deliberately out to cage the free muse of 'poesy' composition. It was strange, for instance, to hear people saying that the poet's main interest should be confined to the area of intimate feelings. Yes, love lyrics have always had a deep humanistic message, without which there can be no real poetry. But there always have been (and always will be) poets with a much wider gamut: some apply their craftsmanship to recording a monetary impression, others delicately and sensitively express the more intimate in man's life, still others devote their poetry to noble social aims. I often venture to compare literature with the *pandur*, and writers with the strings of this folk instrument, for each string has its own sound and together they produce a chord.

No normal society can dispense with such an instrument. It would be hard indeed to imagine a more tedious and boring collection of muses on the Parnassus of our time if the supporters of 'pianissimo' were able to win over all the poets of the world, and if the poet's creativity, individual in its very essence, were compressed into the deeply individualistic philosophy of despair.

However, that philosophy cannot stand up to the real riches and artistic diversity of today's world poetry. The dynamic development of progressive world culture, passionately committed to the ideals of peace, social progress and humanity, is oriented on the great achievements of the classics. It has never been, and never will be, captive to the individualistic vision of the world. That is so because the reader of today, the people, mankind, have a much weightier say in determining the ideal of the poet and of poetry. The experts, on the other hand, have an increasingly lesser say. Genuine poetry is accessible to the mass reader, and he is the final judge.

The reader has his own classification of poets.

Some interest him but leave him indifferent.

Others interest him, too, and he is prepared to discuss their work, but it does not evoke an answering chord.

Still others are poets for whom the reader is prepared to fight, and who themselves are fighters. They are seldom discussed, but highly appreciated by the reader; their verses are listened to with rapt attention, their books enjoy a wide readership. Such poets were Pablo Neruda and, in our Soviet literature, Alexander Tvardovsky. They commanded attention and respect, the respect, say, a patient has for a surgeon: what will his scalpel bring, salvation or death?

There are poets of consummate craftsmanship. And here I would mention Boris Pasternak, Anna Akhmatova, Marina Tsvetayeva. They are highly praised by professional critics. And rightly so. But the critics at times tend to contrast them to poets of no lesser talent, but dedicated to the struggle for the triumph of the noble social ideals. I am convinced that all poets are remarkable if they are sincere and courageous in their devotion to the destinies of their people, of man and mankind. The concept genuine poet is inseparable from the concept, people's poet.

Neruda and Tvardovsky were people's poets in the true sense of the word. Poetry was their life's vocation, the dictate of the heart, utter devotion to their civic duty.

I recall being in hospital with Tvardovsky. He was no longer bedridden, and one evening we walked to a remote lawn of the hospital park and Tvardovsky lit a bonfire. We were joined by other patients, convalescents and those who would never regain their health. We smoked, talked about things personal and public. Tvardovsky listened, now and again joining in the conversation to agree or agrue. All the sorrows and joys of the world were in his heart, and in his poetry.

That, I feel, is the ideal of the contemporary poet. At any rate, I have always striven for that ideal. And even now I live and work with the feeling that I am still sitting beside Tvardovsky at that bonfire. I

am always astonished when I hear people say that that type of poet is rather like the extinct mammoth, or that he belongs to the 19th century.

Tvardovsky was a man of remarkable integrity, and this he carried into his poetry, which was a fusion of sincerity, deep intimacy and fidelity to his social ideals. Hence, the rare combination in his work of different genres, from penetratingly precise lyrical miniatures to poems of truly epic magnitude.

Paradoxically, some try to instill in the Soviet writer the idea that fidelity to one's social duty can only hamper creativity and turn the artist into a dual personality by injecting something entirely alien to the purity of his poetic world. This is but a rehash of a book published in Russia before the October Revolution by the so-called *Vekhovtsi,* who sought to vilify all that was progressive and democratic in the Russian culture associated with the revolutionary liberation movement.

The Soviet poet's appreciation of the social purpose of literature is not something indoctrinated. It stems from life itself, from the poet's experience, from his inner convictions. I know of poets who early in their careers decided to seal themselves off from the storms and complexities of their time and devote their talents to the eternal themes of love, nature, reflection. Some of them even decided to retreat into a pastoral life and compose paeans to nature. For some this bucolic dream came true, and they produced a goodly number of books. But they did not become real poets. On the other hand, those who — whether by choice or by circumstances — took another road and shared with the people their historical destiny, became poets of stature and led a meaningful life, without which there can be no great poet.

Only by merging one's own destiny with that of the people does the artist acquire his identity and genuine creative freedom. This simple truth is not understood — in some cases willfully — by those who would inculcate in the poet an elitist conception of his place in society. By giving his all to the people, they aver, the poet is submerged in the people, loses his individuality and the possibility fully to express his own 'I.' But has there been a single case in the history of poetry of a poet creating a meaningful work by holding aloof from the people, or looking down on them from the heights of his poetic Olympus?

There have been no such cases. All the more surprising, therefore, are the assiduous attempts to place the poet in an ivory tower, of a more modern model, needless to say. The retreat into 'pianissimo,' mentioned above, is one such model. There are many others.

I have had occasion to comment on a speech made at an interna-

tional gathering of poets not so very long ago. This is what the speaker said:

'Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here from different countries. You represent different nations. Only I do not represent any nation or any country; I represent all nations, all countries, for I represent poetry,. Yes, I am poetry. I am the sun that illumines the planet, the rain that freshens the earth, the tree that flowers in every clime.'

This poet raised his modernized ivory tower to cosmic heights. Many applauded him, but in the way they would applaud an accomplished circus performer. I, too, believe that we poets are really responsible for the whole world, but he who is not tied to his native land, his people, cannot represent the world. Like every other person, the poet must from early youth realize that he will become a representative of his people and must prepare himself to act as such. Otherwise he will fall prey to indifference, that fatal malady of poetry.

For the Soviet poet, social purpose implies devotion to the ideals of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in which he sees the radiant future of his people. And when some try to presuade us to abandon that devotion, I hear the voice of those who would stifle poetry by indifference, deprive the poet of any share in the people's life, turn him into a mere onlooker. Can a man who stands apart from the destiny of the people represent them?

Alexander Blok urged the intelligentsia to 'hearken the music of the future, the music of revolution.' Our finest poets had an ardent filial feeling for the Revolution. I know that from my father, the renowned Avar poet Gamzat Tsadase. And I recall Tvardovsky's attitude, too. He could not tolerate 'highfalutin' words, but it was with deep internal conviction that he spoke of the Revolution as his mother, adding: some, standing aside, will probably see her shortcomings, but for me she is my mother. His was not a blind love, and he declared it not as a young man, but at a stage in life when he had already travelled a long and difficult road. In our mountain country there is the saying that at this stage people acquire a mature understanding of what life is all about.

I will not be divulging any secret if I say that among our intellectuals there are those (not many, actually a few individuals) who do not share entirely certain aspects of this attitude to the Revolution, which is the very core of the Soviet writer's world outlook. The bourgeois press calls them dissidents and is at pains to make out that in our society dissidence is a punishable crime. It is moved to ecstasy when one or another dissident is tried for an obviously criminal act. The bourgeois press can be relied upon to raise a hue and cry about him being tried for his politics. As a member of the Presidium of the

USSR Supreme Soviet I have had occasion to examine appeals against court sentences in cases of this kind. And these bourgeois press comments surprise me, for when an appeal is examined, it is not the thoughts of the accused, but his concrete actions, for which he was tried in court in full conformity with the laws of our socialist state, that are taken into consideration. Thus, 'persecution of dissident thoughts' has nothing to do with it. It is purely a matter of observing revolutionary law and of the need to defend the gains of our Revolution.

The fate of my own Daghestan and my career in literature are likewise insolubly tied with the Revolution. Soviet power opened wide vistas to my people, who up to then lived a secluded life in the narrow mountain valleys of the Caucasus. At the time of the Revolution, Daghestan literature did not go beyond folklore, with its traditional genres and expression media. The Revolution brought my people into the wide world of culture, while retaining and giving more vivid expression to our national traditions. And what can be more necessary for giving full and free scope to the abilities and talents of the poet than a wider vision, enabling him to judge and depict life without bias, while maintaining the artistic identity of his people!

Adherence to the ideals of Lenin's Party is still another cardinal feature of the Soviet poet's social mission. But Communist partisanship implies more than simply choosing a definite political doctrine. If that were so, there would be some justification for the charge that Soviet writers take their instructions from the Communist Party. The fact, however, is that every writer, if he is honest and sincere, accepts and upholds the Party's ideas at the dictate of his conscience. For him partisanship means loyalty to the cause of Lenin, whom Einstein described as one of the custodians and renewers of the conscience of mankind.

It is his conscience that prompts the Soviet poet to express and uphold the ideas of the Party. Those who denounce that as loss of creative freedom, as writing 'under Party dictation,' fail to understand that without conscience, in its Leninist understanding, there is no Soviet poet, and no free flight of his creative fantasy, and no social responsibility for his work.

In our age every great poet quickly wins world renown. His verse is part of the battle of ideas in his own country and the world. This immensely increases his responsibility not only for every word that comes from his pen, but for his every action as a member of society. We should learn this feeling of responsibility from such of our predecessors as Julius Fucik, who had a boundless love of people and, in his last words from the gallows, urged them to be vigilant. More and more the world is coming to realize that life on the brink of war lays a

heavy material and spiritual burden on the peoples. And it is our bounden duty as poets to defend the frontiers of good will, love and compassion against the forces of evil, hatred and callousness.

That is why the people everywhere are now so exacting in relation to their poets. They do not forgive them a single false word. Now as never before, the poet cannot afford to be a shadow of his time; he must be a flame, a source of light.

Light should not be equated with seeing things through rosy spectacles. The poet cannot see the world as, say, a young man sees his future bride, blind to all her minor faults. Nor must he contemptuously see the world through dark spectacles: both produce a false picture the reader will not accept.

The social mission of the poet implies conscious service to the ideals of goodness and justice. Today the interconnection between the national and international in the poet's creation is especially acutely felt. For the progressive maturing of national literatures brings them into the realm of world culture. And here there are confrontations between historically-formed artistic traditions and mutually-opposed ideological and artistic principles.

In his own native literature, too, the poet has to choose a correct orientation if he wants to enjoy genuine creative freedom and not be entrapped by anarchistic concepts of freedom which, for all their exterior brilliance, usually lead to feeble epigonic imitations. The experience of history and of the great Russian and Soviet literature shows that the highroad of mankind's artistic progress lies in a literature which, in one or another way, is associated with progressive and revolutionary movements, a literature, consequently, that is deeply internationalist in its ideological and artistic content.

The foes of progressive culture are doing everything to discredit the spirit of internationalism, an intrinsic feature of the great poets of our time. They are at pains to prove that internationalism imperils national identity and, consequently, freedom of artistic creation.

Many crocodile tears have been shed over the alleged suppression of national literary traditions by Russian Soviet literature. The purpose of such allegations is to bring back narrow nationalism, undermine the trust of the Soviet nationalities in the Leninist policy toward national cultures, and rekindle national egoism.

But in good poetry, everything national, everything permeated with the progressive ideas of our time, is bound to have an international appeal. It is hard to imagine a poet's feeling of national dignity not being enriched by the spirit of internationalism. I spent my childhood in a small *aul,* in my youth I learned to know the life of the people of Daghestan, and later there was opened to me the world of my Soviet land and of countries far beyond. But everywhere, in all my wander-

ings, I always feel myself a representative of the land, the mountains, the *aul* where I first learned to saddle a horse. And everywhere I consider myself a plenipotentiary representative of my Daghestan, and I return to it as a plenipotentiary representative of the common culture of mankind. I am firmly convinced that the spirit of internationalism enriches one's national feelings and allows for their wider and more humanistic manifestation.

From its very early years, the Soviet culture of Daghestan, like that of all the other Soviet nations, has been imbued with the spirit of international brotherhood, but it has never severed its links with its national sources. Sympathetic observation of the life of other peoples has become an ideological and artistic principle of our poetry. Of course, some poets exploit the 'international' theme out of egoistic partiality for their own, the national. But the finest representatives of multinational Soviet literature do not fall into such extremes. While safeguarding and developing all that is best in national poetry, they reach out for the summits of progressive artistic thought.

It is by speaking in the language of mankind that the literature of any nation can express the moral strength of its people.

Let me cite what I believe to be an instructive example. At one time I wrote a poem called 'Cranes' about boys who after death on the battlefield became white cranes. In the Russian translation, apparently to lend 'national color', 'boys' was changed to 'djigits.' When the poem was put to music, the late singer Mark Bernes asked me: 'Would you object if instead of "djigits" I used "soldiers"?' I agreed. The change of a single word gave the poem and the song a wider appeal. It was now addressed to all the soldiers who had given their lives in the battle against the enemies of humanity and humanism.

The genuinely national in the writer's work lies not in his clinging to national attributes or details, but in his creative search being attuned to the requirements of our time.

Ours is Soviet literature. It is written in different languages (there are nine in Daghestan alone), but it belongs to our entire country, to the whole world, for it is the heritage of our country and of the world.

The sources of literature are one's native land, native people, native language. But the vision of every real writer goes far beyond his nationality; the concerns of mankind are in his heart and mind. And that, too, is one of the splendid traits of the Soviet poet's social commitment.

---

exchange of views

On ideological and political pluralism

Dr. Asen Kozharov
Bulgarian Academy
of Science Institute
of Modern Social Theories

Bourgeois and social-reformist theorists and politicians have been assiduously popularizing ideological and political pluralism.[1] They use it as an ideological weapon to defend the political system of modern capitalism and the bourgeois way of life and also as a weapon against Marxism-Leninism, the socialist system and socialist democracy. In the 70s alone, dozens of books and hundreds of articles were published in the U.S. and Western Europe to 'substantiate' the need to 'pluralize' Marxism-Leninism and the socialist system.[2] It is no exaggeration to say that pluralism thrives on unscientific and class-irrelevant interpretations of the problems of democracy, multi-party structures, political opposition and human rights. In fact, its concepts have now been brought to the forefront of the ideological struggle. Marxist literature, albeit belatedly, has criticized these pluralistic concepts in all their aspects, philosophical, political and ideological.[3]

Bourgeois theory and methodology

Pluralism has for many bourgeois ideologists and reformists become practically synonymous with the Western way of life. Originally, however, it was employed to describe quite other phenomena. It was first used in the second half of the 18th century by the German philosopher Christian Wolf, who described as pluralistic philosophical systems which, as distinct from the consistently materialist and idealist schools, maintained that explanation of the universe rested not on one, but on several independent principles. Philosophical pluralism, and particularly eclecticism, were trenchantly criticized by Marx, Engels and Lenin. In this century philosophical pluralism finds its main expression in pragmatism.[4] Pluralism has exerted a marked influence on representatives of other schools of modern bourgeois philosophy, i.e., neopositivism (Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Karl Popper), critical realism (Santayana, Sellars), existentialism (Jean-Paul Sartre).

The first attempts to apply the philosophy of pluralism to analysis of social phenomena date back to the turn of the century. The outstanding example was the so-called 'multi-factor theory,' which in our day has been adopted, with certain modifications, by many bourgeois ideologists. It seeks to explain the development of society as the result of the operation of many independent factors, such as environment, heredity, economics, science, ideology, politics, etc. It arose as an alternative to Marxism which the pluralists denounce as a 'unifactor' concept since, they argue, it negates all other motive forces and impulses of social progress, save economic ones. Having produced this caricature of Marxism, the pluralists (Popper, for instance) maintained that the economic factor must never be overestimated, for otherwise we would be 'belittling' the importance of ideas and decisions.[5]

However, pluralism has itself undergone substantial change. Philosophical pluralism is being complemented by political, ideological pluralism, each of which purports to explain the essence and development laws of a definite area of social life. Thus, from an abstract philosophical idea about the structure of being, pluralism has developed into one of the main schools of bourgeois sociology and politology opposed to Marxism-Leninism. More, its anti-Marxist and anti-socialist orientation is becoming progressively more pronounced.

Its bourgeois class nature is especially apparent in political pluralism (also known as 'pluralistic democracy').[6] Its exponents hold up their false picture of the social structure and political system of modern capitalism as a model for all time. They reject the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of classes and the class struggle. Instead, they have put forth the wholly unscientific theory of 'social stratification' and 'group structures.' The object is to depict government by big capital as collective government by various 'pressure groups' or 'interest groups' and their organizations. The latter include employers' federations, political parties, the trade unions, farmer organizations, all manner of religious, cultural associations, etc. These 'interest groups,' the argument goes, share in social control and administration through their respective organizations. In other words, the pluralists want to convince the working class that it, too, has a share in managing the affairs of society, and all that is now needed is to arrange for the cooperation of all these public bodies, so that there could be no question of the workers fighting the capitalists and their state.

The pluralists like to pose as the heirs to the philosophical and legal democratic traditions associated with the ideologists of the Enlightenment and 19th century liberalism — Montesquieu, Locke, Mill and Tocqueville. Actually, however, they differ from them on a crucial point, for they negate the idea of social progress. The rivalry,

deals and compromises between the numerous 'interest groups,' the pluralists say, is the mainspring of the economic and political life of society. This, of course, ignores the struggle to transform capitalist socio-economic and political structures. In particular, political opposition is allowed only to the extent that it does not encroach on the foundations of capitalist society. The very idea of eliminating bourgeois society and its revolutionary replacement by a new society is dismissed as 'extremism' that runs counter to pluralism.

And so, pluralism is a bourgeois theory and methodology incompatible with Marxism-Leninism. Nor is it a question of whether or not we should use the word 'pluralism.' For it is not words that matter, though terminological accuracy can sometimes prove very important inasmuch as many terms have their origins in historical traditions and represent a system of interpreting and analyzing reality. But the word 'pluralism' stands for bourgeois traditions and for a bourgeois system of analysis based on the group rather than the class structure of society, and disregards the class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the fundamental differences between capitalist and socialist societies.

The theory of political pluralism has held practically undivided sway in bourgeois politology since the war. In recent years, however, notably with the deepening of the political crisis of capitalism and of bourgeois democracy, there have been definite changes. They show that pluralism is losing ground for it has proved manifestly inadequate to explain capitalist reality and is now giving way to elitist concepts.[7]

Paradoxical though it may seem, precisely at a time when political pluralism, that idealized model of bourgeois democracy, has so glaringly proved at odds with capitalist reality, it is being recommended as a means of 'improving' the political system of socialism, by fitting it into models copied from capitalism.

Weapon against popular rule

One can single out two distinct methods employed by bourgeois ideologists and reformists to 'improve' socialist society by injecting pluralism.

The first is associated with the concept of a multiplicity of 'models of Marxism and socialism.' Of course, there is nothing wrong in the idea of a variety of concrete forms of socialism or the search for different roads to socialism. But the pluralists want a variety not of forms, but of substance. In their understanding, a multiplicity of models means that socialist society in different countries will not subscribe to socialism's fundamental economic, political and cultural ideas. This is not substantiated by experience, which shows that, for

all the different roads to socialism, and all the different forms of the new society, the essence of socialism remains the same.

Such bourgeois and reformist pluralist 'models' as 'market socialism,' 'democratic socialism,' 'humane socialism,' 'national socialism,' etc., are expressly directed against Marxism-Leninism and existing socialism. All these models are devised either by adding various non-socialist elements to the tested experience of building the new society, or, conversely, by subtracting from scientific socialism some of its fundamental principles. As for the different 'variants' of Marxism-Leninism, they are no more and no less than right or 'left' deviations or bourgeois ideological trends that exploit the authority of the ideas of Marx and Lenin. Obviously, this propaganda of a 'pluralistic panorama' of Marxism and socialism is meant to erode the unity of the philosophical and theoretical basis of the communist movement.

The other method is to impose on socialist society the 'pluralistic structure' of bourgeois society, with all its characteristic attributes, including incessant rivalry between the various parties, among them parties opposed to the socialist system and popular rule. Let us take a closer look at this method.

The multiplicity of political organizations and trends, their 'equality' in social life, periodical change of ruling parties and groups, are supposed to reflect the multistratic and differentiated character of the social structure of society, with a large number of groups, whose private interests are upheld by specific organizations, primarily the political parties.[8] And from this the conclusion is drawn that the constant struggle for power, which stems from the rivalry of the various interests; their 'reconciliation,' the search for partial agreements, etc., is the most rational way of assuring the 'self-regulation' of society. And 'self-regulation,' they argue, is assured by 'pluralistic democracy' which is held up as the 'supreme type of democracy.' The democracy of the socialist countries is judged by the degree to which they adhere to this pluralistic model.

The fallacy of all these theories, I think, rests, above all, in their disregard of the fundamental difference between class relations under capitalism and socialism. The class structure of capitalist society, the irreconcilable interests of exploiters and exploited, the heterogeneity of the bourgeoisie as a class — all this logically leads to a multiplicity of political parties and their struggle for power.

That, of course, does not apply to socialism. Abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the strengthening of socialist production relations steadily enhance the social and political unity of the new society. The process of overcoming class distinctions is consummated with the building of communism. But even at

the present stage, the socialist countries have removed the chief source of class and national conflicts and clashes. For society is no longer divided into exploiters and exploited, oppressors and oppressed. And it is on this basis that socialism builds its effective mechanism of popular rule. Irrespective of how the political system of one or another socialist country has formed historically, whether it has many parties or only one, solution of all the multiform and complex problems is achieved through cooperation of friendly laboring classes and social groups, with the leading role of the working class, headed by its Marxist-Leninist party.

Experience shows that the socialist political system does not rule out the existence of several parties.

Parties and alignments that join in the people's common struggle for democracy and social progress can also go on operating at the stage of developed socialism. The Bulgarian Agricultural People's Union, which took an active part in alliance with the BCP in the fight against fascism, gradually adopted scientific socialism as the only scientific ideology also leading to the emancipation of the working peasantry from exploitation and oppression. Today it is building socialism together with the BCP. The Bulgarian Social Democratic Party merged with the BCP, and as for the Radicals and the Zveno party, they joined the Patriotic Front. Pluralists do not advocate just any multiparty system but one guaranteeing 'equal opportunities' in socialist society for political opposition to people's rule.

In political reality, the thesis of 'equal opportunities,' alleged to be provided by bourgeois democracy for all political alignments, is applied mostly to parties competing for state power according to the rules of the capitalist system but not assailing its foundations.[9] Bourgeois pluralists would like the working-class party to exist as a mere 'opposition' integrated into the capitalist political structure like any bourgeois party and subordinating the workers to the capitalist system. They do all they can to bar revolutionary parties of the working class from government. These parties are a special type of opposition inasmuch as they fight for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society. Besides, the existence and activity of Communist parties under bourgeois democracy are admittedly not a gift to the people from the liberals but a result of revolutionary struggle by the working class, which necessarily organizes in a party upholding its interests. The imperialists stop at nothing when their economic and political domination is threatened.

As we see it, the destiny of political opposition under socialism and the concrete historical framework of its existence in countries taking the socialist road depend on the state attained by socialism in the country concerned, on the degree of its maturity, and the actual trend

of the class struggle. In the period of transition, a period characterized by a multistructure economy, which means that social antagonisms persist, there is a definite social basis for the existence of parties opposed to socialism. In Bulgaria, for instance, the regime of the BCP-led Patriotic Front, established in 1944 through an armed rising, authorized the existence of opposition parties. These parties took part in the first free elections and won about 30 per cent of the seats in the People's Assembly. However, they went beyond political activity within legal bounds by engaging in subversion and in preparations for armed struggle against people's rule, with the result that they were dissolved in 1946.

The question arises: Given a different set of circumstances, could anti-socialist and anti-popular forces exist forever in a society that had taken a socialist path? In answering this, it should be borne in mind that when socialism has been built the objective basis for their activity disappears. As for the fate of opposition parties and alignments, it depends on whether they reorganize according to the new social and political reality and the demands of the masses.

Thus the mechanism of 'political pluralism' typical of bourgeois society and needed as a means of disguising the domination of society by a handful of monopolies, loses every objective basis under an entirely different social system guaranteeing genuine people's rule. We are convinced that the criterion of democracy under socialism is not the number of political parties, nor the 'right' of an 'opposition' hostile to people's rule to operate, but the extent to which the working class and other working people participate in government. Experience shows that the establishment of socialist rule does not stop the development of democracy, which, however, takes a new direction and assumes a class character, being exercised in the working people's interests, with the entire population participating ever more effectively.

Bourgeois pluralists would have the working people of socialist countries believe that only a multiparty system of the capitalist type, with an inevitable rotation of parties in the government, is a 'guarantee' of democracy and freedom and can impart proper dynamism to the development of society irrespective of whether it is a socialist or a bourgeois society. Let us note at this point that in Bulgaria, for instance, a parliamentary system went on functioning for more than ten years after the establishment of a fascist regime (1923) and so did opposition parties. And we know from history that there have been many other cases of reactionary dictatorial regimes in the capitalist world taking the form of multi-party systems.

However, bourgeois democracy does not necessarily imply, either in theory or in practice, the existence of several parties and an opposi-

tion. At the dawn of bourgeois democracy, Rousseau and certain other ideologists of a rising bourgeoisie tried to prove theoreteically the necessity for a bourgeois democratic system of a unitary, or monistic, social structure ruling out all opposition, while the Jacobin dictatorship strove to set it up. Under capitalism, attempts of this kind were bound to prove Utopian since its political system can neither express nor execute the will and interests of the people. It does not follow, however, that under no other social system can there be democracy without a political opposition.

In criticizing the political system of developed socialism, pluralists accuse it of lacking a mechanism for the early detection and removal of shortcomings that arise in the course of social development, and of inability to meet the manifold interests of diverse social groups. These interests do exist but socialist democracy, far from ignoring them, evolves and continuously perfects a system of agencies whose functions include fulfillment of this particular task. This system comprises the trade unions, which unite almost all wage and salary earners, the cooperatives, which in most socialist countries encompass the majority of peasants, youth organizations, scientific and cultural societies, unions of creative workers, and so on. The political system of mature socialism sees to it that the interests of diverse social groups and collectives are linked with the interests of society as a whole and gives them a common trend.

As regards shortcomings and problems that arise as socialist society develops, the latter creates special mechanisms of its own to detect and remove them. These mechanisms include, first and foremost, criticism and self-criticism and the activity of government and voluntary control bodies.

The effectiveness of socialist democracy and its superiority over bourgeois democracy have been demonstrated by the history of the new society. The immense achievements of world socialism in every public sphere would have been unthinkable without the system of genuine people's rule that socialism has established and is steadily perfecting.

Subversion under the guise of 'ideological equality'

Present-day pluralism lays claim to the status of a universal doctrine covering all public life, including its spiritual aspect. Its fundamental thesis is that there have always existed numerous ideologists and ideological trends operating simultaneously and that they will always exist, disputing one another. As in the case of political alignments, it contends that there must be 'equal opportunities' for different ideologies.

To understand the true meaning of this claim, one must take

account of the fact that the worldwide struggle now going on is taking place primarly between two incompatible ideologies: the ideology of the working class, or Marxism-Leninism, and bourgeois ideology. Lenin stressed that 'the only *choice* is — either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course . . .' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 5, p. 384). In present-day conditions, says Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the CC BCP, 'the struggle between ideologies is gradually becoming a strategic bridgehead of the class struggle, of the duel between the two worlds.'

Bourgeois ideology as a whole expresses and defends the interests of the capitalist class even though it is a medley of ideological currents. The social reason for this is, first of all, that the bourgeoisie as a class is not homogeneous and that the interests of its diverse components often clash. Secondly, lingering in contemporary capitalist society are survivals of the ideologies of former exploiting classes and there are ideological trends reflecting the interests and illusions of various intermediate, mostly petty-bourgeois strata. Among them are reformist currents intent on 'improving capitalism.'

The general pattern of the spiritual life of bourgeois society is thus composed of the struggle between proletarian and bourgeois ideology and of the relations existing between diverse bourgeois currents. Taken as a whole, it does not fit into the framework of a 'competition of ideas' or a 'contest of opinions' on an equal footing. Only ideological trends that do not endanger the domination of big capital have more or less identical opportunities for expansion under capitalism. True, the working people of many capitalist countries have won certain rights and freedoms, including the right to propagate Marxist ideology. But it should be clear that the dominant ideology in these countries is bourgeois. One has only to think of who in capitalist countries owns the printing plants, broadcasting, television, film studios and other mass media, and who is the real master of research institutions, universities and other centers 'producing' ideas, to realize that Marxist ideology does not enjoy the same rights as its bourgeois counterpart.

Pluralists care least of all about furthering the influence of working-class ideology in capitalist society. The thesis about ideological 'equality' is meant for a society rejecting bourgeois ideology.

But can there by 'equal opportunities' in socialist society for propagating proletarian and bourgeois ideology?

Under developed socialism, due to radical changes in the social and political structure of society, Marxism-Leninism becomes the world outlook of the whole people. Being primarily the ideology of the chief motive power of socialist society, the working class, it also expresses the basic and long-range interests of other components of the new

society — the class of cooperative peasants and handicraftsmen, the intellectuals and salary-earners. It is only remnants of exploiting classes and people caught in the meshes of imperialist propaganda that share bourgeois notions in one form or another and to varying degrees. In our society, this category has neither social support, nor the strength to bring into being any serious 'movement' for the restoration of the former system. Incidentally, socialist democracy guarantees even this numerically insignificant group freedom of conscience and religion and other civil rights. Consequently, the issue of 'equal rights' for bourgeois ideology under socialism is irrelevant since there is no real social basis for it.

The reason why pluralists seek 'equal opportunities' for bourgeois ideology in socialist society is that they want to propagate the moral standards and habits of the bourgeois way of life. Their arguments are not prompted by concern for human rights but by the desire for the legalization of unhampered export of the ideological output of imperialism to socialist countries.

1. As used in contemporary bourgeois literature, pluralism denotes a multiplicity of political forces, parties and ideological views. And this, the pluralists claim, is the classic model of bourgeois democracy.

This article examines the views of bourgeois and reformist ideologists on the subject.

2. The following are part of a longer list: U. Bermbach. *Sozialistischer Pluralismus*. Hamburg 1973; E. Fraenkel. *Reformismus und Pluralismus*. Hamburg 1973; R.K. Furtak. 'Interessenpluralismus in den politischen Systemen Osteuropas.' *Osteurope*, N 11-12, 1974; A. Korbonski, 'The Prospects for Change in Eastern Europe.' *Slavic Review*, N 2, 1974; F. Nuscheler. *Pluralismus. Konzeptionen und Kontroversen*. München 1972; J.-F. Revel. 'Les promesses de l'euro-communisme.' *L'Express*, Paris, N 1301, 1975; S.S. Rosenfeld. 'Pluralism and Policy.' *Foreign Affairs*, N 2, 1974; O. Sik. *Der dritte Weg*. Hamburg, 1972; J.B. Urban. 'Socialist Pluralism in Soviet and Italian Communist Perspective: The Chilean Catalyst.' *Orbis*, Vol. XVIII, N 2, 1974.

3. An analysis and criticism of ideological and political pluralism will be found in the following works among others: F.D. Mitev. *The Principles of Socialism and the Technique of Revisionist Criticism*. Sofia 1974; V.E. Gulyev, E.L. Kuzmin. *The State and Democracy. A Critique of Anti-Marxist Theory*. Moscow, 1975; *The struggle of Ideas in the World of Today*, Vol. 1, Moscow 1975, Vol. 2, Moscow 1976; E. Fromm, L. Sokolowski. 'Zum Platz des Pluralismus in der gegenwärtigen bürgerlichen Ideologie.' *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie*. N 8, 1975; R. Bauermann, K. Geyer, E. Julier. *Das Elend der 'Marxologie'*. Berlin 1975; E. Wimmer, 'Demokratismus und Pluralismus.' *Weg und Ziel*, Wien, N 4, 1973; W. Hollitscher. 'Bürokratismus und Pluralismus.' *Weg und Ziel*, Wien, N 4, 1974.

4. One of its founders was William James, the author of *A Pluralistic Universe*, N.Y. 1909.

5. Popper. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Vol. 2, London, 1957.

It is hardly necessary to prove that the monism of Marxist theory and methodology has nothing in common with the 'unifactor' mechanist-determinist concept. It will be recalled, for instance, that in his correspondence of the 1890s Engels rejected all attempts to interpret Marxism in the spirit of economic determinism. Marxist methodology considers all the factors that influence the development of society, but

rejects the pluralistic approach, which postulates the 'equal value' of all factors without clearly assessing the role of each. Though Marxism does not deny that social development is influenced by a complex multiformity of determinants, it singles out the mode of production and production relations as basic to the development of all social life.

6. Pluralism has become a fashionable word and is used by bourgeois politicians and ideologists for different purposes. For instance, South Africa's Minister of Information and Internal Affairs Mulder recently suggested abandoning the term apartheid in favor of 'pluralistic democracy,' inasmuch, in his words, the former evokes negative and the latter positive emotions.

7. See, for instance, K. Prewitt, A. Stone. *The Ruling Elites*. New York-London, 1973; R, Hamilton. *Class and Politics in the United States*. New York, 1972, p. 45.

8. See R. Dahl. *Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent*. Chicago, 1967, p. 5; R. Hamilton. *Class and Politics in the United States*. New York, 1972.

9. While stressing the class limitations of 'pluralist democracy,' we are far from ignoring the significance of the working people's general democratic struggle in bourgeois society. It is not indifferent to the working people of capitalist countries whether the political regime established in their country is an outspoken fascist dictatorship or a bourgeois democracy. The more democracy there is, the more opportunities the working class and the people have to defend their interests. While exposing bourgeois democracy as nominal, Marxists join efforts with other sincere defenders of democracy, including those who favor bourgeois political pluralism, in the struggle to defend and extend the working people's democratic rights and freedom.

The new internationalism

Antonio Rubbi
CC member, Italian CP

We consider the discussion of internationalism begun in the working-class movement extremely interesting.

This is an exceptionally topical theme; its correct presentation — leaving aside arguments over definitions and epithets — can be of decisive importance in determining the position of the unprecedented broad front of diverse forces and the contribution it can make to a positive solution of the pressing problems now facing the entire world.

We hold the following proposition to be beyond doubt: internationalism is an objective necessity. Today more than ever before, the ideological orientation and political actions of the broad popular, democratic, progressive, left forces, the Communist and Workers' parties, cannot but take into account the multi-faceted panorama of international life and the necessary obligations of international solidarity it imposes.

This necessity coincides with the growing understanding that the

problems now agitating society in the various countries — from economic crisis to inflationary processes — cannot be correctly solved without substantially changing the international causes that are largely responsible for the emergence of these problems.

Today everyone is aware of these worldwide problems. They include, above all, the assurance of peace through a policy capable of containing and rolling back the forces of war and aggression, the forces of imperialism.

Further, they include détente, which in recent years had doubtlessly won important positions (in relation to Europe this refers primarily to the Helsinki Conference). But to become irreversible, détente has to provide political solutions for the serious conflicts still persisting in the Middle East and Southern Africa; it must be backed by concrete steps to reduce the arms race, which has assumed exceedingly dangerous proportions, by concrete disarmament measures aimed at progressive and steady elimination of the confrontation of military blocs.

Lastly, they include a policy of liberation and self-determination of peoples. Today, after the long process of winning national independence in most former colonial and oppressed nations, this policy requires the establishment, in all spheres, of a new pattern of relations with the industrially more developed states. There is also pressing need for multilateral international cooperation. Without it, the economic development of newly independent countries would be largely problematic; the industrially developed countries, too, would find themselves in difficulties, without markets for their goods. They would be faced with the none-too-distant prospect of reduced economic potentials, the undermining of democratic gains and cultural and social decline.

We should also reflect on the new problems that could acquire a dramatic character for the destinies of mankind unless urgent efforts were made to solve them. Reference is to eliminating the disproportion between developed and under-developed, between population growth and expansion of the zone of mass malnutrition, the destruction and damaging of the environment, the more frequent elemental calamities. Solution of all these problems requires reorganizing international relations on a new basis, a new world economic and monetary system, a broad and coordinated program of economic, scientific and technological research, renewal of structures and of national moral and cultural values.

Such, very largely, is the new content, we believe, of action on an international scale.

But there have been deep-going changes in international life, not only of an objective, but also of a subjective character.

There has been tremendous expansion of the zone of operation of the forces prepared to work for positive solution of these problems. It comprises the socialist countries, the non-aligned states, the regions of liberation movements. The workers' and progressive movement includes, of course, the Communist parties, but it also absorbs numerous forces of Socialist and Social-Democratic orientation and of the Christian philosophy. The working class remains the main force, but now within an unprecedentedly varied and broad range of other social forces.

If there is to be the hope of successfully coping with these new realities of the world and its colossal problems, all these forces must have an active part in common efforts and coordinated initiatives.

If it is to be effective and able to direct world development toward peace and security, cooperation and progress, democratic development and social renewal, international solidarity cannot, in our time, abstract itself from the new content of the world situation and the new scope of the internationalist front.

What conditions are required for this tremendous potential to find its full expression? The answer is the possibility and ability to work out independently, absolutely independently, a policy attuned to the achievement of these great aims. And what can be our starting point, if not the native ground on which these forces operate? Internationalism must be linked with the cardinal problems facing the world, with due account of the requirements of national realities. Otherwise, it would have but one fate: it would degenerate into ineffectual propaganda unrelated even to concrete manifestations of solidarity, and would be distant and alien to the working class and the broad masses of working people.

We consider our ability to combine a policy reflecting the national interests of our country with a policy that never loses sight of the entire international picture and of the need to demonstrate, when necessary, effective solidarity, to be one of the results achieved. Perhaps our actions have not been without error, or have been belated, but, we believe, it would be hard to question the consistency of this policy, aimed at unity of the national and international in the character of our Party; it would be hard to question our constant participation in events and the continuity of our obligations in respect of these two parts of unity.

Such a policy can be the fruit of our own analysis, our own theoretical research and our own political action. It must be expressed autonomously not only in resolving internal problems, but also on our main international positions, in our country's foreign policy. Working out the fundamentals of a new policy for Italy and Western Europe, which imposes a tremendous responsibility on us, is, we

believe, important not only as our contribution to the search for a way out of the crisis, liberation from hampering restraints and from the risk of finding ourselves in a subordinate position. It also opens to Italy and Western Europe the opportunity of forming new relations of cooperation and mutual advantage with the countries of Eastern Europe, the Arab world, the Mediterranean and the developing states. Italy and Western Europe could in this way become active forces in the policy of cooperation and progress and could facilitate the extension of détente and new international relations on our continent and the world.

Independence and autonomy are basic conditions for effective and fruitful international solidarity. If in Berlin the European Communist and Workers' parties were able to achieve a satisfactory identity of views on the great aims of peace, security, cooperation and social progress, it was because they recognized that the prerequisite and condition for the struggle in this direction was the pursuit 'of a political line worked out and adopted by every Party in complete independence in accordance with the socio-economic and political conditions and the specific national features prevailing in the country concerned.'

We shall continue to abide by this policy, for we believe that the biggest contribution a Party can make to internationalism is determined by what it does, independently and concretely in its own field of battle, to promote détente, new international relations and the independence and progress of the peoples.

Independent elaboration of problems and of political activity is also a necessary condition for the continuing world struggle for socialism in the new international situation. It is true, of course, that not all the forces working for world peace, international cooperation and social progress are prepared immediately to join the battle for socialist transformations. That is true, though with the profound and complex crisis in many capitalist countries and with the new problems confronting states that have just won independence, there is taking shape a new alignment of social and political forces and a growing demand for democratic and socialist transformations. This is the reaction, at a qualitatively higher level of social development, to the cause of the crisis.

But this positive process is taking place in an age of deep changes in the socio-class structure of society which, of course, can no longer be characterized by the schematic division into 'bourgeoisie' and 'proletariat.' These changes have found, and continue to find, their expression in the variegated and pluralistic systems of representative institutions and forms of democracy, ideological and philosophical trends, different political and social forces.

It is still true, of course, that the working class remains in the center of this front of forces capable of renewing society and transforming it along socialist lines. For the working class, by virtue of its nature and purposeful struggle, is the most consistent fighter for this aim. But it is also true that other social forces are fighting together with it, especially in the developed capitalist countries: the peasants, middle strata, representatives of science, technology and culture. A pluralism of forces is to be observed also in countries that have recently won independence and in the national movements.

With the new scope of the movement developing in the world, we believe that the definition of internationalism as 'proletarian' has become restrictive and does not accord with the new social reality. However, it is not a matter of definitions, but of substance. At the Berlin Conference we rose above this formula, because, objectively, it would have restricted the unitarian appeal the Communist and Workers' parties addressed to the political forces of the workers' and democratic movement, proposing a policy of rapprochement and cooperation on a national and European scale.

It is also true that in implementing the policy of democratic renewal and socialist transformations the Communist and Workers' parties play a leading role by virtue of their ideological orientation and action program. However, the working class and social forces referred to above do not identify themselves only with the Communist parties. The workers' movement of today, particularly in Western Europe, includes diverse political trends, among them trends that are beyond the framework of the Communist parties, some even beyond the framework of Marxist-oriented parties. An understanding of the need for a qualitative change of the social structure, the demand for socialism, are growing also within other political trends. This is an important positive fact, a trend characteristic of our age, and we deem it our duty to do everything we can to bring this trend to reality.

In this situation, with all its new features and peculiarities, can we prescribe for the movement common and universal laws for developing the socialist revolution and building socialist society, divorced from the objective historical conditions in which all these forces operate? Should we not, on the contrary, work out a strategy for the advance to socialism which would accord with the conditions and requirements of the given society and would draw from it the principles of action and the choice of path?

We Italian Communists have put forth precisely this principle in Italy and Western Europe in order to find a way out of the capitalist crisis with a new development perspective. And we call on the broad working and popular masses, on the political forces of the communist, socialist, social-democratic and Christian orientations to become the

main executors of this grand project of renewal and transformation. We are told that, compared with existing and real socialism, this project is so far pure hypothesis.

We are fully aware that the theoretical and political study of the ways to socialism in Italy and Western Europe is still far from completed. Concrete actions in the political realm and the struggle of the working masses have not yet produced results capable of changing the character of the system in which we operate. Besides, we realize that this task cannot be left to us alone. On the contrary, the primary condition for the positive consummation of the work of restructuring society, which will assume a wide scope and will, of course, require much time, calls for close unity of will, effort and cooperation of all these different forces. Above all, it requires unity of the communist, socialist and social-democratic forces by overcoming the historical split, which for over half a century now has kept the West-European working class divided.

In saying all this, we realize also that our idea of socialism already has a solid practical heritage firmly engraved on people's minds. We can look back on more than 30 years of difficult and tenacious struggle of the democratic and popular forces; we have accumulated life-tested practice of unitarian administration over a considerable part of the country; also gains of great importance in assuring the democratic character of the country and in upholding the right of the popular masses to freedom and political participation. And, most important, our strategy meets with understanding among the masses, and that understanding grows as we bring our policy to the knowledge of new laboring strata, new generations, to the knowledge of the democratic and progressive forces participating in the country's life. And so, there are already gains that have become part of the broad and multiform process of transformations in the direction of socialism. We are working on the premise that the development of socialism in the world is a process that will proceed in different forms and will have a different content, and that there will emerge from this process societies differing from each other not only as socio-economic formations, but also as new systems of democratic institutions, as entities expressive of the new type of moral and ethical values.

The experience of socialist construction, with its record of achievement and its revealed shortcomings, is undoubtedly an important aspect of this process. It is a big contribution, both by virtue of its influence in changing international factors, thus creating new and move favorable conditions for the struggle of the international workers' movement, and by virtue of its important economic, social and civil transformations and gains, which extend to such a substantial part of our planet.

We realize that this process requires fresh experience.

In view of the concrete historical conditions of the working-class movement in Western Europe, we feel that we can and should bring into this general process our own experience, in which the creation of the material foundations of socialist society are accompanied by the further development of democracy, in which man's liberation from exploitation involves maximum development of his rights and freedoms; in which social, political, cultural and ideological pluralism stemming from the very history of these countries, would not only be guaranteed, but would be enriched with new moral and spiritual values. In our own and other West European countries the demand for socialism includes this content and we must be able to express it in our strategy and in our concrete programs of political action.

When we so persistently raise the question of independence and autonomy in working out strategy and practical policies within the workers' movement, including the struggle for socialism, we have no intention whatever of contrasting the 'national' to the 'international.' On the contrary, we are convinced that only by following this path can we satisfy the requirements of our country, our workers and our people, and, at the same time — precisely in this way — make our maximum contribution to the general process of advancing world socialism.

Hence we have no intention of confining ourselves to a narrow national framework, in which there would be very little opportunity to solve the problems confronting our country. What we advocate is new internationalism, which essentially implies the need for new relations based on recognition of the autonomy and equality of each party as set out in the final document of the European Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties.

We are likewise convinced that precisely this path will lead to a correct understanding of the causes of multiplicity in the international workers' movement, and on the basis of this understanding we can go over, through the necessary efforts in theoretical and political renewal, to a new and higher level of unity.

---

the press

Dangerous myths

Stepan Mokshin
Soviet historian

ON SOME COLD WAR CONCEPTS

Détente remains an object of ideological struggle. Imperialist reaction does much to minimize the importance of détente, misinterpret it or create the impression that it cannot last.

The enemies of peace and détente, who express the interests of military industrial circles and reactionary, revanchist and neo-colonialist alignments, are trying to slow down or even torpedo détente. They want the governments of leading capitalist countries to renounce talks on disputed issues and fall back on the 'positions of strength' policy toward socialist countries. George Ball, former U.S. Under Secretary of State, thinks détente lulls the capitalist West although he still hopes it will help to pierce at least 'miniscule holes' in the 'iron curtain.'[1] The American trade union boss, George Meany, has condemned the Helsinki documents and accused the U.S. President of 'appeasement.'[2] Margaret Thatcher, the British Conservative leader, has called on the government to follow a 'position of strength' policy.[3]

Some capitalist leaders, the press points out, betray a tendency toward revising the policy of détente. 'Détente,' *Fortune* magazine wrote, 'assumed that we had a real capability of altering Soviet objective.'[4] 'And since this has not come about,' said Manfred Wörner, a CDU/CSU leader, speaking to the Bundestag, 'the West needs a revision of the concept of détente.'[5]

Imperialist propaganda spreads numerous myths aimed at discrediting world socialism, the Communist and Workers' parties and their struggle for peace, security and social progress. I will mention some of them.

Myth of the 'Soviet military threat' to the capitalist West. Anti-communist strategists distort the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and, contrary to common sense, accuse them of aspiring to 'world supremacy' and trying to interfere in the affairs of other countries. In 1975 James Schlesinger, then U.S. Secretary of Defense, assured legislators, with reference to 'secret

data' collected by the CIA and military intelligence, that the Soviet Union spent 50 per cent more on defense than the United States. No sooner had Donald Rumsfeld succeeded him than the CIA supplied him with false information, alleging that Soviet military expenditures added up to an annual $200,000m., or roughly 150,000m. rubles, and were going up by three or more per cent a year. The Defense Secretary did not seem to be interested in the well-known fact that the Soviet national income in 1975 amounted to 362,000m. rubles and that over 80 per cent of this sum was spent on raising the standard of living. What he thinks important is to frighten the population of capitalist countries.

Alexander Haig, NATO commander-in-chief, echoes the head of the Pentagon. Asked by *Der Spiegel* with provocative intent whether it was true that 19,000 tanks and 58 divisions of the Eastern bloc were poised for a surprise attack on the West while NATO garrisons spent carefree 'long weekends,' the general voiced with a serious mien 'genuine concern about the growing Soviet capability to launch a surprise attack.'[6]

Shameless lies like these are picked up by the capitalist media and spread all over the world. Behind the smokescreen of myths about the 'Soviet threat,' the imperialists step up the arms race; high-ranking leaders of NATO countries discuss ways and means of modernizing nuclear weapons and lay plans for nuclear war against the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies.

Washington is seriously considering the new strategic concept of 'limited nuclear war.' The *Washington Post* questioned the wisdom of this strategy, saying that there was no such thing as a small nuclear war. During the presidential election campaign, President-elect Carter, for his part, described the idea of a limited nuclear war as foolish.

The allegations about the 'Soviet threat' are refuted by many realistic-minded people in the capitalist West. Senator William Proxmire (D), Chairman of the U.S. Congress Subcommittee on Priorities and Economy in Government, once said that the Pentagon was distorting and exaggerating intelligence estimates about the size of the Soviet military program to secure record arms appropriations.[7]

However, sober voices like this are drowned by the bellicose mouthings of those whose thinking bears a cold war imprint. Imperialist ideologists ignore realities, yet a look at these realities would be enough to explode the myth of the 'Soviet military threat' and Soviet 'plans of aggression.'

The Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties noted that the stepped-up arms race and the stockpiling of armaments 'pose a direct threat to peace, security and cooperation

between states and block the realization of the European peoples' aspirations for independence and progress.'

'It is imperative,' the recent World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Détente stressed, 'to enhance the international public's awareness of disarmament problems.'[8] The conference adopted a detailed action plan to spell out to the general public in all countries the intricate problems of disarmament, the connection between détente and discontinuance of the arms race, and ways and means of complementing political with military détente.

Myth of socialism as a 'closed society.' The capitalist press claims that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have set up a 'new iron curtain' to isolate their people from the rest of the world. Alfred Dregger, a CDU/CSU member of the Bundestag, affirms that the main subject of the capitalist powers' entire postwar policy has been the 'conflict between legal democracy and Communist dictatorship.'[9] The U.S. Congress has even resolved to appoint a committee to ascertain how the Soviet Union implements the Helsinki agreements. Opponents of détente describe this kind of interference in the affairs of a foreign country as a mechanism making it possible to find out why Soviet policy was not 'substantially liberalized' after Helsinki.

What sort of 'liberalization' are these ideologists of imperialism talking about? In *Ideology and the Ideologists,* Professor Lewis Feuer, a sociologist, expresses the hope that a relaxation of international tensions will provide a more solid basis for 'deideologizing' Soviet society.[10] Various 'Eastern policy experts' declare for a détente conducive to stronger ideological penetration into the socialist countries to undermine their unity.

The sponsors of this propaganda campaign hope against hope that socialism can be 'eroded' from within, turned into a 'pluralist political organism' and made to 'evolve' toward capitalism. Karl Kaiser, a West German economist and sociologist, sees 'the purpose of the policy of détente ... in a convergence that will gradually transform the opposed systems.'[11] The idea is, obviously, to pave the way for ideological penetration into socialist countries and for the ideological 'convergence of the two systems.'

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries advocate greater cultural cooperation between countries with different social systems, more contacts between individuals and nations. The Soviet Union maintains cultural relations with 120 countries and participates in the activities of more than 250 international cultural organizations. Over 17,000 Soviet cultural workers go abroad every year and roughly as many foreign scientists, actors, writers and artists visit the Soviet Union. In accordance with the Helsinki Final Act, the Soviet Union has taken further steps to increase exchanges of books, films and

works of art. Britain and France, for example, publish six or seven times less books by Soviet authors than the other way round. The situation is much the same in the case of films and TV programs. Contacts between people have expanded lately. In 1975 alone, over 58 million foreign guests visited the CMEA countries and over 35 million citizens of socialist countries went abroad. The Soviet Union last year played host to 980 foreign trade union and workers' delegations, and 750 delegations of Soviet workers visited other countries. Some of the latter trips met with hurdles. In particular, the U.S. authorities have repeatedly refused entry visas to Soviet trade union delegations invited by American unions.

Speaking to the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: '. . . The socialist countries are not a "closed society." We are open to everything that is truthful and decent, and are prepared to multiply contacts in every way, making the most of the congenial conditions created by détente. But our doors will always be closed to publications advocating war, violence, racism and hatred of man, and doubly so to emissaries of foreign secret services and the anti-Soviet emigre organizations they have created . . . We are not affiicted by spy mania. But neither shall we afford freedom for subversive acts against our system, against our society.'

Myth of the incompatibility of the class struggle and détente. Peace opponents ascribe all their setbacks to détente. They blame peaceful coexistence for the deep crisis of capitalist society, the growing influence of democratic forces in Western Europe, the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal and the 'black colonels' regime in Greece, the defeat of the invaders and reactionary regimes in Indochina and of the colonialists and neo-colonialists in Angola. To adapt détente to the class aim of capitalism, anti-communist and anti-Soviet strategists would like peaceful coexistence to be an 'ideological compromise' between the two social systems. This is why they talk more and more often of a social status quo without which, they say, the policy of peaceful coexistence is meaningless. They contend that the Soviet Union takes advantage of détente to 'undermine' the social order in Western countries. Examining the so-called 'dangers posed by the policy of détente,' Richard Löwenthal, professor of international politics at the University of West Berlin and Columbia University, claims that in 'Soviet political practice,' the effort to preserve détente is coupled with 'offensive actions . . . on the periphery of the West and in the third world.'[12] Critics of détente 'warn' the Soviet Union against counting on détente should it step up the class struggle.

U.S. News & World Report comments that there will be 'either

greater give on the part of the Kremlin, or a hardening of American policy toward Russia.'[13] Opponents of peaceful coexistence declare that unless the Soviet Union shows restraint and moderation in the third world, relations in the spirit of détente will be impaired. Even the *Christian Science Monitor* writes that this kind of comment is untenable, for there is nothing in Soviet-American agreements or in documents about détente making détente conditional on the socialist countries' refusal to support national-liberation movements.[14]

The obvious purpose of utterances against détente is to suggest to the masses that détente and the class and national-liberation struggle are incompatible. The 25th CPSU Congress dealt with these arguments of capitalist propaganda. 'This,' the Congress stated, 'is either outright naivety or more likely a deliberate befuddling of minds. It could not be clearer, after all, that détente and peaceful coexistence have to do with interstate relations. This means above all that disputes and conflicts between countries are not to be settled by war, by the use or threat of force. Détente does not in the slightest abolish, nor can it abolish or alter, the laws of the class struggle. No one should expect that because of détente Communists will reconcile themselves with capitalist exploitation or that monopolists will become followers of the revolution. On the other hand, strict observance of the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other states and respect for their independence and sovereignty, are one of the essential conditions of détente.'

Experience shows that imperialism has no intention of upholding any 'status quo' in the class struggle and wants no 'ideological compromise.' Indeed, it uses the most sophisticated methods and powerful mass media in its psychological war against socialism and progress, *first,* to prevent the spread of communist ideas in capitalist countries and undermine the social basis for détente there, *second,* to loosen international solidarity and split the front against reaction and the war danger uniting world socialism, the international working class and national-liberation forces, and *third,* to divert the attention of the working people of capitalist countries from the crisis of the capitalist system and from the struggle to change that system.

The Communists, who champion the revolutionary replacement of capitalism by socialism, consider that the policy of peaceful coexistence and international détente provides the most favorable conditions for the working class and other progressive forces to persevere in their struggle.

Myth of 'Eurocommunism' and 'West European exclusiveness.' The Communists' Berlin forum alarmed the imperialists. Their media resort to various falsehoods, alleging, in particular, that some parties had to make 'concessions' while others scored 'gains.' One is struck

by the effort to prove that communism in Europe has an East European and a West European variety, now labelled 'Eurocommunism.'

There is nothing new in the pseudo-theoretical arguments used. In the early 60s, capitalist propaganda counterposed the concept of 'humane,' 'democratic' socialism to Marxist-Leninist, scientific socialism, insisting that the Soviet model of socialism was 'outdated and dogmatic' and calling for new ('develped,' 'Western,' 'national,' etc.) models.

Asked by *Der Kurier* whether he was a 'Eurocommunist,' Franz Muhri, Chairman of the Communist Party of Austria, answered that the notion was not a Communist invention. If 'Eurocommunism' implied a common West European model of socialism, Austria's Communists rejected the idea. They say that there can be neither a Soviet, nor a common West European model. Socialism in each country must be determined by the general principles of socialism with due regard to specific national features.

Knud Jespersen, Chairman of the Communist Party of Denmark, refuted allegations about the various parties' 'concessions' and 'gains,' dismissing these claims of the capitalist press as 'sheer nonsense.' Actually, he said, 'the 29 independent parties achieved unity as a result of talks over a long period, without any diktat or defeat whatsoever. The victors were 29 million Communists, who put forward new initiatives and gave new impetus to the struggle. The enemies talked about subordination whereas all Communist Parties, including that of the Soviet Union, stress independence and none seeks a central position.'[15]

Having deluded themselves into expecting a split in the communist movement, anti-communist strategists plainly underrated the Communists parties' common approach to fundamental contemporary issues, their class solidarity and their readiness, stated by them at the Berlin Conference, to 'develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin.'

This internationalist solidarity, which the Communists have upheld for over 100 years, remains a powerful and tested weapon of all Marxist-Leninists in the struggle for communist ideals.

These, then, are in rough outline some of the myths hatched by imperialist ideologists. They indicate that the activity of opponents of peace and détente is still dangerous. There are still seats of war on the globe, and war preparations are continuing and even gaining in intensity. The Communists realize that in these circumstances, one of the fundamental objectives of sustained ideological effort by Marxist-Leninists is to analyze and expose the ideological positions of imperialism.

1. George Ball, 'The Summit is a Western Defeat,': *Newsweek,* August 11, 1975.
2. *Daily World,* October 4, 1975.
3. *The Times,* August 2, 1976.
4. *Fortune.* April, 1976.
5. See *Deutsche Volkszeitung,* January 22, 1976.
6. *Der Spiegel,* August 16, 1976.
7. *International Herald Tribune,* October 28, 1975.
8. World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Détente. (Helsinki, September 23-26, 1976). Public Opinion and the Struggle for Disarmament in Conditions of Détente.
9. See *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung,* January 16, 1976.
10. See Lewis Feuer, *Ideology and the Ideologists.* Oxford, 1975.
11. Karl Kaiser, *Die europaische Herausforderung und die USA.* Munich, 1973, pp. 112-113.
12. *Die Zeit,* April 9. 1976.
13. *U.S. News & World Report,* January 5, 1976.
14. See *The Christian Science Monitor,* weekly International Edition, December 22, 1975.
15. *Land og Folk,* July 2, 1976.

Social Science Series

theories and critical studies

History and politics
B.I. Marushkin. Cloth $2.75

Soviet nationalities policy and bourgeois historians
Cloth $3.95

current problems

The economic cycle: postwar developments
S. Menshikov. Cloth $3.95

The scientific and technological revolution — its impact on management and education
V. Afanasyev. Cloth $3.95

Progress Books
487 Adelaide Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5V 1T4

facts and figures

Capitalist economic crises

The year 1976 brought no relief to capitalist economy from the upheavals of the 1974-1975 crisis. Realities have upset all the glowing forecasts made by Western economists at the beginning of the year that a period of recovery had set in.

A general decline in production was observed particularly in the latter half of the year, unemployment had reached proportions unprecedented in the past 40 years and prices increased steeply.

In the November 8 issue of the *International Herald Tribune*, U.S., Japanese, Canadian, FRG, British, French and Italian specialists call on their governments to '... immediately shift their policies ...' otherwise the '... world may face a new economic downturn ...'

The impact and depth of the economic crisis that hit capitalism in 1974-75 is comparable only to that of the 1930s. It spread simultaneously to all the main capitalist economic centers. For the first time in the postwar period there was a noticeable backward movement of the economies of all the industrially developed capitalist countries. In 1975 their gross national product, as against 1973, dropped 1.7 per cent and industrial output of all the non-socialist countries shrank by 6 per cent, and 11.6 per cent in the industrially developed capitalist countries.

All branches of industry were affected by the slump, including new spheres of production (electronics, petro-chemical, automation, etc.). Oil extraction and the petroleum industry in the capitalist countries was thrown back to the 1972 level, the auto industry found itself at the 1970 level, and steel smelting, at the 1969 level.

Foreign trade relations in the capitalist world were badly affected by the crisis, causing sharp competition on the world market with a significant drop in international trade turnover. The physical volume of exports from the non-socialist countries in 1975 dropped, by 5 per cent compared with 1974 and imports went down 13 per cent; correspondingly 7.2 and 11.6 per cent in the developed capitalist countries. The trade and balance of payments deficit reached huge proportions. In 1974 and 1975 they totalled 21.3 and 39.3 billion dollars respectively for the developed capitalist countries.

Unemployment reached immense proportions. According to the

International Labor Organization, the figure for 1975 was close to 18.5 million. This is double the 1973 level and almost 2.5 million more than official bourgeois statistics.

In contrast to previous economic upheavals, this crisis, besides the usual drop in industrial output, capital investments, growth of unemployment, etc., saw a further increase of inflation. From the middle of 1974 to the middle of 1975 export prices on raw materials on the world capitalist market increased 2.8 per cent; prices on fuel went up an average 10.4 per cent and prices on manufactured articles increased 32 per cent. Living costs sky-rocketed placing a still greater economic burden on the working people. From July 1974 to December 1975 prices on food and consumer goods in the developed capitalist countries went up an average 18.7 per cent, and a drop in the population's real incomes caused a sharp down-trend in daily purchases.

Not only the economy has been affected by this crisis. It has been accompanied by a worsening of social conflicts, rapid development of the anti-imperialist movement, the peoples' growing struggle against imperialist oppression and economic inundation by foreign capital, particularly by the giant international monopolies. The character, depth and sharpness of the 1974-75 crisis stress the correctness of the conclusion drawn by the June 1976 Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties: 'The difficulties encountered by imperialism are the result of a further deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system, affecting all spheres of capitalist society.'

1974-1975 CRISIS

Sphere of economy and branch of industry	Unit of measurement	Year and quarter (month)		Indices		Duration of monthly declines	Extent of decline
		Pre-crisis high	Low-point	Pre crisis high	Low point		
Developed capitalist countries as a whole							
Overall industrial production	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	121	107	12	11.6
Extractive industries	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	102	97	12	4.9
Manufacturing	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	119	104	12	12.6
Energetics	1970=100	1974 4th qr.	1975 1st qr.	128	127	3	0.1

Metallurgy		1974	1975				
	1970=100	1st qr.	3rd qr.	127	93	18	26.8
Chemicals		1974	1975				
	1970=100	3rd qr.	2nd qr.	130	112	6	13.8
Total unemployed	Thousands	1974 1st qr.	1975 4th qr.	8,605	16,050	21	+88.5
Consumer prices	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 4th qr.	139	165	18	+18.7
Exports physical volume	1974=100	1974	1975	100.0	95.7	12	4.3
Imports physical volume	1974=100	1974	1975	100.0	93.1	12	6.9
USA							
Gross national product	Billions of dollars; 1958 prices	1973 4th qr.	1975 1st qr.	845.7	780.0	15	7.8
Industrial output	1967=100	1974 Sept.	1975 March	131.8	111.7	6	15.3
Extractive industry	1967=100	1974 March	1975 Aug.	112.2	105.3	16	6.2
Electric power	1967=100	1973 Oct.	1974 Jan.	165.3	153.0	3	7.4
Steel output	Million tons	1973	1975	136.0	106.0	24	21.1
Output of:							
automobiles	Millions	1973	1975	9.7	6.7	24	30.9
trucks	Millions	1973	1975	2.9	2.2	24	24.1
Stock prices	1941-43=100	1973 Jan.	1974 Dec.	118.42	67.07	23	43.4
Bankruptcies		1974	1975				
	Units	1973	1975	9,915	11,300	12	+14.0
	Units	Dec.	April	693	1,202	16	+73.4
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Oct.	1975 May	4,100	8,538	19	+108.2
Prices							
consumer	1967=100	1974	1975	147.7	161.2	12	+9.1
wholesale	1967=100	1974	1975	160.1	174.4	12	+9.0
JAPAN							
Gross national product	Billions of yen current prices	1974 3rd qr.	1975 1st qr.	89,990	89,038	8	1.1
Industrial output	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Feb.	136.1	105.1	15	22.8
Extractive industries	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Feb.	132.9	104.4	15	21.5
Manufacturing	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Feb.	133.4	104.6	15	21.6
Electric power	Billion kwh	1973	1975	369.0	334.6	24	9.3

Coal	Million tons	1973	1975	22.4	19.3	24	13.9
Steel	Million tons	1973	1975	119.3	102.2	24	14.3
Automobile output	Thousands	1973	1975	7,042.0	6,942.0	24	1.4
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Oct.	1975 Nov.	530	1,320	25	+149.1
Prices consumer	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 July	130.4	172.8	20	+32.5
wholesale	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Sept.	125.6	157.3	22	+25.2
Stock prices	1968=100	1973 Jan.	1974 Oct.	410.9	265.5	21	35.7
Bankruptcies	Units	1973 Nov.	1974 Dec.	857	1,179	13	+37.5
FRG							
Gross national product	Billions marks 1962 prices	1974 1st qr.	1975 3rd qr.	149.5	142.0	18	5.3
Industrial output	1970=100	1974 Feb.	1975 July	114	100	17	12.3
Extractive industries	1970=100	1971 March	1975 Aug.	105	80	53	23.8
Manufacturing	1970=100	1974 Jan.	1975 July	114	98	18	14.0
Electric power	Billions kwh	1974	1975	306	297	12	2.9
Coal	Million tons	1974	1975	95.0	92.0	12	3.2
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	53.0	41.0	12	22.6
Automobile output	Thousands	1973	1974	3,964	3,124	12	21.2
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Jan.	1975 Dec.	228	1,345	35	+489.9
Prices consumer	1970=100	1974 Jan.	1975 Oct.	123.3	137.0	21	+11.1
wholesale	1960=100	1974 Jan.	1975 Aug.	121.0	136.0	19	+12.3
Bankruptcies	Units	1973	1975	5,515	9,200	24	+66.8
FRANCE							
Gross national product	1970=100	1974 3rd qr.	1975 1st qr.	124.0	117.0	6	5.6
Industrial output	1970=100	1974 Aug.	1975 May	129	108	9	16.3
Energetics	1970=100	1974 Aug.	1975 May	124	105	9	15.3
Coal	Million tons	1974	1975	22.9	22.4	12	2.0

Electric power	Billion kwh	1974	1975	180.2	178.4	12	1.0
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	27.0	21.5	12	20.0
Automobile output	Thousands	1974	1975	3,045	2,952	12	3.0
Average monthly unemployed	Thousands	1974	1975	497.7	860.9	12	+73.0
Prices consumer	1970=100	1974	1975	136.7	153.8	12	+14.0
wholesale (manufact-ured goods)	1962=100	1974 June	1975 June	208.5	186.8	12	10.4
Industrial stock prices	29 Dec. 1972=100	1973 May	1974 Sept.	120.3	64.8	16	46.1
Bankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	11,981	14,871	12	+24.1
GREAT BRITAIN							
Gross domestic product	Millions pound sterling, 1970 prices	1974 3rd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	12,234	11,785	9	3.7
Industrial production	1970=100	1973 Oct.	1975 Aug.	111.3	98.8	22	11.2
Extractive industries	1970=100	1974 July	1975 June	94	86	11	8.5
Manufacturing	1970=100	1973 Oct.	1975 Aug.	112.3	98.9	22	11.9
Electric power	Billion kwh	1974	1975	274.5	252.5	12	8.0
Coal	Million tons	1973	1974	132	111	12	15.9
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	22.4	20.3	12	9.4
Automobile output	Thousands	1974	1975	1,936	1,430	12	26.1
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Dec.	1975 Aug.	513.5	1,250.4	20	+143.5
Prices consumer	15 Jan. 1974=100	1974	1975	108.5	133.0	12	+22.6
wholesale (manufact-ured goods)	1970=100	1974	1975	152.0	188.0	12	+24.0
Stock prices	1970=100	1973	1974	130	76	12	41.5
Bankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	5,716	7,500	12	+31.2
ITALY							
Gross national product	Billion lira, current prices	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	97,182	92,809	12	4.5

Industrial production	1970=100	1974 April	1975 May	126.0	101.7	13	19.3
Extractive industry	1970=100	1974 Jan.	1975 June	114.0	85.7	17	24.8
Manufacturing	1970=100	1974 July	1974 Dec.	131.9	100.8	5	23.6
Electric power	Billion kwh	1974	1975	141.7	140.0	12	1.2
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	23.8	22.4	12	5.9
Automobile output	Thousands	1974	1975	1,631.3	1,337.7	12	18.0
Unemployed	Thousands	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	484	667	12	+37.8
Prices consumer	1970=100	1974 1st qr.	1975 1st qr.	134.5	164.9	12	+22.6
wholesale	1970=100	1974 1st qr.	1975 1st qr.	160.6	190.2	12	+18.4
Bankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	3,883	3,806	12	1.9
Real wages	1966=100	1974	1975	156.2	166.4	12	+6.5

The 1974-75 crisis was preceded in the past 50 years by other crises of overproduction that likewise affected, in greater or lesser degree, all spheres of the capitalist economic and social system.

The 1929-1933 crisis was devastating, lasting over an exceptionally long period. It affected all spheres of capitalist economic activity. Industrial output was cut almost by half, domestic and foreign trade was sharply reduced (export from all capitalist countries dropped by 67 per cent). The stock markets were in turmoil with a 60-75 per cent drop in share prices. Bankruptcies were widespread (109,000 in the United States from 1929 to 1932). But it was the working people who were affected the most. Real wages dropped sharply and every fourth worker and employee was left without a job.

After several years of the depression and a slight pickup, the latter half of 1937 was hit by a new general crisis. Preparations for the Second World War, however, had their effect on this crisis. The outbreak of war interrupted the cycle.

The United States was the center of the first postwar crisis in 1948-49. Industrial output experienced an 18 per cent drop, bankruptcies increased and more than 4 million were left jobless. Britain and Canada were not affected to the same extent. West European countries and Japan were still rebuilding their war-ravaged economies and this helped keep the manufacturing industry alive.

The 1957-58 crisis affected a much larger number of capitalist countries with a noticeable convergence of the phases of their economic cycles. Production dropped in the manufacturing industry

in the United States, Canada, Britain, Italy, Japan and France. Although there was no general production slump in the FRG, its rate of growth was reduced to a minimum and many of the larger branches of industry found themselves in a crisis (extractive, metallurgical, shipbuilding and textile). The crisis was accompanied by a big increase of unemployment with about 10 million unemployed in the capitalist world.

The 1970-71 overproduction crisis by comparison was not very deep. It differed from the others because this was the first crisis in postwar years to affect all the developed capitalist countries and create the prerequisites for synchronizing the economic cycle. The impossibility of settling the crisis caused a further intensive accumulation of the 'products of the disintegration' of the capitalist system.

1929-1971 CRISES
(Developed Capitalist Countries as a Whole 1929-1933 Crisis)

Sphere of economy and branch of industry	Unit of measurement	Year and monthly, quarter		Indices		Duration of monthly declines	Extent of decline
		Pre-crisis high	Low point	Pre-crisis high	Low point		
1929-1933 Crisis							
General index of industrial production	1929=100	1929 June	1932 July	103.6	58.0	37	46.0
Coal	Million tons	1929	1932	1,169	806	36	31.1
Oil	Million tons	1929	1932	186	152	36	18.3
Electric power	Billions kwh	1930	1932	302	254	24	15.9
Steel	Million tons	1929	1932	110	42	36	61.8
Automobile output	Thousands	1929	1932	6,276	1,950	36	69.0
Unemployed	Thousands	1929	1932	5,852	25,988	36	+344.1
Real incomes	1929=100	1929	1932	100.0	42.3	36	57.7
1937-1938 Crisis							
General index of industrial production	1937=100	1937 June	1938 March	102	91	9	10.8
Electric power	Billion kwh	1937	1938	382	389	12	+1.8
Coal	Million tons	1937	1938	1,068	973	12	8.9

Oil	Million tons	1937	1938	243	235	12	3.3
Steel	Million tons	1937	1938	113	87	12	23.0
Automobile output	Thousands	1937	1938	6,269	3,770	12	39.9
1948-1949 Crisis							
General index of industrial production	1937=100	July 1948	April 1949	133	125	9	6.0
Coal	Million tons	1948	1949	1,140	1,021	12	10.4
Oil	Million tons	1948	1949	434	427	12	1.6
Steel	Million tons	1948	1949	130.2	129.6	12	0.5
1957-1958 Crisis							
General index of industrial production	1958=100	4th qr. 1957	3rd qr. 1958	103	98	9	5.0
Coal	Million tons	1957	1958	1,139	1,060	12	6.9
Steel	Million tons	1957	1958	218	187	12	14.2
Automobile output	Millions	1957	1958	11.6	10.5	12	9.5
Unemployed	Thousand	1957	1958	7,300	9,560	12	+31.0
1970-1971 Crisis							
General index of industrial production	1963=100	March 1970	Nov. 1972	152	148	8	2.7
Coal	Million tons	1970	1972	1,146	1,092	24	4.7
Iron ore	Million tons	1971	1972	500	480	12	4.0
Steel	Million tons	1970	1971	416	395	12	5.0
Automobile output	Millions	1969	1970	27.8	26.4	12	5.0

Not all these crises were identical in their impact and the number of countries they affected and each reflected specific historical conditions. Nevertheless, each represented a new stage in the growth of the main capitalist contradictions that are weakening its foundations. Crises are a sign of the mounting difficulties in managing the productive forces, caused by the capitalist system, of the increasing contradictions between the growing social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation.

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WCIX 8PS, England.

Progress Subscription Service
487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, M5V IT4, Canada.

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism, 5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi 55, India.

FRENCH EDITIONS:

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et d'Information, 9 Boulevard des Italiens. 75 Paris 2e, France.

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières, 96 ouest, rue Sherbrooke, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

AL-Thakafah Al-Jadidah, Al-Saadoon St., Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Bagdad, 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, Nové Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden, Brodgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark.

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

GERMAN EDITIONS:

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandels-betrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

'Globus', Vertrieb ausländischer Zeitschriften 1200 Wien, Hochstädt-platz 3, Austria.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papajanis Stephanos, Emanuil Benaki 25-6^{0} Athens, Greece.

People's Agency, Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus.

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace and Socialism, P.O.B. 9525, Haifa, Israel.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI, Ajay Bhawan, Patna 4, India.

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura, Könyv-és Hirlap Külkereskedelmi Vallalat, Budapest 1, Fö u 32, Hungary.

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via della Botteghe, Oscura 4, 001 86 Roma, Italy.

JAPANESE EDITION: Nauka Ltd. 2, Kandu Zinbocho 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

MALAYALAM EDITION:
5 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 55, India.

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbatar Mongol Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I. Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715, Oslo 1, Norway.

PERSIAN EDITION:
P.B. 49034, 10028, Stockholm 49, Sweden.

POLISH EDITION: RSW. 'Prasa-ksiazka-ruch' BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional, Av. Santos Dumont, 57, 2 Lisboa-I, Portugal.

PUNJABI EDITION: Punjab Book Centre, 1038 Sector 22-B, opp. General Bus Stand, Chandigarh, India.

RUMANIAN EDITION: I.C.E. 'Libri', Calea Victoriei 126, Bucaresti, Rumania.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, Smolenskaya-Sennaya 32/34, Moscow 121200, USSR.

SINHALESE EDITION:
91 Cotta Road, Colombo 8, Sri Lanka.

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Aereo 1253, Bogotà, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A. Filosofia y Letras 34, Copilco Universidad, Mexico 20, D.F. Mexico.

Ideologia y Politica, Fr Rufino Torrico N° 671-Of. 401, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracás, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panamá, Rep. de Panamá.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

TURKISH EDITION: 1 Berlin 10, Postfach 100 229, West Berlin.

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp khâu Sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi, Democratic Republic of Vietnam.