WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

May 1977, Vol. 20, No. 5 75¢

Dominican Republic / 124

Investigating the economy / 102

Government by the people in the USSR / 12

Illusions of bourgeois reformism / 35

NATO against détente / 54

Purveyors of lies / 130

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

May 1977, Vol. 20, No. 5

Features

3 The Helsinki Agreements and the struggle for peace
R. Chandra

12 Government by the people
J. Pittman, S. Sudiman

35 The illusions of bourgeois reformism in developing countries
I. Eskandari

45 The socialist economic intensification strategy
G. Mittag

54 NATO against détente
P. Boychuck

Exchange of views

63 Socialist economic integration and international relations
K. Olszewski

73 Proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary process in Africa
A. Dansoko

79 Export of capital — one of the essential bases of imperialism
J. Purton

Party experience

89 Roads of revolution
J. Insunza

102 Investigating the economy
J. Carrera

110 Why we are with the communists

Viewpoints

114 Global forecasts and realistic solutions
N. Fedorenko

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

124 The Dominican Republic: problems and prospects
P.J. Persia

The press

130 Purveyors of lies
J. Peterson

Facts and figures

139 The strike movement in the developed capitalist countries

---

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.

The Helsinki agreements and the struggle for peace

Romesh Chandra
Secretary-General,
World Peace Council

Man has always associated his innermost aspirations with just and lasting peace. The agreements reached at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and recorded in its Final Act, which was signed almost two years ago by 33 states of Europe and by the United States and Canada, are an expression of the people's resolve to banish war from the life of society, an expression of their desire to use the inexhaustible material and spiritual potentialities of mankind through economic, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation among nations with different social systems.

The time that has passed since is short in terms of history. But it is enough to satisfy anyone of the wisdom of the leaders of socialist states and the political foresight of some of the statesmen of capitalist countries who overcame great obstacles and differences and agreed to develop international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence, to carry forward détente. There is growing evidence that the Helsinki peace charter gave a powerful spur to the struggle of the peoples of every continent for détente, disarmament, national independence and social progress.

The peoples of Europe played a decisive role in preparations for the Helsinki summit. The Europe from where the two world wars came, the Europe from where the armies of colonialism marched to enslave and kill people in various parts of the globe, but where also scientific socialism was born, the Great October Revolution took place and the socialist system came into existence, has taken the first steps to change the political and psychological climate of the world and discard cold war in favor of détente.

A set of treaties and agreements relating to the German problem made it possible to ease tension in the heart of Europe by removing the issue of national frontiers from the European agenda. It confirmed the political realities resulting from World War II and the defeat of fascist Germany. Growing relations between the socialist and non-socialist countries of Europe show not only the possibilities of ex-

panding mutually beneficial peaceful cooperation between states with different social systems, but the opportunities which this cooperation affords for the solution of pressing European problems, such as those of energy, raw materials or transport. The signing of the Helsinki Final Act, made possible by the experience gained, paved the way for a better Europe.

Furthermore, ever since Helsinki, the people that have won or are winning freedom have looked upon Europe in a different way. They no longer see it only as the continent of the fascists and colonialists, only as the Europe which produced wars, death and destruction and from whose western part colonialism still spreads; they also see Europe now as the continent which took important steps for détente, giving mankind greater hope of durable, just and democratic peace.

It would be wrong, therefore, to think that the Helsinki Conference was an action carried out in Europe and only for Europe. This would be a narrow approach preventing a proper view of today's world in all its interconnections, in all its complexity and multiformity, and underrating the world significance of the CSCE, the role of those who made the Conference possible and created the spirit expressed in its Final Act. The CSCE and its Final Act are indicative of a new balance of world forces. They would have been impossible without the tremendous contribution of all peoples to the formation of détente, to the worldwide struggle for peace, freedom, independence and social progress, against war, imperialism and fascism.

In speaking of this contribution, even in the most general terms, I must also note the important role played by the gains of the national-liberation movement, first of all the signal victory of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea (Cambodia), by the vast movement of solidarity with Indochina, with the Chilean and other peoples struggling against fascism, by the non-aligned countries and the peace movement in all countries.

Therefore, it is fair to say that while the Final Act was only signed by the participants in the CSCE, it is also a result of the efforts of all peoples and impinges on the destiny of the whole of mankind.

Détente is neither the product, nor the patrimony of one continent. It is not a tree which grows on one continent and nowhere else. It greatly contributes to lessening the threat of war in every part of the world. Peace supporters perceive détente as a global process of putting international relations on a sound basis. To be sure, it is a complex and contradictory process extending over a long period, for to move on from the distrust and fear of the cold war years to normal relations between countries based on mutual confidence and readiness to settle differences and disputes not by force, threats or saber-rattling, but by negotiation on the principles of equality, justice and

respect for the other side's legitimate interests is no easy task.

Helsinki opened the perspective of an end to the arms race, of cooperation in Europe, of better living standards for the population of Europe. All this is also vital for the rest of the world not only because of the importance of Europe, but because the example of solving European problems one by one shows the way to lessening tensions in other areas of the world.

Just as all peoples contributed to the success of the CSCE, so the Helsinki spirit creates new possibilities, new favorable conditions for every people fighting for a new life, against imperialism, fascism, oppression and injustice. The efforts of the peoples of Europe to consolidate the Helsinki gains are inseparable from the struggle of the peoples of the world for peace and social progress. In particular, they are linked with the struggle of the peoples of the developing countries, who want to take their natural resources into their own hands, end hunger and poverty, attain economic independence and rid themselves of oppression. The struggle to abolish fascism in Chile and beat off the offensive of fascism in other Latin American countries, such as Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, Guatemala, Haiti or Nicaragua, is likewise a task going beyond that continent. It is an internationalist duty of world opinion, a duty inseparable from our struggle in Asia, Africa and, above all, Europe. There is a direct connection between the struggle of the peoples of Europe for the materialization of the Helsinki agreements and the Arab peoples' struggle for peace and justice in the Middle East, the battles of the Palestine people for their inalienable rights, including the right to establish their own state.

The Helsinki spirit has provided the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe with new opportunities to march forward to victories. Their struggle for independence contributes vitally to the struggle for an end to the arms race and for disarmament. In turn, the struggle to end the arms race is equally vital to the struggle for independence. We do not say: Wait till there is disarmament, and then we shall all be independent and free. Nor do we accept the other — totally false — idea that until every country is free, the struggle for disarmament is meaningless.

Lastly, an atmosphere of détente creates opportunities for mankind to solve such universal problems as those of food, the environment or raw materials. From this point of view, man's future depends directly on whether he will succeed in curbing the forces of war and reaction, stop the arms race and gear the funds and human energy to be released as a result to the implementation of far-reaching social programs.

All peace supporters need to see these links clearly if they are to

draw correct lessons from the Helsinki Conference, which can and should become the catalyst of a chain reaction of détente encompassing the whole world.

It would be hard nowadays to come across a politician calling explicitly for war. However, this is not to say that the enemies of détente and the Helsinki spirit, those who tried to block preparations for the CSCE and then to torpedo the Conference itself, have downed arms. They have simply changed their tactics.

This change is so instructive in itself as to be worth dwelling on. It may be recalled that before the CSCE met, its opponents said it would fail. And as they could not discredit the Conference, they ignored its documents, alleging that it had achieved nothing. The publicity given to the Helsinki principles compelled them to claim that the Final Act gave 'advantages' to one side (not theirs) and that, in any case, it could not be implemented. And now they pretend to support the Helsinki accords, saying that they uphold the Helsinki spirit against the 'Soviet threat.'

Nothing can conceal the actual state of affairs — the campaign over the so-called 'Soviet threat' is a counter-offensive against détente and, first of all, against disarmament, that is, against what all the peoples are vitally interested in.

The campaign is also designed to undermine public confidence in the sincerity of the intentions and fruitfulness of the activity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries committed to the cause of détente and disarmament.*

No amount of propaganda camouflage, no change of masks on the political scene, will help the latter-day 'defenders' of the Helsinki spirit to disguise their identity. These are spokesmen of the forces responsible for the aggression in the Middle East, for the fact that the people of Palestine are denied their sovereign rights, for keeping alive the hated colonialist and racist regimes in southern Africa, for the coup d'état in Chile and continuing efforts to 'destabilize' certain Latin American countries, for attempts to perpetuate the division of Korea, for the lingering tensions on our planet, for the appearance of new imperialist military bases, for the arms race, for arms deliveries to reactionary regimes.

* The campaign over the so-called 'military threat' of the Soviet Union has another purpose, too, and to this I would like to draw attention. This purpose is to mislead public opinion in the non-aligned countries, to create the impression that there is an arms race for which 'two sides' are responsible. Behind this screen of falsehoods, arms on a massive scale are being poured into third world countries, above all by the U.S. armaments profiteers. Some of these countries are now acting as gendarmes of imperialism by way of 'paying' for the arms deliveries. Others are becoming more and more dependent on imperialism as a result of these arms supplies, and their advance toward economic independence is slowing down accordingly.

It is obvious to any sensible person that the allegation about the 'Soviet military threat' is intended to justify more military spending in some Western countries. In 1976, the West European NATO countries increased their military budgets by $5,000 million. The United States had a record military budget of $113,000 million in 1976.

For those who profit from armaments, détente is 'all right' provided it does not affect their profits nor stop them from increasing these profits. They resort to frontal attacks and turning movements against the solemn undertaking given by their governments at Helsinki to promote détente in the military sphere, against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of their peoples, on whom mounting military budgets put an increasing burden, making their daily lives harder and forcing them to work more for a livelihood.

Militarization of the economy, far from reducing unemployment in capitalist countries, aggravates the situation on the labor market. To divert the masses from the real causes of the imperialist crisis, some Western politicians seize on various subterfuges. In particular, they try to discredit socialism, and this is the real aim of the campaign over 'human rights' in the socialist countries, which the enemies of détente are conducting on the plea of concern for the implementation of the 'third basket' of the Final Act (cooperation in humanitarian fields).

The socialist countries scrupulously implement the provisions of this section of the Final Act, as every unbiased analyst will admit. I am sure this will also be seen by those honest people who may have been misled by vicious propaganda. What is perfectly clear is that in this instance, the imperialists are by no means concerned with the 'third basket.' What do they care for human rights? Had they really been concerned about human rights, they could find a more suitable sphere for their efforts in their own countries instead of brazenly interfering in the affairs of other countries. They would be better advised to provide the many millions of jobless persons in the capitalist world with a real right to work. Bourgeois 'humanists' should also go on from words to deeds in the matter of completely eliminating racism, apartheid, fascism and religious fanaticism, whose victims lack civil rights. Lastly, one feels like asking the champions of 'absolute freedoms' how much longer they intend to shut their eyes to the fact that reaction steps up the persecution of communists and democrats and jails dissenters, including peace fighters.

Those behind the campaign are prompted by anything but concern for human rights. Their aim is to conceal the real state of affairs as regards human rights in the capitalist world, to create the impression that the struggle for a just reorganization of society is useless because human rights are 'denied everywhere.' It follows that the torture and terror in Chile or the shootings of African workers in South Africa are

only part of a widespread 'universal phenomenon' which in these cases has perhaps taken somewhat sharper forms. This falsehood is meant to justify the unjustifiable. The anti-Soviet, anti-socialist campaign is being used as a means of undermining the worldwide movement of solidarity with the victims of crimes against humanity in countries ruled by fascist and neo-fascist regimes. But its primary purpose is to minimize the experience of the country of the October Revolution, to reduce the appeal of the Soviet Union, make the people a passive, apolitical onlooker and divert them from the struggle against social injustice, unemployment and inflation and their causes. By using lies, imperialism tries to prevent the peoples from coming to the inevitable conclusion that they cannot exercise the ordinary human right to eat and work or take care of their health, or develop their spiritual values, unless they transform society.

I was born in India in the decade after the October Revolution changed the world. My people, with whom I fought for independence, gained so much from the October Revolution. They gained in inspiration and support. My people fought heroically for their freedom. But how much harder would this struggle have been and how much greater the toll of sacrifice had it not gone on in the epoch initiated by the October Revolution and had it not enjoyed the unqualified solidarity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The October Revolution is part of my life, part of the life of my beloved motherland. This is why millions of people in India and other countries, particularly the peoples of the developing non-aligned countries, see the current anti-communist smear campaign in its true light. For only the blind can fail to see that reaction wants to weaken the unity of peace forces and, no less important, to dissociate the non-aligned countries from their best friends, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Reshaping international relations on democratic principles — an effort to which the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole make the greatest contribution — is imperative today. It will be effective only if all governments and peoples and all social forces join earnestly in it.

Recently I read Leonid Brezhnev's introduction to a volume of his speeches and writings published in France. The General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union wrote: 'I should like to stress here one thing only. It is not enough to say we want peace. We want lasting peace. We not only want it but are doing everything in our power to achieve this goal. And lasting peace is conceivable only as a just, democratic and truly universal peace. In other words, a peace based not on the premise that "might is right," but on the equality and freedom of all peoples and states, big and small, indus-

trially developed and still developing. Such a peace would accord with the interests of all and at the same time with the interests of each.'*

These simple words show what the peace movement is all about.

But what is this peace we are striving for? Not a peace based on the balance of terror or on power and might over those who do not have them. We want peace which is in the interests of all and in the interests of each. It is a feasible task. What is our optimism based on? It is based, first of all, on the strength of the bulwark of peace which socialism has become. Championing peace along with the socialist countries are the young independent states. The peoples of the capitalist countries, for their part, have an objective stake in détente.

In 1936, when we were fighting against the dangers of fascism and of a second world war, Georgi Dimitrov said: 'We need a peace front spreading over all parts of the world, from Tokyo to London, from New York to Berlin ... We must gird the globe with such a network of peace organizations, with so powerful an international solidarity movement, and adopt such effective actions of united international proletarian policy with a view of maintaining peace as to stay the warmongers' criminal hand.' But in the 30s this communist call was drowned by the roar of guns. Nevertheless, the lessons of World War II were not lost. Looking back at the main stages of the peace movement, we see how much has been achieved in these years, how greatly the situation today differs from what it was in 1936. Due to the changed balance of forces on the planet, the policy of peaceful coexistence and détente now plays a decisive role in international life and determines its main trends. We have succeeded in encircling the globe with a network of organizations of peace champions and in strengthening the international solidarity movement.

An indication of these changes is the activity of the World Peace Council. Our ranks have multiplied. The most diverse political forces have been able to come together and join the World Peace Council. In many countries, the national peace movements increasingly assume the character of a front, or a united body embracing all who love their country and stand against imperialism and fascism, and that means the vast majority of the people of each country.

The initiatives of this period taken by the World Peace Council to mobilize world opinion consisted, first of all, in pressing forward the campaign for more signatures to the Stockholm Appeal against the Arms Race, for Disarmament, stepping up the effort to speed social and economic progress in the newly independent states in the climate of détente and extending the front of solidarity with the peoples of Chile, South Africa, Cyprus and other countries. The influence of the peace forces and the appeal of the ideas advocated by them have

* *New Times*, No. 2, 1977.

grown to such an extent that politicians, MPs and whole governments are compelled to reckon with them.

Under pressure from public opinion, a number of West European statesmen are coming to the conclusion that the national interests of their countries are irreparably damaged by accepting what NATO demands, which means building up armaments. It is becoming more and more difficult for Western politicians to ignore public opinion, which insists on cutting military budgets, as the Soviet Union has repeatedly done in the past and continues to do.

In reply to the growing demands of peace supporters in the United States, President Jimmy Carter, for his part, pledged himself time and again during his election campaign and after taking office to cut down the U.S. military budget. These have yet to be implemented but the fact remains that they were made.

What Georgi Dimitrov said more than 40 years ago is still valid. In today's circumstances, we must expand the network of organizations of peace champions and foster international solidarity. A powerful peace movement is what was needed then and is needed now. Our task is not only to defend peace, not only to stay the hands of those who would bring back the cold war and even the hot war. The new period of détente has set us new tasks and this entitles us to call ourselves peace builders. We need a vast network of peace organizations also for the purpose of building the new world we all seek.

The year 1977 may become largely decisive in this respect. It will see negotiations on important and promising lines of world politics. Mankind pins great hopes on the second round of Soviet-U.S. strategic arms limitation talks. It also looks forward to progress in the Vienna talks among 19 countries on cuts in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Besides, it is imperative to resume the Geneva talks with a view to ending the war of aggression in the Middle East. The Belgrade meeting of the foreign ministers of the countries which attended the Helsinki Conference should contribute to security in Europe.

A pressing demand of today is to launch a world offensive of peace supporters. It is essential that peace supporters the world over should campaign for the reinforcement and promotion of the Helsinki spirit, for the full implementation of the CSCE Final Act, for new initiatives. They must ensure that détente becomes irreversible. Frederic Joliot-Curie, founder of the World Peace Council, said that 'one people alone, let alone one individual, cannot eliminate the threat of war. Only the joint efforts of the peoples of all countries will make it possible to achieve this goal.'

This is the spirit which guides the national and international peace movements. There can be no question of one or several movements

imposing their point of view on others. But we are aware that the most important thing at the moment is the unity of the peace forces. We need this unity move than ever, more perhaps than before the Helsinki Final Act, because today's counter-offensive of the cold warriors is not just one more counter-offensive but a very dangerous operation. And yet it cannot succeed — it will be defeated by the will and power of the peoples.

One year before Helsinki, we said: 'The Conference is going to take place, and it is going to be a success.' Some people laughed, saying that we were living in a fool's paradise. But today we repeat that we shall go forward to new gains for the cause of peace.

Together we can do this.

Attaching great importance to discussion of the problems raised by WPC Secretary-General Romesh Chandra in his article, the Editorial Council of the journal intends to continue dealing with the role of various factors impinging on the state and evolution of international relations. It plans, among other things, to cover the following themes: the socialist community as the driving force of favorable changes in the world; factors promoting or hampering international détente; peace as an indispensable condition for the social and economic progress of the developing countries; the contribution of the non-alignment movement to the reshaping of international relations; joint actions by diverse political trends to end the arms race; calculations and miscalculations of imperialism's militarist circles; international solidarity in the struggle against seats of fascism.

Government by the people

John Pittman
CC, PB member
CPUSA
Satyajaya Sudiman
Leadership member
CP Indonesia

LAND OF SOVIETS — 60TH YEAR
SURVEY ONE

How the Soviets work

This year marks the 60th anniversary of the power of the Soviets. The Russian word 'soviet' means 'council' and when we speak of the Soviets of Working People's Deputies we mean the elected representative bodies on which government in the USSR is based. The Soviet Union itself, the world's first socialist state, takes its name from these Soviets. During a recent visit to the country we were able to study the everyday functioning of the Soviets at all levels, first in the Republic of Turkmenistan (one of the 15 socialist republics comprising the USSR), and later in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR itself. We visited towns and villages, collective farms and factories, met voters and their deputies, observed the work of the executive committees of the Soviets and their permanent commissions and activists, took part in sessions, examined documents and interviewed members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan and the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of this Republic and of the USSR.

All we have seen and heard had led us to this conclusion: the Soviets, which Lenin even before the October Revolution saw as the embryo of the new form of people's government, have in the 60 years since the revolution grown into a powerful force and become mass organizations through which genuine people's power is exercised. As Lenin wrote, 'It is the people, who even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, while possessing equal rights by law, have in fact been debarred by thousands of devices and subterfuges from participation in political life and enyoyment of democratic rights and liberties, that are now drawn into constant and unfailing, moreover deci-

sive participation in the domestic administration of the state.' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 28, p. 465). We saw to our satisfaction how, thanks to the consistent development of socialist democracy under the guidance of the CPSU, the present system of Soviets guarantees and gives practical expression to the full functioning of people's power.

In this report of our impressions we shall try to deal in detail with the key points in the organization and activity of the organs of Soviet power, starting from the elections and continuing through the work of the deputies, the Soviets themselves and their commissions up to the Supreme Soviet presidium, which performs the functions of a 'collegiate president.'

A desert republic

This was the first time we had actually seen Turkmenistan, the USSR's southernmost republic. In the first Soviet years its territory was populated by nearly one million, including over 700,000 Turkmen. Its population today is 2.7 million, of whom 1.5 million are Turkmen. We knew that 60 years ago it had been a desolate and remote border area of the Russian empire, but we had no concrete idea of what life was really like here in those not so distant days.

Was it a state? No, right up to the time of the October Revolution of 1917, the Turkmen had no statehood. In fact, they were not even a nation. The formation of the Turkmen nation out of scattered tribes came later.

Were there any cities? On the eve of the revolution, on all the places marked on the map there lived less than a thousand Turkmen. When a traveller asked where the people lived he received the answer: 'In the saddles of their camels.'

What about industry? The best it could offer was the railway workshops. Before the revolution 5,500 people were employed in industry and of these only 150 were Turkmen.

Agriculture? Nine-tenths of Turkmenistan was desert; the few irrigation systems were in the hands of feudal landlords. As for agricultural implements, there was a total of 64 ploughs.

Education? The only Turkmen woman who received a higher education before the Revolution was a girl who had been adopted by a Russian general and taken away from her native land. The illiterate were 983 per thousand of the population. Official statistics on literacy led the Russian magazine *Vestnik Vospitaniya* (Education Herald) to predict in 1906 that it would take 4,600 years to solve this problem in Central Asia.

Socialism has changed all that. The country that greeted us was quite a different Turkmenistan.

Last year they had an unusually severe winter. It prevented us from

enjoying what might be described as the most exotic item on our program — a speedboat trip across the desert. The Lenin Kara-Kum Canal, the world's longest desert waterway, which runs through Turkmenia, was frozen over for the first time in its history. We stood on its banks with their fringe of rust-colored rushes, we saw the irrigated fields, and we visited the collective and state farms that now produce an annual cotton crop of over a million tons.

The Marii Hydro-Electric Station, the biggest in Central Asia, is going up on the banks of the canal. Part of it is already in operation and produces 630,000 kw. When completed, the station will have a capacity of 1,370,000 kw. While we were there, an order came and the operator stepped up the load by 10,000 kw. The whole of Turkmenia was not making that much electricity in 1913.

The republic's oil and gas industry lies in the western area, near the shores of the Caspian Sea. On the road from Nebit-Dag to Kum-Dag we ran into a sandstorm so violent that we couldn't open the car door on the windward side and the oil rigs were actually bowed by the wind. Turkmenistan yields about 15 million tons of oil and one-fifth of the Soviet Union's output of gas.

In short, anyone revisiting the country after a break of half a century would have found very little that was at all familiar, except perhaps the tomb of Sultan Sanjar that has loomed over the desert for eight centuries. So in answer to the question, what has Soviet power given Turkmenistan, one can reply quite briefly and without any risk of exaggeration — everything you see around you. However, this implies big advances toward a new pattern of life and also new problems, new difficulties that cannot be solved without further dedicated work.

'Throughout the history of our republic,' C.S. Karriyev, Secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party's Central Committee, stated, 'the activity of the Soviets has been determined by the objectives placed before the country by the Communist Party. Its decisions constitute the political program of Soviet power, which is totally dedicated to serving the people's interests.'

How is this power actually exercised?

Elections

In the USSR there are more than 50,000 Soviets at the various levels, from the villages to the center. They have 2.2 million deputies. The first thing we investigated was how they are elected.

Since the first days of socialism it has been a principle, laid down in the electoral law of the country and faithfully observed, that all elections to the Soviets are to be held 'on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot.' (*Constitution of the USSR.*

Article 134). In Turkmenistan, as throughout the country, everyone who has reached the age of 18 has the right to vote, irrespective of race, nationality, sex, religious beliefs, social origin, property status or past activities. The law makes only two exceptions, for people who have been medically certified as insane and for those sentenced by a court of law to forfeiture of their electoral rights.

'You have come just when we are starting our preparations for the current elections to the local Soviets,' we were told by Ann-Mukhmed Klychev, President of the Presidium of Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet. 'Deputies to the Soviets hold office for two years and there will be new elections this summer.

'By preparations we mean making a preliminary summing up of the work done by the Soviet in its current term, so that people can see who of their deputies has come up to expectations and deserves to be nominated for another term, and who should not be. After every election the composition of the Soviets is usually renewed by 30 to 50 per cent. Preparing for the elections also means that the working people start setting up the election commissions; the next step is to nominate the candidates, then comes a careful checking of the electoral rolls so that every person can exercise his right to vote no matter where he may be on election day — on a long train journey, on some distant collective farm pasture, or in a prospector's tent in the middle of the desert. We make sure that everyone can cast his vote, but we see to it that no one casts two votes.'

One of our group was from the United States and another from Indonesia and this account reminded us of how the last presidential elections were held in the USA and how the preparations for the parliamentary elections in Indonesia in May are being conducted.

In a certain sense the United States and Indonesia are opposite poles in respect of bourgeois democracy. The U.S. ruling circles love to advertise their system as the world's freest society. On the other hand, the working people of the United States can certainly be proud of some solid democratic gains they have won in the course of stubborn class struggles. However, the enormous gap between promises and performance is the reality that inheres in the capitalist class nature of the American system. Whereas the regime in Indonesia states with brutal frankness that no communists, or even those that are suspected of communist sympathies, will be allowed to participate in the elections, the monopolies of the United States take a much more subtle line that suits them better. Democratic freedoms are acknowledged on paper but rarely practised. For example, the mechanics of the so-called two-stage electoral system created a situation in which only 53.3 per cent of the voters took part in the presidential elections of last year.

In our view an election campaign under Soviet conditions is conducted on fundamentally different lines. It is a powerful social movement. The masses do not merely 'participate,' they run the elections from beginning to end. The responsibility for conducting the elections is placed in the hands of the population.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR passes the election statute, but supervision of the ballot, deciding of controversial points, documentation, registration of candidates and counting of the votes, all fall within the competence of the central and local election commissions. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Turkmenistan approves the composition of the republic's Central Election Commission, but, like the local commissions, it has to be composed of 'representatives from the trade union organizations of factory, office and professional workers, from the cooperative organizations, the Communist Party organizations, and youth organizations, and from cultural, technical and scientific societies and other public organizations and societies of working people . . .'[1] During the last elections to Turkmenistan's local Soviets 90,000 people worked in the election commissions; of these 35.7 per cent were Communist Party members, and about 60 per cent factory workers and collective farmers. In the USSR, 1,400,000 people worked on the election commissions for the elections to the present Supreme Soviet, and 10,000,000 on the commissions for the elections to the local Soviets.

Another specific feature of the Soviet system is the selection or nomination of candidates for election, of those who are in future to express the people's will. Who, we asked, has the right to nominate candidates? And who does not have that right? The operating organs of state power, in the person of the previous elected Soviets, do not have the right. The right is granted to 'organizations and societies of working people: Communist Party organizations, trade unions, cooperatives, youth organizations and cultural societies.' (*Constitution of the USSR*. Article 141).

Bourgeois propaganda has been producing a good deal of falsehood distorting the Soviet electoral system. It is claimed, for example, that this system abolishes the right of the individual to present himself as a candidate for election, that the voting is a purely formal process because there is only one candidate to choose from, and so on. Such claims, unfortunately, are quite often taken at their face value.

What is the actual situation?

Yes, the practice is to nominate only one candiate for each electoral district. But now let us consider that practice a little more closely.

The candidate's nomination usually takes place at a general meeting, which is normally held among the people where the candidate works. Before this the party, trade union and Komsomol organiza-

tions have consulted the socially active members of the staff as to who is the best person to nominate. What criteria are used in this process and which are given priority?

'First of all,' M. Mollayeva, Central Committee Secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party, replied, 'comes the respect in which a person is held by the people with whom he or she works. Second, the candidate's organizing ability. Third, his work record. And fourth, his ability to cope with the job.'

And what about age, sex, social origin, party membership? None of these factors play a decisive part in any individual case. In general, they have to be taken into account, so that the body of deputies as a whole is representative of all sections and categories of the population.[2]

Now let us suppose we have named our candidate. Where is a person better known than at his or her place of work? A discussion begins. The candidate can be rejected. All that is needed is a straight majority of votes against him. We were told at Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet, in the Marii Region and in Nebit-Dag that this does happen sometimes. In such cases a new candidate is nominated; anyone taking part in the meeting may propose one and no restriction of individual rights is allowed. After this the rule operates that for official registration a person's candidacy must be supported by a majority vote at a meeting that numerically represents more than half the work force. In this way democracy and creative initiative are happily combined.

After all, what real value is there in the boast of the bourgeois press that in New York's Union Square or London's Hyde Park anybody can tell the world he wants a certain person elected to Congress or Parliament? Nobody has ever got into Congress or Parliament that way, or ever will. The cult of individualism, of 'individual liberties,' is persistently fostered because it serves not democracy but the division of the working-class masses, whereas their success depends on their unity and solidarity. Historical experience fully confirms this lesson, namely: collectivism is the essential and best foundation for the realization of individual civil rights and the common interests of the working people. Collectivism forms the bedrock of the Soviet system and it is natural that it plays a big part in elections.

After his official registration the candidate starts on his rounds of the voters. In the last elections to Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet over 600,000 people, or more than half of the voters, attended election meetings. Detailed reports of such meetings are printed in the press, which means that everybody is able to form an opinion of the candidate. The final result is that the voters rarely make mistakes.

This, too, can be proved by facts.

The point is that Soviet laws do not free a deputy to a Soviet from responsibility, from accountability to the voters after his or her election. And these voters, this constituency, are working people. This, in our view, is one of the most important features of socialist democracy. After all, to whom is the member of parliament in capitalist countries accountable? Nominally, of course, to constituencies who also are working people, but actually to the monopolies, corporations, party bosses and other elements of the ruling class. Besides, the legislation and procedure of some capitalist countries actually release the deputy of any direct responsibility to account to his constituents. In countries where communists are elected they value their ties with the masses because they are communists, but the capitalist parliamentarian is not bound to give a strict account of himself to his constituents.

Soviet law, on the other hand, is quite definite on this point: 'The deputy is responsible to his constituents and accountable to them.'[3] The voters may at any time recall a deputy who has not justified their trust.

In capitalist parliamentary practice, despite all the scandalous exposures and investigations, all the reports of backstage maneuvers, bribery and corruption among these elected 'representatives of the tax-payers,' the actual recall of a member of parliament is rare. Yet, in Turkmenistan we were told of several cases when the voters quite freely exercised their right to recall deputies. Last year, for example, three deputies were recalled from the Supreme Soviet of the Republic, and eight from the local Soviets. Official statistics for the country as a whole confirm that this practice is routine. In the past ten years over 4,000 deputies have been recalled from the local Soviets, about 100 from the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous republics, and since 1959, when the present procedure was introduced, eleven deputies have been recalled from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Among them were workers, collective-farm chairmen, and the secretary of a party regional committee, recalled for an improper attitude to their duties as deputies, a breach of state laws, or acting in contrast with the moral principles and norms of Soviet society.

Arithmetically these figures are not very significant. But their political meaning is what is significant. It is a good thing when a mistake can be rectified; and even better when such mistakes are rare.

The deputies

'Who's next, please?'

People come and go. Only we, who have asked special permission, sit on one side, watching Deputy Kuliyeva, of the Ashkhabad City Soviet, receiving her visitors.

In our travels through Turkmenia we could not help noticing that women hold posts on an equal footing with the men in government bodies, cultural institutions and management of the economy. In the republic's Supreme Soviet 35.3 per cent of the deputies are women and eight out of ten of these women are Turkmen. This is impressive not only because in our own countries women still have a long way to go in achieving equality (there are only 18 women among 535 members of the United States Congress, for instance, and in the Indonesian parliament, less than five per cent.)

The other striking fact is that this true equality is to be found here, in Central Asia, where only 60 years ago law and custom scarcely granted women the status of human being, let alone human rights. We heard about a Turkmen woman who was daring enough to be one of the first to take off the parandja, the horsehair veil. Her daughter now recalls what a storm of prejudice she had to endure. The daughter is now a secretary of the Central Committee of the Turkmen Communist Party.

In the Marii Region we met Gyzylgul Annamukhamedova, formerly a teacher and now a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and chairman of the 'Communism' collective farm. She became chairman in 1950 as a widow with two children on her hands, having lost her husband during the war. And she succeeded both in bringing up her sons and making a go of the farm. We visited this flourishing collective enterprise, which brings in an income of five million rubles a year. We saw the big village school where one of Annamukhamedova's sons teaches, and we also saw the memorial that the members of the farm had put up. It was wrapped in green cloth that flapped in the winter wind, but in spring it will be unveiled. On Victory Day, May 9th, the village will pay tribute to the memory of its people who died on the battlefields of World War II. Of the 300 men who went to the war from the village, 160 never returned.

We should like to pay homage, on the pages of this magazine, to our distant friends, to their national heroes, to the warriors and builders of socialism, to their splendid women.

At the city Soviet visitors were still coming. We took detailed notes on who came to see the deputy and what about, between the hours of 16.30 and 18.00 on Wednesday, February 2: a housewife, member of the factory trade union committee, head doctor of health center, librarian, and a representative of the Tashkent Agricultural Machinery factory. The matters discussed were the repairing of ditches destroyed by a mud flow, the allotting of a recreation zone for the factory, the provision of housing for doctors, the organization of hobby circles at the children's library, and the taking of orders by a

dress-making establishment at people's place of work. All quite ordinary, everyday matters, but important nevertheless.

Every request and application was officially recorded. Deputy Kuliyeva promptly picked up the telephone and got in touch with the right people, then arranged with her visitors when they should contact her again. She made no extravagant promises, but all the promises she did make, and those of the authorities she contacted, were noted down for checking in future.

Receiving visitors regularly is only one of a deputy's duties. He or she is also bound to keep up correspondence and hold periodical meetings with constituents and report back to them. The deputy has to check up on the work of the factories and institutions in his area, study public opinion and current needs and cope with many other tasks, not to mention the work in the Soviet itself.

We met and talked to deputies at nearly all levels. In the village of Gyami, near Ashkhabad, we were invited to the home of A. Meredova, a schoolteacher and deputy of the village Soviet, and her sister S. Meredova, a collective farmer and deputy of the District Soviet. In Nebit-Dag we were the guests of S. Klychev, chief surgeon of the hospital, and E.P. Mulyavko, an oil rig operator, both deputies of the City Soviet. In the town of Marii we met the chairman of the executive committee of the Regional Soviet, Annayev and his colleagues. It was clear: the higher the 'rank' of the Soviet, the more concerns it has.

We learned more about the duties of a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy from Yekaterina Shchekuteva, a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Krasnaya Presnya Electoral District of Moscow. She holds a title of Merited School Teacher of the Russian Federation and now is a physics teacher. She is not a party member. In the past she worked as a machine operator on a collective farm and technical inspector at a factory.

A deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet, she told us, must study, among other things, quite a few draft laws, data on nominees for government posts with due regard to the situation in his or her particular district, and listen to the advice of experts and constituents on these matters. More, it is common practice that a Supreme Soviet deputy attends sessions of Soviets at lower levels in order to be in the picture as regards the day-to-day work of local government bodies on the territory whose interests the deputy represents in the supreme body of government.

When asked how much time she spent performing her duties as deputy and teacher, she said it was roughly 'half and half.' Her annual mail brings hundreds of letters, all of them to be answered. Also there are hundreds of visitors. This is nothing out of the ordinary. Contacts

maintained by all the deputies are very numerous. Here are only a few general figures. In the 1971-75 period the USSR Supreme Soviet was visited by more than 100,000 people and received one million letters. Not all the applicants had justified complaints, but the fact that the response to 40 per cent of the applications was favorable was evidence of a thoughtful approach.

In addition to that, deputies must always keep in mind the electors' mandates. We must explain this, for in capitalist society there is nothing like the Soviet Union's institution of mandates.

Strictly speaking, it is not a deputy but a candidate for the office of deputy who receives mandates from the electorate. Mandates are not current applications, like those we heard about during the reception of local residents. A 'mandate portfolio' is made up of collectively approved suggestions formulated a pre-election meetings. By the time the candidate becomes a deputy, the portfolio is full, and there will be a new one when the next elections come around. So, the proposals it contains are to be carried out before that date.

It is the custom to consider the mandates right at the first session of the Soviet, said D. Shahnazarov, Executive Committee Chairman at the Nebit-Dag Soviet. The mandates received by one or another deputy are compared, grouped and combined for execution by a Soviet. Some of them are rejected when found impracticable under the circumstances. The motives for such a decision, rare as it may be, are openly explained to the electorate. Of the 850,000 mandates forwarded to USSR local government bodies of the previous convocation, 822,000 were accepted, and 742,000, or 87.7 per cent, were carried out in due course. The local Soviets of Turkmenistan received 2,880 mandates, and 2,077 have already been carried out. The Ashkhabad City Soviet received 44 mandates, of which 37 were carried out before a quarter of the term expired.

Are there any representative bodies of bourgeois power that can say they fulfill 90 per cent of the obligations assumed?

Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Shchekuteva has 14 mandates. What are they about? A new supply center for school dining rooms opened in 1975; an outpatient clinic is being built, but the construction of a district House of Culture has yet to get off to a start.

There is no point in glossing over things. Nothing can be done too easily under any social systems. It takes work, including work by deputies.

In short, Soviet deputies have great responsibilities. Also, their rights and conditions for normal work are guaranteed.

The work of a deputy or, in the case of a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR or one of its constituent republics, a parliamenta-

rian, is never a source of profit under socialism. Deputies are not paid for their work. The state compensates only their correspondence costs, and the like. While performing parliamentary duties they are temporarily relieved of their regular work (but are paid an average remuneration). Transportation is free for them and they enjoy priority rights at cultural and service establishments. Deputies are also given powers to exercise direct control of the processing of matters they are interested in and be present at all pertinent hearings. Administrators and officials must receive a deputy without delay. Deputies to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the republics also have the right to propose legislation and to address requests to the government. Lastly, they enjoy legal immunity, which means that no deputy can be arrested, tried, fired or demoted without the consent of the Soviet concerned.

Sessions

Officially, Turkmenistan's capital, Ashkhabad, is about a hundred years old, but its actual age is slightly over 28 years: late at night on October 5, 1948, the city was hit by a disastrous earthquake. In a documentary we were shown we saw smouldering ruins and people in grief. When this event was recalled in a talk at the office of A.M. Klychyov, President of the Presidium of Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet, one of those present made a warning gesture asking us, as it were, to switch the conversation. In those tragic days Klychyov lost his two children. He was Chairman of the City Soviet when Ashkhabad was being rehabilitated.

As people said during the Tashkent earthquake in 1966, the Soviet republics in Central Asia live 'on the back of a frenzied camel,' In the recent period shocks in Ashkhabad sometimes reached six to seven points on the Richter scale. But, except for a few broken windows, they did no harm.

Houses in new Ashkhabad look solid and beautiful. S. Saparov, who is Chairman of the City Soviet today, showed us the new streets, city gardens and houses. For the construction of one of those houses — the republican library — he and his two colleagues were awarded a State Prize. In Saparov's office, with construction diagrams and plans on the walls, we were told that since the 1948 earthquake the city population had increased 130 per cent, the residential area had grown 5.4-fold and industrial output shot up 380 per cent.

What is the role of the City Soviet in this effort?

The week before our visit the Executive Council of the Soviet was reviewing the builders' preparedness to start the next stage of city construction according to plan. Some criticism was addressed to the Ministry of Construction, which had worked according to a 'total

construction' scheme, while the selective method, that is, construction by districts, was more in the interests of the city. And measures were taken in response to the criticism addressed by the builders to the city authorities.

Our talk at the Ashkhabad City Soviet was frank and friendly. We were told about the city's needs and the problems they have not yet been able to cope with. They told us, for example, that there is still a waiting list for new, modern flats because building organizations are not yet up to strength. But everybody knows where he stands on that list and priority is given to those in special need, people with big families, the disabled, war veterans and also to workers with a distinguished labor record.

Twice during our trip we were able to observe the work of the Soviets actually in progress. In our presence the executive committee of an Ashkhabad district Soviet discussed the preparations for the spring sowing at the Makhtum-Kuli collective farm, and the executive committee of the Nebit-Dag City Soviet reviewed the work of the public libraries. In both cases the discussion was businesslike and critical and at the same time there was an atmosphere of goodwill and concern for people's welfare. The decisions taken while we were there included a recommendation that 28 of the citizens of Nebit-Dag should be awarded the Veteran of Labor medal. The executive committee also considered an application from a young woman, A. Rajapova, requesting to be appointed guardian of her younger sisters and brothers, who had recently become orphans; the request was granted and in addition the executive committee offered material assistance and care for the family's future. The Soviet would immediately apply for the young woman's husband to be recalled from army service to help look after them.

While we were in Nebit-Dag there was also a general meeting of the Soviet, its ninth session. We received a cordial invitation to attend.

The subject under discussion was city transport. During our tour of the city we had not gained the impression that transport was a problem. Nebit-Dag is a young city (this year it will celebrate its 30th birthday). It is not very large and has been built according to a definite plan. You can see all the way down its straight, incredibly clean streets to the mountains at one end or the desert at the other. The whole transport fleet consists of 300 buses and some taxis. So where's the problem? Our impression was confirmed by the opening report, which mentioned that the transport workers had been awarded a diploma by the Party Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers.

But perhaps our judgment was based on a knowledge of transport problems in cities far from Turkmenistan. Anyway, the Nebit-Dag

people were not interested in outside standards. Their criticism was levelled against what they considered unsatisfactory in their own conditions. The deputies' investigating commission presented its report to the Soviet and this was followed by a lively debate. Obviously the deputies had a good knowledge of the system. They had studied traffic flows and talked to their constituents and the municipal authorities. The session passed a characteristic decision, giving credit where credit was due, pointing out some specific shortcomings and stating who would be responsible for rectifying them, how long he had for doing so, and who would check on the final result.

There were also several procedural points that indicated the way the Soviet tackles its duties. For instance, there was the fact that nearly all the deputies (200 out of 230) were present from beginning to end of the session. There was the sense of confidence with which they demanded answers to their questions. There was the fact that these answers, given by the city administrators, were always serious and well-reasoned. Even so, the chairman stated quite emphatically at the end of the debate, 'We request the deputies' transport commission to consider once again whether the answers given at this session are satisfactory and report on this to the next session.'

In the local Soviets all over Turkmenistan, we were told, 2,210 such sessions were held last year. More than half the deputies spoke and 4,500 questions were discussed. From statistics we were able to judge which problems most of the Soviets have been concentrating on. Top priority is given to agriculture, land-usage, and protection of the environment; second come planning and budgetary matters; and third, questions of public education and culture. Other subjects were checking on the observance of socialist laws and the maintenance of public order, health and social security problems, public catering and provision of everyday amenities. In fact, there is hardly a single aspect of life that does not warrant their attention.

We realized how unfounded are the claims of some 'Sovietologists' that socialism leads to over-centralization, that the local government bodies depend entirely on the center and cannot take any decisions on the vital problems of their area. The facts we have cited here surely indicate the opposite — the local Soviets are firmly in control of both political and economic affairs in their districts. They have full powers to make practical decisions on all questions concerning the conditions of the life, work, amenities and cultural activities of the population. They have a good deal of scope for showing initiative and doing real creative work, and also the legal and material means for putting their decisions into practice.

Naturally there are clear limits to the competence of the Soviets because the interests of separate regions have to be coordinated with

those of the country as a whole. But even in cases when the problems extend beyond the competence of a given Soviet, the Soviet is by no means helpless.

As an example, we were told of a case from the history of the Kara-Kum Canal. After covering a thousand kilometers across the hot desert, it reached Ashkhabad and spread out in a large reservoir, where the local people go sailing. But then a tricky dilemma arose.

What should be the next step? Should the digging be continued without any break along the main route and the Caspian Sea or should the builders call a temporary halt and concentrate on land reclamation along the part of the canal that had been completed? Opinions differed. The USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources in Moscow, for instance, was in favor of the second alternative in view of its economic advantages. Their idea was that after an advance there should be consolidation, then a further advance. And they had good grounds for their argument.

But there were other considerations as well, and in Turkmenistan they predominated. What is water? A fluid used in farming and industry? Certainly. But it is also the 'moisture of life' in any broader sense. Where the canal had been built, we saw better what water means. It means tree-lined streets and the dew sung by poets, it means fishing and swimming, beaches and even life-savers, for they, too, became a necessity in Turkmenistan.

In Nebit-Dag and Qum Dagh, we saw how eagerly people were waiting for what they call the 'big water.' But its advance is outside the competence of the town Soviet. The canal is a national project the republic cannot build without help. Accordingly, the Turkmen government and Supreme Soviet took the matter to Union agencies, to ministries and the central government, to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Speaking at its latest session, B. Burashnikov, first deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers in Turkmenistan, described the project as one of immense significance, both economic and social. This view prevailed in the end. The tenth five-year plan provides for the continuation of work on the Kara-Kum Canal project. It will be extended by more than 200 kilometres, making the canal 1,100 km. long.

There are no 'gaps' between Soviets, such as could hinder discussion and solution of the complicated problems that life poses unstintingly. From top to bottom, the Soviets make up one system of government bodies. Its lower echelons vigorously support and help to carry out decisions made in higher echelons. They also work out and send in their own proposals, which the Soviets higher up carefully examine. Interaction takes place with strict respect for the sovereign rights of the Union republics and with due regard to the distinctive

aspects of local conditions and to the extended rights and powers of local Soviets. The extension came when, between 1968 and 1971, new laws on village, settlement, town and district Soviets were passed in all Union and Autonomous Republics. The 25th CPSU Congress stressed that the effort must be continued by bringing the jurisdiction of the Soviets at the next level — Territory, Region and Area — into line with present-day requirements. We understand that a special commission of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR is now working on this.

The Soviets carry on their activities in the full view and with the participation of the deputies and the general public. Their links are so varied and ramified that we admit it took us some time to form a clear picture. Indeed, the deputies are distributed among standing commissions, which have a large body of voluntary assistants (known by the collective name of *aktiv*) in the fields concerned. The Ashkhabad City Council, for example, has an *aktiv* of 1,000 people, or almost three times the number of deputies. Nor is this all. The Soviets' executive committees have a number of other voluntary organizations and committees. They include parents' committees, councils for work among women, people's public order squads, youth counselors and committees supervising observance of legislation on religion. The whole of Turkmenistan has about 23,000 people active in organizations of this nature, and about 200,000 inhabitants belong to the *aktivs* of Soviets.

As we got to know more about the activities of the Soviets, as we talked with deputies, activists and party leaders, we also gained an idea of the problems, the as yet unsolved difficulties that arise in the course of the practical functioning of the system of people's government in the USSR. This was only to be expected. We were studying not some Utopian system where everything was supposed to be perfect from the start and needed no further development. What we were studying was the practical participation of the masses in governing the country. Such participation implies real creativity on the part of the masses and, like any historical process, it is in a state of constant development and change. Of far greater importance, from our point of view, is the nature of these difficulties and problems. In contrast to the situation in the capitalist world they don't have to be solved by stripping down the whole political system and building it anew. The way these problems have to be tackled is through making even fuller use of the latent possibilities of the system, perfecting each part of the mechanism, which is built on principles that have proved their worth in practice. And this is exactly how the CPSU tackles them.

Furthermore, the Soviets do not operate in a vacuum. They closely

interact with the biggest non-governmental organizations — party, trade union, youth, scientific, technological, cultural and educational. While this article was in preparation some highly relevant data appeared in the Soviet press. Through the system of Soviets and public organizations, 2 million deputies and 30 million voluntary activists take part in deciding public and state affairs. But this is not all. Participating in the process there are also 9.5 million voluntary inspectors, 113 million trade union members and more than 35 million Komsomol members. This great mass of people is united by the Communist Party, which itself has a membership of 16 million. (*Pravda*, March 18, 1977). The activity of these millions of people form a living close-knit fabric of socialist democracy. When you have discovered that, you realize better than ever that Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, had every reason to say not long ago that in practice the whole Soviet state is administered from top to bottom with the participation of the masses.

The commissions

From Turkmenistan our route led to Moscow and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The Supreme Soviet, which consists of two chambers: the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, sits twice a year and the Soviet state flag flies above the Grand Kremlin Palace during sessions. Their proceedings are widely reported in the USSR and abroad. We are told that the Supreme Soviet had never deliberated behind closed doors. The impressive Georgievsky, Vladimirsky, Green and Red Halls are open to representatives of the Soviet public and to foreign diplomats and newsmen. There are live radio and television broadcasts of the sessions. A deputy is shown a transcript of his speech only about ten minutes after delivering it, and the transcript is printed in the current issue of a daily bulletin. A full report of the proceeding is published soon after the session.

The public closely follows the sessions because they pass laws, approve economic plans, hear reports on their fulfillment and discuss major problems. Much less is known, especially abroad, about the activity of the Supreme Soviet in between sessions.

The capitalist press, with its shrill propaganda campaigns against the socialist way of life, alleges, for example, that except for a few days a year, the Supreme Soviet is permanently 'on holiday' and that the deputies lack 'professional qualifications' because they only work, perform their parliamentary duties, from time to time.

What is meant here, by 'work' and 'professionalism'? Professionally, the deputies to the Supreme Soviet are workers, farmers, engineers, people active in the cultural sphere, doctors, teachers, scien-

tists, economic managers, political leaders — in short, they represent every field of activity. But this is precisely why the Supreme Soviet deals with every problem in the presence of and with the participation of people whose experience and prestige in the given field are universally recognized. Let us see what is done in between sessions.

First of all there is the work of the standing commissions which we described briefly in our account of the local Soviets.

We do not expect the commissions and sub-commissions to be seen as a Soviet invention. These are forms used in numerous countries belongong to different social systems. But while these agencies are similar in form, they differ strikingly in content. The Library of the U.S. Congress has published a report saying that in 1975, over half of the 138 Congress committees held only four or even fewer meetings each and 28 did not meet at all. Senator Dale Bumpers, who had asked for the report, was certainly right when he called these data a further indication of the low efficiency of Congress.

In the Soviet Union, the standing commissions have been set up 'to contribute to the continuous and effective functioning of the USSR Supreme Soviet during and between sessions' as the Statute puts it. Their leverage is growing. And while all the commissions of the first Supreme Soviet comprised 89 deputies, those of the second and fifth numbered 114 and 258 respectively and now they comprise 1,000, or two-thirds of the total number of deputies.

The commissions are empowered to supervise the exercise of executive authority[4] and they make wide use of this right. The planning and budget commissions, for instance, carefully examine, together with representatives of the industrial commissions concerned, draft budgets submitted to the Supreme Soviet, as well as draft economic plans, including five-year ones. Before the latest session (October 1976), which approved the tenth five-year plan, the commissions worked on the draft for a month and the work involved 600 deputies, or more than one-third of all deputies. In addition to the draft plan, they discussed 147 reports from ministries, departments and Union republics.

Commissions participate directly in legislation. We were enabled to acquaint ourselves with this activity by studying official records. As an illustration, we have chosen the discussion on basic legislation on underground resources, the latest of the USSR Supreme Soviet's protection of the environment laws. Here are some episodes from that discussion.

The experts' sub-commission includes noted scientists, managers, lawyers, economists, production organizers. We quote from the minutes:

'V. Fedanov: The previous meeting entrusted Comrades Pan-

kratov, Zhabrev, Kaverin and myself with ascertaining whether we need a paragraph defining the state fund of underground resources as a whole. We consider it necessary. Legislation on land and water, for instance, defines not only the state fund as a whole, but also its components. We suggest that the paragraph be worded as follows (he reads the text).

'A. Sergeyev: I have been against such a paragraph from the first because it is absolutely impossible to define the state of underground resources. To talk about the "increase" or "expenditure" of such resources means nothing. Not so in the case of minerals. But then we risk mixing up concepts.

'I. Baigulenko: I don't think we need that paragraph.

'I. Zhabrev: Whether we like it or not, we cannot get away from defining in law what we mean by "underground resources." Look at what people propose — half of it is about that. It follows that we need a definition.

'L. Melnikov (chairman): I suggest that we vote. Those in favor of the paragraph, please raise your hands. Nine. Who is against? Ten. Motion rejected.'

Episode two is borrowed from the debate on the same bill in a joint drafting commission of Supreme Soviet deputies.

'I. Voronin: The draft speaks of prohibiting "unjustified selective working of rich deposits." This is an unfortunate wording.

'V. Stepanov: "Unjustified" should be crossed out. "Justification" can always be found.

'I. Voronin: Last year five million tons of ore had to be written off at a mine near where I work, as a result of selective working. The law on mineral resources is meant to protect them. Leaving in a word like that could spoil everything.

'S. Ibrahimov (chairman): Any suggestions?

'N. Chersky: We should agree with Comrade Voronin.

S. Ibrahimov: So we take out the word "unjustified."

However, the next meeting had to return to the amendment.

'L. Melnikov: There are many cases in which rich areas are allowed to be worked selectively. In Canada we saw huge piles of lean ore near a mine. They use ore with a one per cent copper content and there is a reserve pile with a 0.3 to 0.4 per cent metal content.

'I. Voronin: I still disagree and will raise the question at the session . . ."[5]

The above calls for some explanation.

The Basic Legislation on Mineral Resources bill was submitted by the government and won unanimous approval. Three amendments were moved by deputies during the debate but only one was approved. Anyone who thinks this is too little should compare the texts

of the law and the bill (incidentally, the bill was published and was open to public discussion for four months). He would find identical texts in the case of only one article (Art. 50 of the law); everything else is different — there are different structural solutions, new wordings and a number of additional articles.

Perhaps the bill was not properly worded? No, its basic provisions were approved at every framing stage. This also goes for the Basic Legislation on Education, but there were 43 amendments and nine new articles, the Basic Legislation on Public Health, in which 46 of the 55 articles were amended, and the Basic Legislation on Land — three new articles were added and a number of others redrafted. That is a regular procedure: the law on underground resources was examined paragraph by paragraph, some parts even word by word, before it was put into final shape.

In the Supreme Soviet archives there are red files marked 'permanent,' containing thousands of typescript pages, a record of the hundreds of meetings of the standing commissions of the two chambers, the joint preparatory commission, expert subcommissions, drafting groups, ad hoc sub-groups on various problems, etc. Day after day, the Supreme Soviet receives reports from Union republics, ministries, research centers, industrial enterprises, and analyzes press comments and letters from the public. There appeared to be more than 1,500 letters.

Geological engineer A. Kostikov sent in proposals from Krivoi Rog direct to the Supreme Soviet and they were carefully considered. K. Urazayeva, an Uzbek student, wrote to the newspaper *Izvestia*. The ideas in her letter were reflected in the Law. It was probably a pleasant surprise for A. Teryayaev, chief engineer of a mine in Armenia, to read the final version of Clause 32 containing a whole paragraph exactly as he had suggested in a local newspaper.

Such cases were by no means just the lucky ones. We could mention many more. Anything that was practical and worthwhile was accepted; only the unworkable was rejected.

There is a debate at every framing stage. We have mentioned the case of the experts' subcommission rejecting, by a majority of one, a proposed amendment to the underground resources bill. But the amendment was accepted just the same — the deputies overruled the experts. I. Voronin, director of the Ust-Kemenogorsk lead and zinc combine, did not have to speak at a Supreme Soviet session (as he had said he would at the concluding meeting of the preparatory commission) about the word 'unjustified,' because his view had prevailed in the meantime.

What we find really interesting is certainly not the allegations of certain authors who say there is 'no free exchange of views' in the

Supreme Soviet, but something entirely different. Why do such debates persist? What causes them? In a socialist society there are no antagonistic contradictions or hostile classes and groups, no clash, as under capitalism, between the people's interest in thrifty utilization of the country's mineral wealth and its wasteful exploitation by monopoly. Why, then, all the argument over a single word?

L. Melnikov, Chairman of the experts subcommission, had an interesting answer. He is a veteran of seven terms in the Supreme Soviet and a veteran, also, of many of its debates. He said he did not always get his view accepted — after all, no set of arguments is so strong it cannot be corrected and improved by another.

This, like the earlier case of elections, shows that the urge to achieve unanimity is an essential feature of socialist democracy, a qualitatively new feature that distinguishes it from capitalist democracy. Some Western commentators seek 'glimpses of freedom' under socialism only in opposing voices, if only just one deputy would disagree with something, they say.

We have an instance of this. Just before the Basic Legislation on the Family and Matrimony was put to the vote in the Supreme Soviet, V.I. Simukonene, a Lithuanian deputy (a teacher), unexpectedly moved four amendments. Nothing could have been easier than just to hear the amendments and go straight ahead with the vote. The majority was in favor of the bill and it was certain to be approved. But what about those few lost votes — how much they would mean to the apostles of 'freedom' by registering an 'opposition'?

The session chose a different approach that also required greater effort. The vote was put off for 24 hours and the commission concerned weighed the proposed amendments on their merits regardless of the fact that they came from one deputy. The commission recommended that two of the amendments be included in the all-Union law and the other two, which were of a more particular nature, be referred to the Union republics. So unanimity prevailed once again, and it is a more popular law because of it.

We see a key achievement and advantage of socialist democracy in the fact that the political system of Soviet society allows to achieve unanimity which encompasses all opinions, even those backed by the few, and that a mechanism has been devised that enables people to come to terms without pushing anybody aside as 'opposition.'

The Presidium

In the three hours we spent with M.P. Georgadze, Secretary of the Presidium, Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Kremlin changed its appearance three times. In the morning, its golden domes thrust into a limpid spring sky, then we saw curly summer clouds floating in the

blue, and lastly a snowstorm swept across the city. We wondered what the Kremlin had looked like when our interlocutor first came to Moscow. M. Georgadze had been a member of the Presidium for 20 years now. As a young man he was a tractor-driver in the Caucasus and when he first came to Moscow with some of his countrymen they went straight to the Red Square to see the Kremlin. 'We even took a taxi for the purpose. And then we saw it. I'd never have thought I was going to work there some day.'

In the Soviet Union the state is headed by a collective body, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Its numerical composition is stipulated by the Constitution and guarantees representation of all the Union republics and main population groups. The Presidents of the Supreme Soviet Presidiums of the Union republics are elected by tradition to be Vice-Presidents of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The present membership includes L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU; V.V. Nikolayeva-Tereshkova, the first woman cosmonaut; N.A. Novosyolova, a milling-machine operator at the Urals motor works; Rasul Gamzatov, the Daghestan poet; Academician I.I. Artobolevsky, and A.V. Gitalov, a collective-farm team leader from the Ukraine.

The Presidium is elected by and from deputies to the Supreme Soviet, to which it is accountable. The Constitution chapter on the highest government bodies describes the Presidium as a component of the Supreme Soviet and an agency ensuring the latter's continuous functioning.

In the Presidium room, around the conference table, there are chairs for 36 members of the Presidium. One of them is for Nikolai Podgorny, President of the Presidium, and along both sides of the room there are seats for invited members of the public. Most of their meetings are held in open session.

'The last session,' Georgadze told us, 'was held only two days ago. You may have read about it in the papers. We were discussing problems of the procedure for dealing with letters sent to state organizations by members of the public. On another point in the agenda proposals were made for amending existing legislation. The Presidium also discussed the question of drafting the fundamentals of forestry legislation, and passed a decision to publish the draft for public discussion and put it before the next session of the Supreme Soviet. And as part of our usual practice we heard and discussed reports on the work of two standing commissions of deputies.'

Between sessions, the Presidium takes decisions on important administrative, economic, social, cultural and foreign policy matters. It sets the dates of elections to the Supreme Soviet, convenes regular sessions, coordinates the work of the two chambers and standing

commissions, keeps in touch with the deputies and supervises execution of the Acts approved by the Supreme Soviet. It assigns an important place to steps aimed at promoting socialist legality and protecting citizens' rights. Its prerogatives include the awarding of orders, medals and honorary titles.

Presidium meetings concern themselves with key problems. As for everyday matters, these are settled by polling the Presidium members. Each Presidium member has two weeks to study the documents and hold the requisite consultations, and then he must give his opinion — pro or con — in writing. A document is approved only when all Presidium members agree; when there are objections the matter is referred to a meeting. And there is a hot line for deciding urgent matters.

M. Georgadze informed us in detail about the everyday work of the Presidium. We had no difficulty in discerning standards designed to maintain democracy in collective decision-making and ensure that decisions are adopted unanimously.

In conclusion, we were interested to hear about the relationship and interaction between the Soviets and the Communist Party, between party organizations and deputies.

'Our party does much to advance socialist democracy and perfect the functioning of Soviets,' the Presidium Secretary told us. 'The 25th Party Congress made an important contribution in this respect. In drafting the new Soviet constitution we follow the strategy evolved by the Congress. Congress recommendations are at the basis of our work on a code of laws and on a new Statute of Territory, Region and Area Soviets.

'Being an ideological and political force of society, the party influences the work of Soviets accordingly, and not by issuing "instructions" or interfering. Local Soviets get constant attention and help from the party organization. Communists collectively discuss such matters of fundamental importance to the work of Soviets as Leninist working methods, full exercise of rights and powers, control over the execution of decisions, more efficient work by the deputies. The party group of a Soviet is generally led by the first secretary of the party committee of the district, city, region or republic concerned. According to tradition, communist deputies render account to their constituencies and fellow-communists.'

On our way from the Kremlin, we felt that we had investigated all essential components of the USSR's governmental system. We had satisfied ourselves that workers and peasants hold the majority of seats and have a decisive say in government bodies. We realize, of course, that to be elected to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the country is an honor that is not granted to many. However, all

elected government bodies, which make one system, function according to one and the same set of laws. Those who take part in their activities know by experience and see in their everyday lives that the purpose of these activities is the people's well-being.

Democracy is passing through a deep crisis in the countries where the communist parties we represent are operating, that is, in the capitalist part of the world. Political struggles in bourgeois conditions reveal the tremendous effort which has to be made to safeguard democratic rights and freedoms, the high cost of every legislative office and the numerous obstacles to a people's representative winning office. The capitalist press more and more often admits such realities as the people's dwindling confidence, the limited role of elected bodies, the curtailment of legislative functions in favor of executive authority. These alarming signs are growing.

What we have seen in our study of the Soviets indicates that the future of democracy lies in the transfer of power to the working people, in the transition to socialism. This happened for the first time 60 years ago. The Soviets have travelled a long way since then, they have developed and now they show their strength. Their activity fully confirms Lenin's definition of what the Soviets stand for: 'It was an authority open to all, it carried out all its functions before the eyes of the masses, and was a direct and immediate instrument of the popular masses, of their will' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 10, p. 245). The system of people's rule confidently follows its own traditions and development laws. It has gained invaluable experience, the results and advantages of which are available to all.

1. Legislation on Elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic, Ashkhabad, 1975, p. 36.

2. The local Soviets in Turkmenistan are composed of 21,118 deputies. Of them, 68.2 per cent are workers and collective farmers; 77.5 per cent are Turkmen; 43 per cent are candidate members or members of the CPSU; 44.8 per cent are women (among them 73 per cent are Turkmen women); 32.4 per cent are young people under 30.

3. 'Law On the Status of Deputies of the Soviet of Working People's Deputies in the USSR,' Article 6.

4. 'The standing commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities shall be entitled to hear reports on matters under their jurisdiction by representatives of the Government of the USSR, ministries, USSR departments and other all-Union agencies, as well as by representatives and republican and local government bodies and organizations.' When asked by a commission, leaders of any rank 'shall appear at commission meetings to testify on the matters under discussion.' 'The recommendations of a standing commission shall be considered by government agencies and organizations without fail. The results of the consideration or the measures adopted shall be communicated to the commission within two months at the latest.' (Statute of the Standing Commission of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR, Moscow, 1974, Art. 21 and 23).

5. 'A standing commission member whose proposals have failed to win the support of the commission may uphold them during the discussion of the relevant item by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR or its Presidium.' (Statute of the Standing Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Art. 26).

Illusions of bourgeois reformism in developing countries

Iradj Eskandari
First Secretary, CC,
People's Party of Iran

The immediate aim of every anti-colonial revolution and of every national-liberation movement — irrespective of the methods it has chosen and of the development stage of the embattled people — is the winning of national sovereignty, i.e., wresting political power from the imperialists. But the winning of political power does not cover the entire concept of national independence. A no less important aspect is economic emancipation, i.e., using all the natural resources and productive forces to benefit the people, not foreign capital. That both these aspects of national independence (the political and the economic) are inseparable, is widely recognized in developing countries. For in this day and age, political imperialist domination is exercised mainly through neo-colonialist economic penetration.

In many liberated countries state sovereignty has not prevented imperialist neo-colonialist exploitation of a large, in some cases the main, part of their natural and manpower resources. For the developed capitalist countries their former colonies and semi-colonies are still a source of cheap mineral and agricultural raw materials. Up to 60-80 per cent of the exports of many Afro-Asian and Latin American countries consist of two or three products, in some cases only one. Their economic development is dependent on the capitalist market and subject to its fluctuations and laws, which seriously impede, if not altogether block, efforts to overcome backwardness. How this works can be seen in the price changes in trade between developed capitalist and developing countries which, more often than not, are to the disadvantage of the latter.[1]

That is why the wide economic-level gap is becoming wider still. In

1953 the ratio between average per-capita income was 8:8, in 1973 it was 1:16. The developing countries account for about 15 per cent of the capitalist world's output and for no more than 18 per cent of its foreign trade. Their constantly increasing indebtedness to the capitalist West, which now stands at $160-170 billion, and their foreign trade deficit (with the exception of the oil-exporting countries) added up to more than $51 billion in 1975. The multinational monopolies are draining out huge sums from the developing countries — net profits in 1973-75 were in excess of $23 billion.

The social results of imperialist exploitation are even more staggering. The World Bank estimates that more than 800 million in Asia, Africa and Latin America live in abject poverty, and according to the International Labor Bureau, in 1975 there were 280 million unemployed, or about 30 per cent of the able-bodied population.

We Marxists are convinced that economic emancipation is inconceivable without fundamental internal change to remove the main obstacles to expansion of the productive forces and thus create the groundwork for all-round development of the national economy and narrow the gap between developing and developed industrial countries. However, these much-needed changes encounter resistance from imperialism and from the conservative forces at home. The choice of the capitalist or the socialist path is determined by the balance of strength between these forces and those working for genuine social, economic and political progress. And though the struggle is far from complete in many of the emergent states, more and more of them are opting for the socialist orientation. It is only logical that imperialism, with a vital interest in hardening their social and economic backwardness and dependence, should do everything it can to contain or reverse the trend.

The international situation today is such that the imperialist powers cannot, as easily as in the past, use outright coercion to keep developing countries within their orbit. That is why along with neo-colonialist methods of economic penetration, they rely on the 'export' of reactionary economic, political and social concepts based on the supposed 'benefits' of capitalism, its growth potential, 'free enterprise,' 'consumer society,' etc. And this goes hand in hand with intensive anti-communist propaganda, the spread of all manner of lies about the economic and social position in the socialist countries, flagrant anti-Soviet slander, biased interpretation of developments in the international workers' and national-liberation movement.

Reformism is a key ideological weapon in these attempts to prevent the developing countries from choosing the correct path. The bourgeoisie, it will be recalled, brought reformism into the labor movement of the capitalist countries to emasculate its revolutionary

content and 'reconcile' it with capitalism. Now the imperialists are systematically using it also in the developing countries, where the working-class movement is very young, in some cases still in the embryonic stage. The main purpose of reformism here is not so much to prevent, or even soft-pedal, the development of working-class political activity (though that aim is also pursued), as to compel the national-liberation movement to abandon its revolutionary anti-imperialist course in favor of 'cooperation' with imperialism and to accept the capitalist orientation.

This 'adaptation' of reformism to the national-liberation movement is not new, of course. More than half a century ago, Lenin pointed to the difference between reformist and revolutionary trends in colonial and dependent countries. And this difference, he said in his report to the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, 'has been very clearly revealed of late in the backward and colonial countries, since the imperialist bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to implant the reformist movement among the oppressed nations too' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 242).

Of course, the collapse of the colonial system compelled the imperialists to make the necessary alterations in the methods of disseminating reformist ideas in the newly-liberated countries. In the past, the main method was direct use of colonial power and the organizations that serve it. Now the imperialists have to operate through 'middlemen.' And they are of different kinds.

Where anti-democratic and anti-national governments have been installed as a result of direct imperialist intervention or support, the machinery of government sometimes serves as the conduit of reformist conceptions. In such cases the state employs a system of harsh repressions against the revolutionary elements in the national-liberation movement, combined with certain economic and social reforms to promote capitalist production relations. The reactionary concept of alliance between the exploiter and exploited classes is assiduously inculcated, partly through demagogic propaganda to create the illusion that economic emancipation can be achieved through bourgeois reforms and industrialization based on cooperation, even merger, with foreign monopoly capital. In this and other ways the ruling faction tries to prove the 'advantages' of the capitalist over the socialist orientation.

There are many opportunities for instilling reformist conceptions in the national-liberation movement in countries where the national government takes a more or less conciliatory and inconsistent attitude vis-à-vis imperialism. And, of course, imperialism makes the maximum use of its natural ally, the reactionary sections of society and their political organizations.

Historically, the capitalist mode of production represents a degree of progress over pre-capitalist formations, and reforms that accelerate the introduction of capitalist production relations make the economy more dynamic. Some political leaders and ideologists describe this as a progressive process. In particular, they draw an analogy between 19th century reforms in Germany and present-day reforms in, say, Iran. But any such comparison ignores the following important factors.

First, a 'revolution from the top,' whether in Iran or any other developing country, cannot be equated with the 19th century reforms carried out by Prussian methods, for the simple reason that we are at the imperialist stage of world capitalism, at the state-monopoly and not pre-imperialist stage, when the monopolies were not yet holding back the dynamism of 'free competition,' in other words, when capitalism was still in its ascendancy.

Second, bourgeois reformist measures carried out against the background of capitalism's general crisis can only lead to dependent economic development and, at best, raise the country to the status of a capitalist country subject to imperialism. The experience of the past 30 years has made it perfectly clear that development along capitalist lines means that economic and, consequently, also political dependence are not reduced, but in many cases actually increased as a result of a reformist policy and a conciliatory, if not to say encouraging, attitude to the neo-colonialist activities of the imperialist monopolies.

Third, in this time of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, such development, though it does to a certain extent alleviate backwardness, is nevertheless historical regress compared with the perspectives open to the developing countries with the existence and strength of the socialist world system and its all-round and effective support of the young states.

Fourth, economic development in Asia, Africa and Latin America should not be measured against the more or less archaic system of the past. The aim should be to choose a path which, in a relatively short time, would enable them to overcome their backwarness compared with the developed industrial countries, so that the hundreds of millions whom imperialism assigned a minor role in history would be brought into the mainstream of progress.

All this can be attained through fundamental socio-economic changes aimed at the subsequent building of socialism, of a society free of exploitation. This presupposes, in particular, a bigger organizational role for the national-democratic state, primarily in establishing a powerful public economic sector, so vital to victory in the fight for national liberation. Only in that way will the results of the first

stage of the national-liberation struggle (the winning of political power) serve as a firm foundation for victory in the second stage, i.e., economic emancipation, which is the decisive factor in consolidating political independence.

The imperialists are bent on preventing the developing countries from choosing the socialist orientation. And to that end they are turning some of these countries into showcases of capitalist development which, they affirm, will bring the peoples economic prosperity and social progress. Iran is being held up as the most convincing example. Hence, even a cursory examination of Iran's development over the past 20 years is highly instructive.

The pro-imperialist regime established through a coup in August 1953 proceeded to introduce capitalist relations by authoritarian methods, calling the series of measures adopted to this end a 'white revolution' and later a 'revolution of the shah and the people.' It promised to achieve economic progress, raise the standard of living, consolidate national independence, 'restore Iran's one-time greatness,' and so on.[2] Through this 'revolution,' Iranian society was to have taken a leap enabling it not only to end its lag in record time but to become, in the shah's words, one of 'the world's five major industrial powers' in 10 to 20 years. But while 20 years of a markedly capitalist orientation have passed, Iran's social and economic reality is entirely different from what was promised.

There is no denying that the rapid introduction of capitalist production relations by effecting certain bourgeois reforms, in particular an agrarian reform, as well as through more or less guided industrial construction, imparted a degree of dynamism to the country's stagnant semi-feudal economy. From 1968 to 1973, the GNP increased by 107 per cent. But behind this impressive figure there is the reality of uneven development by industries. While the annual growth of industrial output in that period was 15 per cent, agriculture showed a mere 2.5 per cent increase. The overall growth of the GNP was due in considerable measure to a rapid increase in oil production, trade and the service industry. The changes that did take place in Iran's backward economic structure can hardly be described as far-reaching. Agriculture and the extractive industries (oil and mining) in 1972/1973 accounted for approximately 45 per cent of the GNP,[3] manufacturing for less than 11 per cent and the service industry, whose overexpansion is typical of the economy of the underdeveloped countries, 40 per cent.

Much of the output of the manufacturing industry comes from the food and textile industries (31 and 27 per cent, respectively). The petrochemical, chemical, steel, metalworking, mechanical engineering and other heavy industries, which are the main factor for

economic progress, supply only about 20 per cent of total industrial output.[4] More and more capital goods have to be imported (they claim over a quarter of all investments). This suggests that economic growth is unreliable and depends entirely on the capitalist market. Besides, the metalworking, electrical engineering and some other industries will include numerous primitive enterprises using chiefly manual labor.

Industrial imbalances are compounded by the uneven geographical distribution of industrial investments, which are concentrated in Teheran, Ahwaz, Isfahan, Arak and Tabriz. As for vast areas in the east, southeast and south of the country and in the border areas — Kurdistan, Iranian Azerbaijan and Western Khousistan — they are allotted only a small part of the investments and their development rate is still very low.

The lag of rural Iran, where 18 million out of a total population of 34 million live, is increasing. Official policy, aimed at mechanizing work on capitalist farms, has virtually sacrificed the small peasants to big capital, which often merges with foreign monopoly capital. These farms (some of them with more than 100,000 hectares and assets of $100 million) were given the finest lands and every manner of technical and financial aid. All the other farms continue to use much the same primitive techniques as they did before the 1961 reform, with the wooden plough still the principal implement. These three million farms owned by individual peasants (over 10 million people) were left to their own devices after the abolition of the semi-feudal system of land tenure and are suffering from decreasing crop yields and output and a declining standard of life. Until recently an exporter of farm produce, Iran is now compelled to import millions of tons of grains and large quantities of meat, dairy products and even fruit.

The country's economic growth as a whole is based exclusively on the revenue from oil. And since oil sales have been under effective foreign monopoly control in spite of the agreement with the International Petroleum Cartel signed in March 1973, Iran is developing lopsidedly and, moreover, finds itself dependent on the oil monopolies' 'goodwill.' This policy runs counter to the national interest, particularly as oil reserves will begin to run out within about 10 years from now.

The present regime of Iran is seen by the shah himself as 'one of the most loyal friends' of the United States and the capitalist system as a whole. He has taken Iran into aggressive imperialist blocs and spends huge sums for military purposes in the interests of the policy of aggression pursued by imperialism and by arms manufacturers.[5] To bolster the balance of payments of major capitalist countries, he has 'recycled' a substantial part of oil earnings (about $10,000 million) by

granting loans, specifically to the World Bank and IMF, purchasing World Bank bonds and industrial shares on the Western market and in other ways.

This policy of exporting capital has greatly increased Iran's involvement in the capitalist world economy and given rise to an unprecedented reverse flow of foreign monopoly investments, attracted by the opportunity to make petro-dollars. Increased many times over since 1973, these investments are channelled either independently or in association with Iranian private and, above all, state capital into the oil, petrochemical, steel, power, and mining industries, mechanical engineering, agriculture, the banks, construction, hotels and other businesses.

This interpenetration of foreign and domestic capital results, among other things, in growing monopoly trends among Iran's industrialists, big merchants and financiers. There emerge major government, private or mixed amalgamations which dominate whole industries fully or partly, such as automobile (Iran National) or steel (Shahryar). Industrial capital merges more and more with bank capital. The Industrial and Mining Development Bank of Iran (assets, 7,000 million rials, or $10 million), the Shahryar Bank (5,000 million rials) and other banks are virtually controlled by major Iranian industrialists and by monopoly corporations.

The monarchial regime stimulates the formation of state monopoly capitalism in Iran by setting up infrastructure facilities and putting them at the disposal of the private sector gratis or on easy terms, granting private enterprises subsidies and loans and various tax and financial easements, undertaking to train scientists, technical personnel and skilled workers for them and increasingly merging government capital with domestic or foreign monopoly capital. Contradictory as this phenomenon may appear in a backward country, it is, nevertheless, an inevitable consequence of capitalist development at this imperialist stage.

While creating a monopoly upper stratum of society, the regime's economic policy leads at the other pole to a deteriorating standard of life. The capitalist agrarian reform has accelerated the impoverishment and proletarianization of a large body of peasants and caused large-scale migration to the cities. Yet the industries cannot absorb so vast a work force and the result is mass unemployment. The 'revolution of the shah and the people' has made social inequality more marked than ever, a fact admitted even officially. And while the authorities have repeatedly declared that they intend to follow an 'equitable incomes policy.' their actual policy is the exact opposite.

Official sources set per capita income at $1,521 a year. But the figure should be taken very critically. It is obtained by methods that

are useless for establishing the real state of affairs, such as dividing the enormous oil revenue (to the tune of $17,000 million) by the total number of the population or by lumping together the incomes of the wealthy inhabitants of Teheran and other cities and the incomes of millions of peasants and workers. If that part of the oil earning which is not spent on national industrial development and consequently has no effect on the standard of living is discounted, the real per capita GNP turns out to be only $760. To be sure, the 'revolution of the shah and the people' has benefited some highly privileged categories supported by the regime — the big merchants and manufacturers as well as top civil servants and military men — and has been of some help to the middle strata, but the vast majority of the population has gained nothing.

Contrary to official allegations, the plight of the people and the increasingly uneven economic development are not a product of passing difficulties 'arising naturally from an ever more prosperous economy.' Iran's current economic and social difficulties are due mostly to structural causes and are a direct consequence of the regime's policy. The 'Iranian miracle,' far from delivering the country from economic dependence, has extended this dependence to every sphere of public life. More than before, the economy depends on the capitalist market for industrial plant and raw materials as well as for food — a fact unprecedented in the country's history. More than 20 years of forced capitalist development have, in spite of the existence of immense financial resources, revealed the adverse results of an orientation entirely at variance with the people's vital interests.

The capitalist orientation runs counter by its very nature to the fundamental objectives of the national-liberation movement, for it inevitably ties the developing countries to the imperialist economic system. This means that the main obstacles to social and economic progress and the dependence of key economic fields on the capitalist market and imperialist monopoly are still there.

Attempts to 'integrate' the developing countries into the monopoly capitalist system inevitably come up against the fundamental contradiction between the peoples' desire for independence and the imperialists' neo-colonial policy. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are increasingly aware that they cannot win economic freedom through capitalist development, which makes it a mirage in the desert of imperialist subjugation.

The West says many nice things about 'development aid,' 'international economic cooperation,' 'releasing funds to maintain the purchasing capacity of countries producing raw materials,' and so on. The facts show, however, that the imperialist powers are by no means eager to foster the social and economic progress of these countries

but want to retain their own privileges at all costs. A fairly recent indication of this was the virtual failure of the international economic cooperation conference (Paris, December 1975) of 19 developing countries and major capitalist countries to devise 'better' forms of mutual economic relations.

It should be noted at this point that the neo-colonial policy of imperialism is obviously becoming more and more international as a component of the counter-revolutionary global strategy of an old world trying to check the inexorable march of history. Although their mutual contradictions persist, the imperialist powers want to maintain and 'collectively' affirm their domination both in countries which they have contrived to bring into their aggressive blocs and the non-aligned countries (through the European Common Market, for instance). In this situation, the global strategy of imperialism toward the developing countries includes not only economic neo-colonialism but also the imposition of anti-democratic governments, the export of diverse forms of fascism and the use of every means of direct or indirect pressure, intimidation, blackmail and violence.

U.S. imperialism is the biggest 'exporter' of fascist-like regimes. Reactionary dictatorships are in power in all those countries of the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America where U.S. influence predominates. The stranglehold of U.S. monopolies is strongest in Latin America, where 80 per cent of the population live under dictatorial regimes, including fascist regimes, as in Chile.

According to a report published by the Brookings institute in December 1976, the U.S. government since 1945 has interfered not less than 215 times in the affairs of developing countries by threatening them with military force or actually using it. Washington's recent attempts (backed by all Western powers) to frighten the OPEC countries into renouncing the oil price increase on which they had agreed at the Duha conference (December 1976) were so obvious that even the capitalist press could not conceal the fact.

The imperialists do their best to prevent Asian, African and Latin American countries from consolidating their sovereignty and safeguarding their right to manage their natural resources as they think fit. They try to hamper cooperation between these countries in resisting plunder by the multinationals. Now a primary requisite of economic liberation is uncompromising struggle to dislodge foreign monopoly capital from its positions.

This struggle must, of course, go hand in hand with the political struggle against imperialism and reaction at national and international level. In this connection, mention is sometimes made of the need to establish a new international political order. We believe that the issue of genuine equality in international relations cannot be reduced to a

political accord reached by governments and imposed from above. It is primarily a social issue linked with the existence of two opposed social systems. For as long as imperialism exists, the economic and political basis for its exploitation of and discrimination against lagging nations will persist. The problem as posed by the progressive forces of the developing countries is to undermine the basis of this exploitation and discrimination by expanding the truly equitable and mutually beneficial relations that have formed between them and the socialist countries.

It is the anti-imperialist trend that objectively determines the content of the struggle to reshape international economic relations on democratic and equitable lines. Anyone approaching the matter soberly and without bias cannot afford to forget this fact. The struggle of Asian, African and Latin American countries is appreciated and firmly supported by the socialist countries. And when we see deliberate or inadvertent, open or veiled attempts to divide the world into 'poor' and 'rich' and to lump capitalist and socialist countries together in the latter category, we say that such attempts are directed, in effect, against the developing countries, because they make it easier for the imperialists to continue and step up neo-colonial exploitation.

However, the peoples of these countries realize more and more that to bring about genuine national renaissance and achieve all-round social progress, they must deepen the revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist content of their liberation struggle and carry out fundamental changes that clear the way for advance in a socialist direction.

1. Oil is no exception. Oil prices rose by only 10 per cent in the past three years, while prices of goods and services imported by OPEC countries rose 20 per cent, which means that the 'purchasing capacity' of oil has been cut by at least half.
2. See Hamid Safari, 'The "White Revolution": Myth and Reality,' in: *WMR*, September 1976.
3. By the end of the fifth five-year plan (1978), the share of oil alone in the GNP is expected to be 48.7 per cent. The one-commodity character of production is thus becoming more pronounced.
4. Most of this 20 per cent comes from enterprises built with the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.
5. Nearly $10,000 million has been spent on arms purchases in recent years.

The socialist economic intensification strategy

Günter Mittag
PB member and CC Secretary,
Socialist Unity Party
of Germany

The whole meaning of socialism is to give people a better life, and building a developed socialist society shows us just how close the link is between that better life and economic intensification. So the SUPG bases its development strategy on unity of economic and social policy.

The aim of intensification

Our party's General Secretary, Erich Honecker, emphasized in his report to the Ninth Party Congress: 'In future, too, our policy will be focused on consistent accomplishment of our main task, continuous improvement of the people's material and cultural standards through high growth rates, higher efficiency, scientific and technological progress and higher labor productivity. This fully accords with the interests of our people and is backed by our accumulated experience, which indicates that good work always yields good results. Higher efficiency standards in social production provide the prerequisites for further uninterrupted accomplishment of our major social-policy undertakings. These two aspects are inseparable, for the point and purpose of socialism is to assure the well-being of the people.'

Such is our party's long-range policy, and it corresponds with the objective requirements of building developed socialist society. It has been consistently carried out since the Eighth SUPG Congress (1971), which approved a wide-ranging social-policy program centered on raising material and cultural standards. And our citizens are already enjoying its tangible results. The decisions of the Ninth SUPG Congress re-emphasized our party's determination to go ahead with far-reaching social-policy measures needed to attain our chief goal.

With the previous five-year plan successfully fulfilled, and the scientifically calculated assignments for the 1976-80 plan drawn up, we set concrete target figures for the ten-year period (1971-80), which will see truly historic changes in the German Democratic Republic.

Here are some of those figures: 1,360,000 flats will be added to our housing fund, which will mean better living conditions for more than four million of our citizens. About one million of these flats will be in new buildings accommodating approximately 2,800,000 or nearly a sixth of the Republic's population. About 95 per cent of them will have either central or other modern heating systems. There will be many improvements also in existing housing. In short, in these ten years we shall have taken a long step toward final solution of the housing problem by 1990.

Real per-capita incomes will rise from the 1970 average of 5,836 marks to 9,580 in 1980, or by 65 per cent, a nearly two-thirds increase. Retail trade will increase by 100 billion marks: from 3,900 marks average per capita purchases in 1970 is about 5,800 in 1980, an increase of 50 per cent with retail prices remaining stable.

In the 1971-80 decade we shall add 33,400 new classrooms, so that about one million pupils will be attending modern schools equipped with all the latest teaching aids. The health services will be substantially expanded. Day-nursery accommodation will increase by nearly 100,000, which will be of tremendous help to working women.

All this can, and will, be achieved through dynamic economic growth. Under the current five-year plan, national income will rise to about 830 billion marks, or 200 billion above the previous five years. Economic growth is not an aim in itself, but a necessary precondition, a lever, for solving social-policy problems.

Industrial output in 1976-80 will total 1,400 billion marks, an increase of 400 billion over the previous five-year period. Investments to increase the Republic's economic potential and expand the economy's material and technical base will exceed the sum of 240 billion marks, or as much as we invested in the 17 years 1951-1967. The figures are a gauge of how the material and technical basis of socialism is being strengthened to accelerate attainment of our socialist production goals.

The immediate and priority aim of production in developed socialist society is higher material and cultural standards, and higher growth rates on the basis of intensified production is the way of achieving them. This direct interdependence of economic development and better conditions for the people is intrinsic only to socialim. In turn, higher prosperity standards become a factor in boosting production and raising its efficiency and quality. Our workers, and the people generally, are more closely united with our socialist state and our party. The GDR is thus consistently and perseveringly, thanks to its dynamic development, helping to strengthen socialism internationally.

Unity of economic and social policy rests on the objective basis of

public ownership of the means of production and the power of the working class in alliance with the cooperative farmers, the socialist intelligentsia and other strata. And our experience has made it abundantly clear that public ownership, socialist economic planning and socialist democracy are essential factors in enabling the people directly to enjoy the fruits of their dedicated labor.

In a socialist society, in accordance with the objective economic laws that govern its development, every worker has a vital stake in making optimal use of public property in the interests of all. This determines the social basis of our people's activity, their wide participation in the socialist emulation movement for higher productivity, intensification of production, higher quality standards, more efficient use of machines and materials. Fixed production assets in 1975 amounted to 366.7 billion marks. This vast national wealth is entrusted to the 6,430,000 men and women engaged in the production sphere. That is why we regard intensification not as a purely economic problem, but rather as a social requirement stemming from the deeply humanistic nature of our society. That is our understanding of intensification, and it coincides with the party's policy of promoting the people's well-being. Intensification is thus an inseparable part of our long-range strategy for attaining the main goal of socialism, and it is only in this context that its social implications can be fully understood.

The idea is to intensify the whole process of extended reproduction, to increase its effectiveness. Of tremendous importance in this context is the activity of the people themselves, which makes for more efficient use of machinery and materials and raises the effectiveness of all the factors that go into extended socialist reproduction. In short, the object of intensification is more rational use of all the means and resources of the socialist economy in extended reproduction. Referring to extended reproduction based on accumulation, Marx emphasized that it was not merely a matter of quantitative growth, for 'at a certain point the process finds its qualitative expression in the greater productivity of the efforts needed for reproduction.'

Fundamentally, intensification means higher effectiveness and higher quality in every branch of the economy. But it also means higher output, which, too, is an inalienable feature of socialism. Thus, in 1980 industrial output will be up 36 to 38 per cent on 1976, well in keeping with the growth rate in the previous five-year period. Similar growth rates are retained in the current five-year plan and this fully accords with the directives approved by the Ninth Party Congress. But to assure uninterrupted growth we shall have to rely more on intensification, i.e., on qualitative factors. This is one of the regular

features of our development, which has now emerged in many socialist countries.

A vivid expression of this is the increasing share of machinery and equipment in the production process. Thus, in 1960 the value of machinery per industrial worker was 34,350 marks, in 1970 the figure was 58,632 and in 1975, 74,451 marks. In other words, the value of plant per worker more than doubled in 15 years. Consumption of materials and production services in industry over the same period increased by 138 per cent, or more than doubled, though the number of workers employed rose by only 10 per cent.

Machinery is, of course, a product of social labor and its increasing use raises the effectiveness of social labor and, consequently, economic growth.

Increased effectiveness does not come automatically, it requires systematic effort. It is in this sense that Marx emphasized that labor, in conditions in which it is really free, acquires a scientific character and 'expresses itself as a type of activity governing all the forces of nature.'

Socialist intensification and creative labor are two sides of one and the same medal. Intensification under socialism has nothing in common with exertion of physical effort. On the contrary, it presupposes the further emancipation of labor, increases its creative nature. This is facilitated by use of the greatest achievements of science and technology, and the many socialist rationalization measures. Again the figures: in 1965, 566,000 workers submitted innovation proposals, in 1970 the figure had risen to 661,000 and in 1976 to 1,600,000. The number of production innovators has increased by one million — a result of the party's policy of attaining our main goal through intensification. In 1975, 31 per cent of all employed in the economy had a share in innovations, and most of them, more than a million people, are directly engaged in production. This is still another indicator of social development.

Another important factor is the higher skill of our workers. In 1970-75, the number of persons with higher or spcial secondary education increased from 716,000 to 1,019,000, and in this period 920,000 apprentices completed their training and were assigned skilled jobs. Thus, in 1975 this category accounted for 61.7 per cent of all industrial workers as against 36 per cent in 1961. The process also has its social aspects: 75 per cent of our population up to the age of 35 now have a higher, general or specialized secondary education or have received occupational training.

All these intensification measures are attended by measures to improve working and general conditions. This applies, first and foremost, to elimination of hard manual labor, reducing industrial

noise, dust and dirt resulting from technological processes, and also better planning of shops, restrooms, canteens, and also recreation, cultural and sports facilities. All-round improvement of working and general conditions is a priority aim of party policy.

Production rationalization under socialism is always in the interests of the people, always a means of raising their material and cultural levels and improving working and general conditions. This is one of the fundamental differences, a difference objectively determined by the character of the social system, between intensification under socialism and capitalism.

Key problems

To achieve a steady, dynamic and well balanced development of all branches of the economy the energy and raw materials base will have to be expanded, and better use made of home stocks of raw materials. With continued expansion in the extractive industries, the economy will be assured of growing supply of materials for extended reproduction. The building up and modernizing of this base is a key factor at the present stage of development of the productive forces with its long-range perspective of transition to communism. 'The raising of the productivity of labor,' Lenin wrote, when setting out the tasks of the Soviet government, 'first of all requires that the material basis of large-scale industry shall be assured, namely, the development of the production of fuel, iron, the engineering and chemical industries' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 257).

Between 1976 and 1980 approximately one-third of all the GDR's investments in the economy will go toward building up the power and raw materials base. Coal, electricity, ore, matallurgy, chemicals, construction materials and other branches of industry will be further developed. Moreover, the policy of intensification demands a comprehensive approach to the problem, involving not merely the producers of raw materials, but all branches of the economy. Maximum use must be made of every ton of raw material. Marx said that we must 'turn all nature to our purposes so as to discover the new useful properties of things.' Thorough and economical use of the materials we have at our disposal is our main reserve. This means all-round exploitation of raw material deposits, irrespective of the main product, efficient use of raw materials at every stage of processing, from the moment of extraction to the finished product; and full utilization of the components of production, including the recycling of raw material.

The drive for economical use of materials is being stepped up. Targets are being set even higher than in the past and regulations made even stricter. New ideas and initiatives are being realized. For

example, the whole economy has benefited greatly from the fact that a whole industry, metallurgy, has introduced high-precision metal rolling, which makes a big difference to the consumption of steel and non-ferrous metals. In 1976, for instance, 20,000 tons of rolled goods were saved. Another big saving device is the systematic collection and reprocessing of secondary raw material. Its importance to the economy can be seen from the fact that in 1975 the recycling of secondary raw material saved 2,500 million marks.

As a country that depends largely on imported materials the GDR has to be particularly aware of the problem of economizing on raw materials. Ways of saving, even if they involve initial outlay, are becoming more and more important and at the same time we are learning to make them more effective.

Public initiative in saving materials is spreading. To encourage thrift, new wholesale prices are being introduced on products within the industrial system. In this important field of activity we are trying to achieve complete coordination between the interests of the economy as a whole and those of individual enterprises and industrial complexes. At the same time, in line with well-tried past practice retail prices, rents and service charges.

The importance of these major economic tasks is being increasingly appreciated by the public. The party is conducting a broad campaign to help people to understand these problems as a whole. It is also becoming clear that any project for improving quality and reducing rejects is at the same time a project for husbanding raw materials.

Party organizations are orienting production teams toward operating all highly productive machinery in several shifts, so that it can be used to the full. The five-year plan lays it down that the operating time of highly productive machinery and equipment must be raised at a minimum rate of 3-4 per cent a year. This means that further introduction of the multi-shift system is becoming a key factor. Moreover we take into consideration the fact that increasing the return from basic assets is a complex process that has social implications. Careful thought must be devoted to the varied problems of organization in the ideological, political and technological spheres, to the supply of goods, transport and other services, professional training and retraining, intellectual and cultural life.

The SUPG considers it an important task to spread the idea that intensification means increasing output by modernizing and better use of the basic assets available at present, while saving manpower and improving working and living conditions.

Stress on the STR

Whatever problem of intensification we are dealing with — saving and

more efficient use of materials, boosting output and better utilization of machines and equipment, improvement in the quality of goods or growth of productivity in general — the solution is bound to lie in systematic application of the advances of science and technology. Scientific and technical progress is the key to all aspects of socialist intensification. For the first time in history, thanks to socialism, the working class and its allies have the opportunity of putting science and technology entire at the service of the people and using it for the benefit of man.

The realities of today provide striking confirmation of Marx's prediction that the whole process of production would become a technological application of science. As socialism advances it becomes increasingly clear that this process is being made to serve mankind, the interests of the working people, and does not contradict them, as it does in the industrially developed capitalist countries. This is particularly evident against the background of the present crisis in the capitalist world, where growing unemployment has a disastrous effect on the life of the working people and their families.

As a socialist country, the GDR is interested in the planned development of science and technology for the benefit of man. For us the STR is not a fetish and not an aim in itself. Science and invention, like the division and combination of labor and the use of machinery, are essential elements in the productive power of labor. Development of the economic potential is in many ways dependent on them. We are guiding science and technology so that they will further increase the national income and promote the party's general policy.

This is the basis of the tasks formulated by Comrade Erich Honecker in his New Year address: accelerate scientific and technological progress in the economy as a whole and strive for the highest world standards in the main types of output and technology. This is a vital part of the struggle for successful fulfillment of the five-year plan.

In pushing ahead with this plan our party realizes that the GDR has already built up a substantial scientific and technological potential. Under the current five-year plan 35 billion marks will be invested in this field — 10 billion more than under the previous plan. Every year our educational system is turning out growing numbers of young well-qualified specialists with all-round knowledge, capable of doing creative work and not frightened of big undertakings. In the Academy of Sciences and higher schools of the GDR the standard of fundamental research is rising. Scientific and technological cooperation with the Soviet Union, which makes for increasingly impressive results, is being built up. More and more striking scientific and technological achievements are being applied in the economy; the benefits from their use are increasing.

Our party proceeds from the fact that socialist production relations have enormous advantages and create all the prerequisites for the full realization of scientific and technological advances in actual life, in specific economic and production results. As an example, we can cite such facts as the manufacture at the publicly owned Karl Zeiss, Jena Works of special photographic equipment that was used during the Soyuz-22 flight, and the commissioning of the world's first 30-ton plasma furnace at the high-quality steel factory in Freital. The Central Committee of the SUPG discussed at its recent plenums the results of the nationwide drive to achieve the highest world standards called for by the Ninth Party Congress. It drew some fundamental conclusions. The essence of these conclusions is that on the basis of what has been already achieved, on the basis of the increased knowledge and experience of our cadres, their political maturity and deep devotion to their country and party, we have every opportunity of achieving results like those mentioned above in all fields. Our inviolable fraternal alliance with the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the cooperation between the USSR and the GDR in science and the economy allow us to be pioneers in the scientific cognition of nature and society and in using the results achieved for the good of humanity.

The development of close scientific and technical cooperation with the USSR testifies to the fact that socialist economic integration as a whole is a powerful factor in intensification and raising production efficiency in the socialist countries. It multiplies our research potential. Often it is the only way of gaining new knowledge. It accelerates the application of results and makes it possible to organize large-scale rational production. It is advantageous to both countries.

The SUPG associates its successes in carrying out its national economic policy with giving the young people, specialists, researchers, engineers and workers, tasks that mobilize their energies. We believe in providing conditions that encourage them to work creatively. Our people are determined to achieve great things. Supporting this urge, our party sees to it that the plans provide a fitting challenge. In our political and ideological work we also try to orient the working people toward big accomplishments that will help to develop socialism.

Thanks to the broad and varied ideological and political activities of our party organizations, scientific and technological creativity is gaining in scope and greater efforts are being made in the search for solutions that will make our whole economy more efficient. Our people are trying even harder to accelerate scientific and technological progress. The party and the state are dedicated to the idea of using and encouraging the readiness of the masses to reach the heights of science and technology.

In the drive to intensify production the party lays special stress on the quality of management, on the personal responsibility of managers. It is mindful of the need for timely research and development and planning ahead to get results on the production line. We aim to bring fundamental and applied research even closer together, to shorten the period between the initial research and the practical application of its results. A lot here depends on stepping up the responsibility of the big industrial complexes for rationalizing production and reconstruction. Progress in rationalization and reconstruction is a decisive factor in the GDR economy.

It should be noted that more than 85 per cent of the planned growth of commodity production under the five-year plan is to be achieved through increased productivity of labor. In industry and construction nearly 1,200 million man-hours are to be saved by scientific, technological and investment measures. The plan demands pressure on every branch of the economy to produce its own means of rationalization. Between 1976 and 1980 production of the means of rationalization has to be increased by 167 per cent.

To accelerate this process throughout the economy all big enterprises and industrial complexes are to set up their own special departments for making such devices. We envisage that such departments will become technological centers whose staffs will be able to evolve effective and economical processes, improve existing ones and get new inventions and rationalization proposals on to the production line quickly. Their work will be an important step toward achieving top results on the scale of whole factories and complexes. The strategy of intensification is thus being realized in a concrete system of measures tailored to meet its needs.

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany regards fulfillment of the intensification targets set by the Ninth Congress as a political goal of nationwide importance. This broad social approach to the problem is determined by the great importance that increasing our economic potential has for carrying out our program of improving the people's well-being.

We also regard our efforts to achieve further advances in building socialist society, developing the economy, science and culture and achieving a steady rise in material and cultural standards as a contribution to the influence and attractive power of socialism throughout the world. The communists of the GDR see this as a particularly honorable task in the year when mankind is celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

NATO against détente

Peter Boychuck
Alternate member,
Executive Committee,
CC CP Canada

Until not so long ago the United States had quite a good tradition of not allowing its generals to make political speeches. When the generals objected on the grounds of free speech they were told that freedom should be used with discretion.

Unfortunately this tradition has been lost in recent years. The generals never stop making speeches, particularly those who fancy themselves as politicians and have been appointed to NATO headquarters.

Perhaps the most talkative of them all is Alexander Haig, Commander-in-Chief of NATO forces in Europe, whose military-political revelations regularly appear in the West European and North American press. He is always telling people in the West to beware of the Soviet Union's 'offensive might' and 'expansionist aims,' but the real purpose of all the ballyhoo is to make the governments and parliaments of the NATO countries spend more on arms and put more men and weapons in the hands of General Haig. And what he needs them for is to build up international tension and pursue a deterrent policy against the socialist countries.

'Up to now the West's deterrent has been effective,' Haig told a correspondent of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (February 18, 1977). 'But its effectiveness could very soon be lost if the Western parliaments do not make a much greater effort now.' In his role as arms salesman the general complained to the correspondent that most of the NATO partners had not been buying enough weaponry of late.

It is hard not to agree with the Western newspapers that traced a connection between General Haig's utterings and the only recently given promises of the new U.S. administration to cut defense expenditure and clamp controls on the billion-dollar spendthrifts in the Pentagon. It must also be admitted that Haig and the NATO lobby have not wasted their time. The United States arms budget for the coming fiscal year is up again.

Alexander Haig is not the only person engaged in fanning war fever in the West. In a book *Defenseless Europe* that appeared this January his NATO colleague, the Belgian general Rober Close, warns 'irres-

ponsible politicians' that under certain circumstances the Russians could overrun West Germany in 48 hours. The Belgian defense minister, Paul Vanden Boeynants, banned Close from making any further public statements on this question. The general bowed to his authority, but only after the idea of a possible 'Soviet invasion' had made headlines in the capitalist press.

The Belgian defense minister's decision to restrain the general from making such provocatory statements is to be welcomed as a wise step, but not every minister of state is capable of placing the interests of the nation and of international relations above his own sectional interests. A case in point is a statement by George Leber, German Federal Republic defense minister, which will certainly not further international understanding. His calls for a 'permanent deterrent' show that he takes more notice of General Haig's speeches than of common sense. And common sense must tell him that the best thing for his country is not an arms build-up and preparations for a new war (which would mean total disaster for the Federal Republic) but a policy of détente backed by effective measures to curtail armaments.

The voices of active supporters of an aggressive Atlantic posture are heard from other NATO countries. Unfortunately, in my own country, Canada, there are quite a few persons in positions of responsibility who go along with those who try to scare the public with talk of 'Soviet aggression,' obviously with the aim of whipping up the arms race. At the 40th session of the Conference of Defense Associations, Prime Minister Trudeau called for a bigger arms budget, though he admitted that 'the cost of defense reaches astronomical heights.' He was, of course, supported by defense minister Danson, who charged Canadians with complacency in the face of the 'Soviet threat.' The object of the exercise is to browbeat Canadians into accepting the need for a steep rise in the country's arms bill.

A loud voice in Britain is Lord Chalfont's. Year after year he goes on warning the public of an imminent invasion of Europe by Soviet troops and demanding more money for arms. An article he wrote for *The Times* last year (March 15) was called 'The West Must Act to Defend Itself While It Still has the Chance.' Obviously the British reader was supposed to conclude that he had a very small chance of survival and that the only way of preserving it was to sacrifice his butter for guns.

After yet another broadside from General Haig the worthy lord reached the following profound conclusion: 'If you employ an expensive, intelligent and highly trained guard dog, it is as well to pay attention when he barks' (*The Times*, November 8, 1976). Let Lord Chalfont himself answer for the tactfulness of that comparison in the

lofty circles in which he moves. We can only remark that even highly trained dogs will bark for tidbits from their masters.

Luckily, this is understood by many people in the West, including Britain. Replying to Lord Chalfont, Edmund Stevens, *The Times* Moscow correspondent wrote, 'Haig and Chalfont are right in asserting a war danger exists. But they are barking up the wrong tree. As anyone familiar with the Soviet scene can attest, Russians are not planning a blitz attack against Western Europe' *(The Times,* January 26, 1977).

Stevens went on to sum up facts that are well known the world over. 'Distinguished foreign visitors, including world leaders, who met Brezhnev recently, have come away with the impression he is anxious to ensure world peace and is keenly aware of the dire consequences of a nuclear conflict for all mankind' (*The Times,* January 26, 1977).

Developing his argument, Stevens cites the opinion of George Kennan, well-known Sovietologist and former U.S. ambassador to the USSR. The former ambassador believes that the blame for the present deadlock in negotiations on curtailing the strategic arms race lies with the Pentagon. Kennan maintains that if the danger of world war is not to grow any bigger than it has been in the past there must be energetic efforts to curb the ambitions of the military-industrial complex and halt the arms race.

Britain's defense secretary, Roy Mason, also confirmed that last year NATO's expenditure was about $20,000 million more than equivalent spending by the Warsaw Treaty countries. NATO had a substantial numerical superiority over its 'opponents' in regular personnel, he said.

Commenting on statements by Mason and NATO admiral Hill-Norton, a spokesman of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Brian Deer, says that the aim of foreign policy should be to relax tension. The British government, he said, should take the initiative now and cut arms expenditure, scrap its stocks of useless nuclear weapons, which are controlled by the Americans, and leave NATO unilaterally. The creation of NATO in 1949 heralded the nuclear arms race. Now it depends on NATO whether it will end, he declared.

True indeed! The North Atlantic politicians can say what they like and try to shift the blame how they like, but they cannot rewrite history. Nor will they escape public responsibility for setting up an aggressive bloc that has played a shameful part in the postwar history of mankind.

How was this bloc set up and what for? The growth of the Soviet Union's prestige during and after the Second World War, the formation of the world socialist system, the upsurge of the communist and

working-class movement, and the beginning of the colonial system's collapse changed the balance of forces in favor of socialism. In several West European countries the communist movement had developed on a mass scale, millions were voting communist, there were communists in the governments. This obviously called for action on the part of the leaders of the capitalist world. The 'cold war' was launched with the aim of turning the tide of events both on the international scene and in the capitalist countries themselves.

The chief weapon of this 'cold war' was the North Atlantic bloc, set up in April 1949. From the start it was dominated by the United States. It would have been naive, to say the least, for any of the junior partners in the alliance to have counted on parity in NATO. American militarists had not secured the key strategic positions in Western Europe just to share power with somebody else. They wanted political and economic supremacy. So it is hard to restrain a smile when one sees Sulzberger in the *International Herald Tribune* (March 7) giving it as his 'frank opinion' that what was needed back in the 50s was a European commander-in-chief of the NATO forces. This would have demonstrated 'true philosophical equality' in the North Atlantic alliance. But would it?

Fortune magazine, mouthpiece of the American monopolies, was getting nearer the heart of the matter, when it wrote that the United States could not withdraw from a continent that mattered as much to America strategically as Alaska. Well, no one will deny this journal's frankness. Perhaps the editors of *Fortune* think that comparing Western Europe to Alaska is a compliment to Western Europe. All they need to do now is to state their price.

The relaxation of international tension achieved thanks to the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was a big setback for the aggressive policy of the NATO warlords. The policy of détente that has won wide support in many countries over the past decade has exploded the idea of the Soviet 'threat' and the impossibility of peaceful coexistence or cooperation between the socialist and capitalist powers. The result has been that the leading NATO countries have set about normalizing relations with the USSR and other socialist countries of Europe. They have had to overcome internal resistance from the numerous 'hawks' in their own countries who are reluctant to abandon their 'deterrent.' For example, in 1971 Lord Carrington, secretary for defense in Britain's Conservative government, advised 'cooling the enthusiasm' of those who were in favor of détente. But the conclusion of the Soviet-American agreements on preventing nuclear war and further efforts to halt the race in strategic nuclear and other weapons have shown that there is a mutually acceptable road leading from confrontation to military détente.

There has been universal popular support for détente, expanded mutually-advantageous economic contacts, and scientific, technical and cultural cooperation of states with different social systems. This was bound to worry the imperialists and precipitate counteraction. For they saw the erosion of NATO's policy of 'deterring' the socialist countries, were aware of the growing doubts about the advisability of maintaining NATO and of the growing tendency to dismantle it as unnecessary.

The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference came as a fresh blow to the arms drive and preparation of aggression policy. It expressed the people's will for peace and became a kind of code of European security and cooperation based on peaceful coexistence. The Helsinki Conference made a weighty contribution to détente.

The circles associated with the military-industrial complex in North America and Western Europe responded to the success of the peace forces with a campaign designed to aggravate the confrontation of the two blocs. They are using the NATO generals and defense ministers to intimidate European opinion with talk of the 'menace of Soviet aggression.' NATO propagandists are assiduously disseminating this piece of mythology but are studiously silent about the official position of the socialist countries, set out with the utmost clarity by the leaders of their Communist and Workers' Parties at the Crimean meeting of July 30-31, 1973: 'The socialist countries consistently advocate complementing political détente with military détente, which would facilitate disarmament.'

From the very early postwar years the socialist countries have repeatedly proposed reducing foreign and national armed forces in Europe. But every such proposal has been rejected by the NATO leadership. And it was only in 1973 in Vienna that the socialist and capitalist countries began negotiations on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments.

These Vienna negotiations have so far failed to produce any concrete results. If the leaders of the NATO countries really wanted military détente, as they profess, they would long ago have accepted the socialist countries' proposals, based on the principle of not impairing the security of either side. Instead, the NATO delegations have advanced patently unacceptable proposals calling for disproportionate reductions that would give NATO unilateral advantages.

There is no getting away from the impression that the sole purpose of the Western powers at the Vienna talks is to achieve unilateral military advantages, impose on the socialist countries disadvantageous terms, while not assuming any obligations that would affect General Haig's freedom of action. Otherwise, how is one to explain why the NATO countries, while raising a hue and cry about the

'Soviet menace' and the Soviet build-up in Central Europe, rejected the proposal, which Leonid Brezhnev repeated at the 16th Soviet Trade Union Congress, to refrain from increasing armed forces in Central Europe for the duration of the Vienna talks? Moreover, while the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have, for a number of years, refrained from increasing the combat strength of their armed forces in Central Europe, the NATO countries have been steadily building up their armed forces in that region.

The leaders of many Western countries have repeatedly acknowledged that the balance of armed forces in Central Europe between the socialist and capitalist countries is about even. Nevertheless, flouting all logic, NATO insists that the socialist countries should make a nearly three times bigger reduction than NATO.

Other facts could be cited to show that, while rejecting concrete and substantiated proposals, the Western negotiators in Vienna are advancing unrealistic and patently unacceptable plans based entirely on NATO's strategic interests.

A similar stand was taken by the U.S. at the talks held in Moscow at the end of March this year on limitation of strategic offensive weapons. This was an attempt to revise the Vladivostok accord between Brezhnev and Ford to the unilateral advantage of the United States and the detriment of the security of the USSR and its allies. But why should the Soviet Union sacrifice its legitimate interests, its security?

It is to be hoped that Western bourgeois leaders who have had sufficient foresight to support a policy of relaxing international tensions will really take up the questions involved in military détente, i.e., restriction and reduction of armaments as the prelude to subsequent disarmament.

They have a good example to emulate: the peace policy of the Soviet Union, which is militarily the strongest of the socialist states, as expressed in pronouncements by its leaders and in concrete actions. At the October 1976 CC CPSU plenum, Leonid Brezhnev stated that the Soviet Union was prepared to begin disarmament without delay — either large-scale, fundamental or, for a start, partial — on a just basis of reciprocity. Speaking in Tula in January of this year, Leonid Brezhnev reaffirmed that the Soviet aim was not superiority in armaments, but reduction of armaments and relaxation of the military confrontation.

These words have been backed by deeds. 'While the U.S. has been increasing its military budget annually,' P. Rogers wrote in *Political Affairs*, the theoretical and political journal of the U.S. Communist Party (Nov. 1976), 'the Soviet military budget has been reduced. For the year 1977, the Soviet military budget was 17.2 billion rubles, or

$23 billion, as compared to the U.S. military budget of $112 billion.' This year, too, the U.S. is increasing its military spending instead of budgeting for the American people's social needs, while the USSR is slashing its arms budget by 200 million rubles. All told, since the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971 at which the Peace Program was approved, the Soviet Union has made four cuts in defense spending. The same cannot be said about NATO military expenditure, which has increased from $18 billion in 1949 to $155 billion in 1976, and this not counting Greece and Turkey.

A key measure proposed by the USSR and other socialist countries as a means of extending and consolidating détente is simultaneous dismantling of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, with dismantling of their military structures as a first step. The USSR repeated this proposal at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties. Its acceptance would be a realistic and rapid step toward military détente in Europe and would make for closer international trust and understanding.

However, judging from the reaction in Western capitals this, like other peace overtures by the socialist countries, does not have the support of the ruling circles. Apparently they are not yet prepared to abandon this effective instrument for stirring up tension and anti-communism, as was evidenced by last year's round of NATO top-level conferences. Behind the smokescreen of talk about the 'Eastern menace' one could see the real aim of this aggressive alliance, namely, to put through high-cost war-preparation programs, including the continued build-up of the nuclear missile potential.

As was only to be expected, Secretary-General Joseph Luns of the anything but defensive NATO bloc turned down the Warsaw Treaty proposal that all signatories to the Helsinki agreement should pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. Another constructive proposal, not to enlarge existing military-political groupings, was likewise rejected.

With the best will in the world, one cannot accept that this attitude of the NATO leaders is motivated by defensive, humane or similar considerations. It can only be interpreted as part of NATO's aggressive propensities.

The NATO leaders, and primarily the U.S. imperialists, are trying to dictate to West European nations what kind of governments they should have and what political parties the people should and should not support. Now as in the past, NATO serves as protector for the most reactionary European circles. Its aggressive, anti-democratic nature has repeatedly been demonstrated by its threats to various countries whenever the influence of the communist or other left parties was growing, and by gross interference in their internal affairs.

We all remember NATO's role in the Greek military coup of April 1967; its subversion against the sovereign republic of Cyprus, and against the national-liberation movements, particularly in southern Africa, and, the latest example, its interference in the internal military conflict in Zaire.

According to General Haig, the question of 'Marxist participation' in Western governments is the most serious question now confronting NATO. And since some people in Western capitals believe that communist participation in the governments of big capitalist countries would bring on the dissolution of NATO, the general has served notice: 'I will not agree to Marxist parties in the governments of the West-European industrial countries' (*L'Humanité*, Feb. 24, 1976).

This flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states has met with sharp protest from representatives of parties far removed from Marxism. But the protests have not prevented the U.S., FRG, British and French leaders from deciding, in June 1976, to deny Italy all financial and economic assistance if there are communists in the government. Even the conservative *Times* described this as 'gross blackmail' by Italy's NATO allies.

Nor have we forgotten the more recent pressure put on Portugal. According to the Paris *Le Nouvel Observateur* (July 5, 1976) 'at the very height of the events in Portugal, the Americans were discussing expelling Lisbon from NATO.' Political bullying was supplemented by NATO maneuvers in Portuguese waters.

Washington and certain other Western capitals evidently believe that international laws and agreements prohibiting interference in the internal affairs of other countries do not apply to them. Yes, they like to mention the Helsinki Final Act, but only to accuse someone else of violating it. While falsely charging the socialist countries with 'human rights' violations, imperialist circles are doing their best to steer the world back into the 'cold war.' When they themselves come under fire for their interference in the affairs of other countries, for their attacks on the restricted bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms that exist in the capitalist countries, they act as if the Final Act had never been signed.

This new spurt of NATO activity and its anti-communist thrust are evidence of desperate attempts by this imperialist bloc to halt social progress on our planet. Standing opposed to that is the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and all the democratic, peace forces working for a healthier international climate, for mutually-advantageous cooperation between countries with different social systems.

The forthcoming Belgrade meeting of 35 nations can develop détente. But for that its participants have to remember that Helsinki

was a conference on European security and cooperation. It would therefore be only logical for the Belgrade meeting to concentrate on peace, security and cooperation in Europe.

Europe's future lies not in confrontation of the two blocs, which would only mean more hardship and the danger of military conflict. Europe's future is a continent without weapons, without military spending, without fear of war. The future is for a Europe advancing to social progress in conditions of durable peace. We Canadians have every reason to know that when peace reigns in Europe and international cooperation is developing, the political climate across the world is considerably improved.

MARXIST CLASSICS BACK IN PRINT

The German Ideology. Marx, Engels
Third revised edition. Cloth $4.95

On Literature and Art.
Marx, Engels Cloth $3.95

The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism
Marx, Engels Cloth $1.95

The First Indian War of Independence 1857-1859
Marx, Engels Cloth $1.60

PROGRESS BOOKS
487 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5V 1T4
416-368-3550

exchange of views

Socialist economic integration and international relations

Kazimierz Olszewski
CC Member,
Polish United Workers' Party,
Vice-Chairman of Council
of Ministers,
Chairman of CMEA
Executive Committee

Referring to the strengthening friendship and cooperation of the socialist countries, their impressive achievements, growing strength and influence, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said in addressing the 25th CPSU Congress: 'The socialist countries are playing an ever more prominent part in the world economy. The socialist community has now become the world's most dynamic economic force. In the past five years the industry of its member-countries grew four times as swiftly as that of the developed capitalist states. In 1975 the industrial output of the countries of our community was more than double that of the Common Market countries.'

And referring to the role economic integration has played in all this, Leonid Brezhnev gave the following description of the 1971 long-range Comprehensive Program of socialist economic integration: 'This program, Comrades, raises cooperation among socialist countries to a much higher level than ordinary promotion of trade. For example, it means joint development of natural resources for their common benefit, joint construction of large industrial complexes to meet the needs of all the partners, and cooperation between our countries' enterprises, and whole industries planned for many years ahead. Implementation of the Comprehensive Program has already significantly deepened our economic interaction and made our economies mutually complementary to a greater extent and to the considerable advantage of all concerned.'

This is a terse and vivid description of the main features and trends of the present stage, which will determine the development of the socialist economic community in the years ahead. Among these features are steady, dynamic growth of the member-countries' economic potential and planned extension of socialist economic integration.

Encouraging results

The CMEA countries' economic development in the first half of the 70s has once more confirmed the superiority of the socialist system and the correctness of the economic policy of their Communist and Workers' Parties. The aim of that policy is continued all-round economic development through wider use of the intensive growth factors latent in modern industry and in the achievements of the technological revolution.

Economic progress is best measured by the growth of national income. And in the CMEA countries it rose by approximately 36 per cent in 1971-75, a much steeper rise than the 14 per cent increase in the developed capitalist countries and the Common Market's 12 per cent.

The high economic performance of the CMEA countries is due primarily to the dynamic development of their industry. Their industrial output for 1975 was up 45 per cent on 1970. High growth rates, higher than in any capitalist country, have been maintained for many years. This, too, is an example of the advantages of the socialist mode of production. Industrial output in developed capitalist countries increased only nine per cent in the first half of the 70s, and only seven per cent in the Common Market countries. There is also this inherent feature of socialist economic growth: the highest growth rates in the CMEA community were achieved in the once industrially backward countries. For instance, Rumania showed a rise of 85 per cent, Poland 66 per cent, Bulgaria 55 per cent, Mongolia 55 per cent and Cuba 50 per cent.

In most CMEA countries the highest growth rates have been in industries basic to continued technical progress and accelerated expansion — energy, machine-building and chemicals, and within these industries such specialized branches as electronics, electrical engineering, high-performance machine-tools, synthetic materials, etc., which are key elements of the modernization and restructuring that make for higher effectiveness of the entire national economic organism.

The new technology, now being introduced on an ever wider scale, plus more efficient techniques, have significantly heightened the productivity of social labor. Measured in terms of national income per worker, in 1971-75 it rose by more than 30 per cent in the CMEA community. Industrial modernization can be gauged by the growth of labor productivity in industry. Thus, in the past five years it increased by 33 per cent as compared with 30 per cent in 1966-1970. To this should be added that about 80 per cent of the increment in industrial output in the CMEA community in 1971-1975 was achieved through

higher productivity. The figures for the individual countries are 70 per cent for Bulgaria, 89 for Czechoslovakia, 85 for the German Democratic Republic, over 70 for Poland, 55 for Rumania, 97 for Hungary and 84 for the Soviet Union.

Dynamic economic progress has found expression also in the foreign trade of the CMEA countries, which was 12 per cent above the target figures envisaged in their 1971-75 trade agreements, with an annual average increase of 14.4 per cent, as against 8.2 per cent in the previous five-year period.

Furthermore, this growth was not achieved by raising prices, as is the case in the capitalist world. For prices in trade between the CMEA countries were changed only in 1975, with due account of the interests of all the partners, and cannot be compared with price escalation on the capitalist market.

It will thus be seen that the high growth of foreign trade between CMEA countries is primarily the result of their economic development and operation of the Comprehensive Integration Program, which has had beneficial results for all our countries.

It is not the purpose of this article to give a panoramic picture of the dynamic socialist economy. That has been done in a number of more detailed studies. I propose to deal only with tendencies characteristic of the present economic situation of the CMEA countries and which will shape their trade and economic intercourse in the years ahead.

Dynamic economic development is a key precondition for strengthening their economic, scientific and technological cooperation. It was raised to a higher plane in 1971, the initial year of a long-range and planned integration process. With higher economic potentials, integration became an essential factor of continued social and economic development in the interests of each member country and of the community as a whole. And the importance of integration grows with the economic development of each country.

And so, successful fulfillment of social and economic plans over the past five years and related joint measures became the basis for deeper economic integration. Now we are tackling the new problems posed by the growing requirements and potentialities of all the members of our community.

New stage

It can be said that economic, scientific and technical cooperation between members of CMEA is entering a new stage.

In the coming years, the growing economic requirements of the CMEA countries will confront us with bigger and more complex problems. This, in turn, will require new forms and methods of economic, scientific and technical cooperation.

We shall have to form longer-term trade, economic, scientific and technical contacts, for the economies of the CMEA countries are now more closely interconnected. This lends more importance to joint planning as an integral part of national socio-economic planning. In fact, long-range development in many industries and lines of production often depends on such joint planning. In other words, the task facing CMEA and its member-states is to extend and perfect planning techniques. Plan coordination has from the very start been a prominent feature of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and its Comprehensive Program recommends widening its scope so as to more closely dovetale national plans.

Last year, in coordinating national economic plans for 1976-1980, we worked out a number of measures to promote close interaction of central planning agencies and economic organizations in working out long-term trade and economic exchanges. This has made for more effective joint work in compiling development forecasts for the economy, science and technology; also joint planning of production of certain types of goods (for instance, digital machine-tools, containerization machinery); establishment of international specialized organizations and amalgamations on production and supply of certain types of equipment for such industries as electronics, textiles, atomic energy.

But the most ambitious piece of coordination was the drafting of a plan for joint multilateral undertakings in 1976-1980. Approved at the 29th session of the Council in 1975, it envisages large-scale projects with investments coming from interested CMEA countries, and also agreements on production specialization and cooperation and joint solution of scientific and technological problems.

This plan differs from all previous ones by the fact that the CMEA countries have made provisions within the framework of their national plans and have appropriated the necessary material and financial resources to carry out these projects, which they regard as an organic part of their own development programs. What we have, therefore, is a kind of common plan which, however, retains all the traits of the national plans of the CMEA countries and in no way limits their independent economic activity.

Along with the five-year bilateral trade agreements, the new plan has become an important instrument for effectively coordinating the economic development of the CMEA countries.

Though coordination of national plans is an important and effective factor, it has to be said that it has not substantially lengthened the period, usually five years, covered by existing bilateral trade and economic agreements. The multilateral plan of integration measures, especially joint investment projects, will operate up to 1980, with

longer arrangements made only for reciprocal delivery of a relatively short list of items. One should not, of course, minimize their importance, especially of such joint investment projects as development of natural-gas and iron-ore deposits in the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, it has to be observed that the total cost of all these joint projects is nine billion rubles, or a fraction of the amount involved in trade between the CMEA member-countries in a five-year period.

The leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the governments of the CMEA countries have decided that coordination of economic plans for the period following 1980 should concentrate on pooling their efforts to achieve comprehensive and long-range solutions of the following problems:

— satisfying the CMEA countries' economically substantiated requirements for basic types of energy, fuel and raw materials;

— coordinated development of engineering based on production specialization and cooperation;

— satisfaction of the CMEA countries' rational requirements in basic foods;

— satisfaction of rational requirements in industrial goods;

— expansion of transport links between the CMEA countries;

— increasing their contribution to equalizing economic development levels.

The 29th CMEA session in 1975 decided to draw up long-term coordination programs on all these problems. Last year's 30th council session approved detailed directives and set a timetable for the completion of this work by CMEA agencies and member-countries and all CMEA agencies are now concentrating on drawing up these programs. This work will take about two years and its results may be used in coordinating national economic plans for the period after 1980. The programs will outline concrete measures for 10 to 15 years and will be made the basis for multilateral and bilateral agreements and treaties setting out the obligations of CMEA members in such areas as scientific research, joint capital investments, production, mutual deliveries, and cooperation with third countries.

New dimensions

The long-term comprehensive programs cover a very wide range of questions. There has been nothing comparable in scale and complexity in the whole history of CMEA coordination of economic development. The targets are formidable but attainable because our countries have all the necessary resources: natural wealth, manpower, a sufficiently developed material and technical base and ample experience in economic planning and cooperation.

The drawing up of such programs depends on the internationalist readiness of the CMEA countries to make joint use of their raw material and other resources along with their production, scientific and technological potential for developing each country and the socialist community as a whole. Such socialist solidarity has well-established economic roots. If one considers the present level of the CMEA countries' economic development, their long-term needs and world economic trends, it becomes clear that some of the socialist countries could not cope with many of the fundamental problems of continued socio-economic advance, relying entirely on their own resources.

It cannot be asserted, of course, that the need for integration is the same in all the CMEA countries, it may depend on a lack of certain natural resources, insufficient know-how, restricted demand on the home market for goods that have to be up to the highest world standards, and so on. The differing scales of the economies give rise to different demands. But despite the variety of their specific conditions there are at best two sets of causes prompting the CMEA countries to push ahead with economic integration as one of the most important means of solving the problems of economic growth.

The first is to guarantee raw material supply over as long a period as possible and adopt the most rational methods of using it. This applies mainly to energy and fuel because some CMEA countries are short of energy resources and the world energy market has been dangerously unstable of late. We believe that a certain independence of the violent fluctuations on the world fuel market is an essential condition for steady CMEA economic development.

The strengthening of this independence demands measures connected with the extraction of fuel, production of generators and installation of power-saving technology in every branch of industry and the economy. All kinds of energy resources must be used in rational proportions, including those that until recently — in view of the apparent cheapness of liquid fuels — were not widely used. In the not far distant future atomic power should become an important supplier of our needs.

CMEA experience in meeting the community's raw material and fuel requirements — particularly coordination of national economic plans for 1976-80 — suggests that in future we shall continue to maintain a high rate of economic development. The solution of energy and raw material, problems is well underway. Moreover, the Soviet Union, the richest of the CMEA countries in raw materials, has shown — and this must be stressed — a wide understanding of the problem. We see confirmation of this in such joint projects as the laying of the gas pipeline from the source of the Orenburg area to the

western border of the USSR, or the joint investment of capital to boost iron ore exteaction on Soviet territory.

The second, no less important factor that makes deeper integration imperative is the need to equip the economy with the best and most up-to-date machinery, apparatus, transport, etc., which will stimulate a stable, economically efficient rate of development of material production and services. Of decisive importance in this respect is the demand for maximum sophistication and quality both to satisfy the CMEA countries' needs and strengthen their position as exporters of machinery and equipment to the markets of third countries. Though some progress has been made, the CMEA countries still have a long way to go in this direction.

The production and scientific potential we have at present is sufficient to ensure that cooperation in electrical engineering will become the decisive factor of technical progress throughout the socialist community. Collaboration in research and development has first priority. This is to be followed by a deepening of international specialization and cooperation of production. This is not a new problem. The CMEA has gained a good deal of experience in tackling it over the past ten years or more. The forms and methods have been evolved and, in recent years extended thanks to the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration. They provide a framework for effective solutions to the challenging production, technical and trade problems involved in specialization of electrical machinery and equipment. The task now is to coordinate the long-term program embracing all, or as many as possible of, the demands of the national economies and at the same time concentrating on the technical and production problems which only international specialization and cooperation of production can solve economically.

The planning of collaboration between the CMEA countries for satisfying their fuel and energy requirements and the need for modern machinery and equipment is the crucial factor in devising effective programs in other fields, such as boosting production of food, industrial goods and means of transport, and bringing all the CMEA countries up to a similar economic level.

The socialist countries and world economic relations

The development strategy of the CMEA countries as already stated, hinges on economic integration. At the same time their plans take into account the fact that détente creates favorable conditions for the expansion of economic cooperation between countries with different social systems. The documents of the 25th CPSU Congress, the Seventh PUWP Congress and the congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of other fraternal countries stress that such coopera-

tion is an effective instrument for achieving both economic and political objectives. It is noted, specifically, that the development of stable, long-term, equitable relations with non-socialist countries is economically advantageous for both sides, encourages détente and provides a kind of material base for peaceful coexistence.

'We are striving for a broad expansion of equal, mutually advantageous economic cooperation free of barriers and restrictions,' stated Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the PUWP CC, at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties in 1976. 'The CMEA's initiative on a treaty with the EEC is intended to promote this. We should like to solve general European problems together, problems such as the fuel-energy system, the transport infrastructure and protection of the environment.'

In practice, however, the building of such relationships encounters various obstacles, both political — erected by the opponents of détente and contacts between countries with opposing social systems; and economic — due to the capitalist mode of production and its pernicious effects on the world economy. The latter include such glaring anachronisms in international economic relations as discrimination, diktat, inequality, exploitation, dependence and subordination, cyclical fluctuations of supply and demand in world trade, an unfair price system, and so on. These evils of the world capitalist system bite deep into the development of the newly-free countries, which in recent years have launched an active campaign to rebuild international economic relations on a just foundation.

The desire of the developing countries to end the system of economic inequality, discrimination, exploitation and monopoly domination met with understanding and support from the socialist countries from the outset. Their position on this issue is clear. It is determined by the fact that both the developing and the socialist countries are objectively interested in reshaping international economic relations to end exploitation and injustice in this sphere, set up machinery preventing the negative effects of capitalism on the world economy. At various international forums, in the United Nations, and conferences of international organizations, and so on, the socialist countries give vigorous support to the just demands of the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America for the abolition of all forms of exploitation by the capitalist states of their weaker partners among the young countries. The Soviet government's statement of October 4, 1976 'On Rebuilding International Economic Relations,' in my view, is an important landmark on this road. Its proposals on what precisely should be rebuilt and what means should be used to create international economic relations on

the principles of democracy and justice have been supported by other socialist countries.

Economic cooperation between the socialist and developing countries has been going on for nearly 30 years. The experience gained allows us to make certain generalizations and assessments that shed light on many aspects of contemporary international economic life.

First, I should like to mention the main feature of this cooperation, which expresses its fundamental class character in comparison with external economic relations in the context of the world capitalist economy. I have in mind the fact that the socialist countries have never engaged in any form of exploitation, have never been colonizers, and consequently have no historical debt to pay for the centuries of pillaging of former colonial peoples and their resources. This debt lies fairly and squarely on the capitalist countries, on their monopolies.

By contrast, the economic relations of the developing countries with the socialist community have played a major, and for some of them (India, Egypt, Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and others), decisive role in building-up their state-run economies, economic planning, and training skilled workers, technicians, engineers and scientists. Moreover, the funds allocated by the socialist countries for these purposes do not come out of profits made in the young states, but are genuinely disinterested aid, provided by the unselfish labor of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries. The political, economic and military assistance given by the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community has played a crucial part in promoting the formation and consolidation of the independent young states on the international scene, particularly those that have not fallen into neocolonialist bondage and have maintained their integrity and independence.

The relations between the socialist and the developing countries are devoid of all discrimination, inequality and exploitation. For instance, more than ten years ago the Soviet Union abolished all duty on imports from the developing countries, while the other fraternal socialist countries reduced it to a nominal level. They provide most favorable terms for the industrial exports of the developing countries and encourage their industrialization. Between 1971 and 1975 the average annual growth rate of imports of finished and semi-finished goods from these countries to the socialist countries was roughly 22 per cent, and in the last two years of the period, more than 35 per cent. The CMEA countries have completed or will complete more than 3,000 construction projects in the developing countries.

All this shows how wrong it is, when dealing with the problems of reforming international economic relations, to treat the socialist coun-

tries on the same plane as the capitalist countries. The advocates of this approach, usually taking as their yardstick the GNP, the per capita income and other similar quantitative indices, put both capitalist and socialist countries in the 'rich' category, assign to them practically the same responsibility for the difficult economic position of the developing countries, and make the same claims on them. Clearly, this treatment of the problem of underdevelopment and the ways of resolving it can only benefit those who seek to hide the true causes of the young states' economic troubles, and shield those who are to blame. Both in the past and in the present the main responsibility for this lies not with the 'rich' countries in general, but with imperialism, with the capitalist monopolies, who are ruthlessly exploiting the 'fringe' of the world capitalist economy and pumping the profits made there into the industrially developed capitalist countries. I should like to note also that the concept of 'rich' and 'poor' countries, in the final analysis, tends to isolate the progressive forces in the developing countries from their natural allies — the socialist countries, the working class in the capitalist countries and other movements working for social progress.

The reliability of trade and economic cooperation between the socialist and the developing countries has proved its worth in the face of the grave world economic crisis. The leaders of the newly-free countries are becoming more and more aware of the fundamentally different nature of this cooperation as compared with the relations their countries enter into with the capitalist states. This was reflected, for example, in the Manila Declaration, passed by a conference of developing countries at ministerial level in February 1976. The declaration departed significantly from the previous practice of making identical demands on the socialist and developed capitalist countries. At the fourth session of UNCTAD held last May in Nairobi, a resolution was passed on trade between countries with different social systems. During the debate the demand on the socialist countries for assistance amounting to one per cent of their GNP was withdrawn.

The foreign policy activity of the socialist countries, their equal and fair relations with the developing countries substantially restrict imperialism's ability to dictate to the newly-free countries the conditions of their political and economic development. Of course, imperialism still possesses certain ways of pressuring the 'Third World' and a certain freedom of maneuver, but in general its former might is diminishing. The trend of events shows that with the present balance of class forces in the world the newly-free countries are quite capable of standing up to imperialist dictates and obtaining fair, by which I mean, equitable economic relations.

The prospects of the developing countries' struggle for the rebuild-

ing of international economic relations are closely tied up with the struggle of the progressive peace-loving forces for extension and deepening of détente, for the creation of a reliable system of security in all parts of the world. Détente holds out to the developing countries a sure economic and political advantage from the standpoint of solving the problems of underdevelopment. Specifically, it opens up definite possibilities of switching the military sections of the economy to peaceful lines, which will have a beneficial effect on external economic ties, while the limitation of military pressure as an instrument of policy will make it easier for the young states to set about refashioning the old economic order, for instance, to nationalize the property of foreign monopolies. So it would be wrong to separate, let alone counterpose, the struggle for détente and disarmament, on the one hand, and the struggle for reforming international economic relations, on the other.

There is obviously common ground between the fundamental aspirations of the socialist and the developing countries on a series of key questions of contemporary world development. This common ground forms a sound basis on which cooperation between the socialist community and the states that have arisen as a result of the collapse of the colonial system will continue to grow. Such cooperation is one of the crucial factors in the developing countries' progress and enhancement of their role in world social and historical development.

Proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary process in Africa

Amath Dansoko
CC PB member,
African Independence Party
of Senegal

Discussion of the principles on which communists base their actions is quite natural.[1] Marxism-Leninism is not an ossified set of rules. It provides theoretical generalizations of the historical experience and present-day practice of the class struggle on both the national and international planes. It is therefore logical for us to exchange views on the question of internationalism, its content, place and forms, at the

current stage of the world revolutionary process. We should like to make our modest contribution to this discussion by considering in detail one aspect of the problem.

It is generally accepted that our epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, generates massive and deep-going economic, social and political changes in the life of individual nations and in international relations and brings to light all kinds of new problems. The changes occurring in the world today are primarily a result of the joint anti-imperialist struggle waged by the three great forces of modern times: the socialist world system, the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement. Though imperialism may have considerable reserves, the advances of the world revolutionary process have deprived it of the historical initiative. But we mention this predominant feature of the contemporary world not just in order to refer to a generally accepted fact.

The solution to the grave problems facing humanity is directly and specifically connected with the transforming activity of the revolutionary forces, with the defeats they are inflicting on international imperialism, that constant source of war, domination and exploitation. Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America today are suffering from starvation, poverty and other afflictions. The responsibility for this lies with the capitalist world system and its offspring — imperialism. And the solution of such vitally important problems as the economic recovery of countries liberated from colonialism, the rebuilding of international economic and other relations on the principles of justice, depends to a great extent on further shifts in the global balance of forces toward peace, democracy and socialism, on the continued curbing of the wolf-pack laws of capitalism.

As we see it, this is why the historical initiative won by the fighters for progress and socialism in the battle against imperialism, their offensive spirit, can be maintained and boosted only on the basis of a further consolidation of the anti-imperialist ranks, by further application of the principles of international solidarity, which have provided the foundation of all revolutionary victories in modern times.

In present-day conditions, of course, the spectrum of the social and political forces fighting imperialism and capitalism has widened considerably. The organizational and other forms of this struggle on the national and international levels have undoubtedly become more varied. It would be a mistake to ignore the problems arising therefrom, just as we cannot afford to underestimate the role of each of the new contingents taking part in the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist movement. However, none of this leads us to the conclusion that is

sometimes drawn about the 'inadequacy' or 'limitations' of proletarian internationalism as the basis of the policy of solidarity pursued by the international communist and working-class movement. Our point of view is fortified, specifically, by the position held on this question by the progressive forces of our continent — Africa — although in other respects their views and character may differ.

It should be noted that the communists' adherence to the principle of proletarian internationalism in no way signifies sectarianism or failure to appreciate the contribution made by other forces who aim at the complete or partial transformation of society. On the contrary, the communists' policy has always been designed to achieve maximum unity among all those who fight against imperialism and for progressive social change. The communists do not regard ideological differences as an obstacle to joint action. While stressing the proletarian internationalist basis of their policy of solidarity, they have never tried to impose this concept on allies who cannot yet accept it or perhaps even reject it altogether. On the other hand, such incomprehension or rejection places the communists under no obligation to abandon the principle of proletarian internationalism or restrict it to a framework acceptable to non-proletarian allies at the given stage of development. This is the line that the communists have consistently adopted on the African continent, where, as we know, the leading detachment in the progressive process that is remoulding society in many countries is a social segment of non-proletarian origin — the revolutionary democrats.

As regards the mistakes of a sectarian character that occurred in the policy-making of certain individual communist parties, these were by no means due to adherence to proletarian internationalism. And when one hears that this adherence is tantamount to a refusal to take into consideration the changes that have happened in the world and threatens to put the communists in a position of 'isolation,' and that it closes the door to fruitful revolutionary practice, one feels bound to conclude that the error in such assertions lies in the way the problem has been presented.

If such allegations were true, it would indeed be hard to understand the highly significant victories won in recent years by the international revolutionary movement. Above all, we have in mind the historic victory of the people of Vietnam, achieved under the leadership of its Communist Party, which in all its activities based itself on proletarian internationalism. Kaysone Phomvihan, General Secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos, has written in this journal about the decisive significance of this victory for the victory of the Laotian people.[2] As regards our own continent, the liberation of the Portuguese colonies, achieved under the leadership of the

revolutionary-democratic forces and organizations, was a striking illustration of the vitality of proletarian international solidarity.

The notable thing is that these forces and organizations show no inclination whatever to cast doubt on the principle of proletarian internationalism. And this is by no means due to a desire to 'keep up the tradition' at all costs, regardless of reality. Awareness of the organic link between the liberation struggle in one's own country with the worldwide struggle against imperialism has persuaded them of the viability and necessity of this principle. As President Samora Machel of Mozambique stressed during the recent FRELIMO Congress: 'Our party is an internationalist party. We realized the importance of proletarian internationalism in the long years of the battle for national liberation.'

In tropical Africa all the countries that have chosen a realistic socialist orientation recognize proletarian internationalism as a factor of exceptional importance for the national-liberation movement in both past and present stages. What makes this fact all the more significant is that the people and organizations in power in these countries that have emerged in the past 20 years certainly did not adopt all the theoretical principles of the communist movement, whatever the influence of the communists. There is no insuperable barrier between the objectives of general anti-imperialist and proletarian solidarity, although the two concepts should not, of course, be confused. So it is quite natural that in the eyes of the Democratic Party of Guinea, the MPLA, the Congolese Party of Labor, FRELIMO, the revolutionaries of Somali, Ethiopia and Benin, the movement they are directing against imperialism and capitalism on both the national and international plane should be very closely connected with proletarian internationalism.

There is nothing 'passé' or backward-looking in this attitude. It springs from determination to resolve the basic contradiction between their peoples and imperialism in a revolutionary way, making full use of the opportunities afforded to the national-liberation movement by the existence of the powerful socialist camp, the international proletariat and their vanguard — Marxist-Leninist parties. And it should be specially noted that the ideological evolution of the revolutionary-democratic parties and organizations toward Marxism-Leninism (some of them already recognize it as their ideology) in no way detracts from their own original features, which incidentally are something that no one in the communist movement would think of 'reproaching' them for. On the contrary, this originality, this national character, has been emphasized in the official documents of the world communist movement. The efforts of the revolutionary-democratic parties and organizations to effect the anti-

capitalist changes are actively supported by the countries of the socialist community, by communists the world over.

As we know, the socialist-oriented countries cannot for a number of reasons abandon their fairly close economic and other ties with individual Western countries and hence with the capitalist world as a whole, which thus exerts and will for a time continue to exert considerable influence on various aspects of their economic and social life. But this only increases the significance for these countries of the factor of solidarity and support from the world's progressive forces, particularly world socialism, which is based on proletarian internationalism.

The weekly *Etumba,* central organ of the Congolese Party of Labor, gives a clear formulation of the position of these countries: '*Proletarian internationalism* is the best term to express the splendid ties of solidarity (between the oppressed peoples of the world and the socialist countries — *A.D.*) .... In their insidious propaganda the imperialists and their yesmen have buried proletarian internationalism a good many times. But what has been the result? Proletarian solidarity has shown itself time and again lately in many parts of the world ... Angola, our closest neighbor, though besieged by reactionary aggressive forces, emerged from its difficult situation only thanks to the practical application of proletarian internationalism.'[3] And it is not accidental that representatives of the socialist-oriented countries and organizations of Tropical Africa speaking at communist party congresses and various anti-imperialist gatherings unfailingly and unanimously declare: 'Long live proletarian internationalism!'

On March 15, 1976, in Konakri, in the presence of Agostinho Neto, Luiz Cabral and Sekou Toure, the leaders of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and the Republic of Guinea, Fidel Castro described the lessons of the events in Angola to tens of thousands of Guineans who had assembled there. Angola, he said, has every right 'to turn for help to the revolutionary peoples, because imperialism is strong and no small country, like Cuba, like Angola, can repel imperialist aggression alone and unaided. *The revolutionary camp exists,* the revolutionary movement exists, proletarian internationalism exists, and if imperialism wants to know what proletarian internationalism is, Angola is a fine example.'[4]

President Neto, expressing his gratitude to the Cuban people and their Communist Party for the fraternal assistance rendered to the Angolan people's struggle, declared in his speech in Pinar del Rio: 'We are here to reaffirm our loyalty to the principle of proletarian internationalism, which has made it possible to turn blood ties and a common history into an invincible force bringing freedom, independence and happiness to our peoples.'[5]

This principled position does not in the least imply any sectarian

bigotry or doctrinaire isolation on the part of the socialist-oriented states of Tropical Africa in their approach to the major continental and international problems. They belong to the Organization of African Unity, where they maintain a firm anti-imperialist course. Motivated by the deep aspirations of the African masses, these states have been able to neutralize all the attempts to push the OAU into one or another form of pro-imperialist policy. Of course, the Organization of African Unity contains a very mixed bag of political forces. Some countries belonging to the OAU are obviously vulnerable to imperialist influence. The events in Angola showed the reality of inter-African contradictions. But they also demonstrated the great opportunities that the progressive countries have both on the African continent and in the international field for thwarting imperialist conspiracies, securing national independence and advancing along the road to socialism.

The same may be said of the movement of non-alignment. Such socialist countries as Cuba and Vietnam take part in this movement without seeing any contradiction between their adherence to proletarian internationalism and joint efforts with the other members to find solutions to international problems. There is no such contradiction and it is characteristic that even conservative-minded regimes in the Afro-Asian world make no attempt to raise the question of 'incompatibility' between proletarian internationalist policy and the non-alignment movement.

The facts corroborate that proletarian internationalism does not ignore the specifics of our age, that it has not been ruled out by the realities of the contemporary revolutionary struggle. On the contrary, it is extremely viable and opens to the road for a flexible policy of alliances that may vary in character and depth.

As regards the struggle for socialism, it is worth mentioning one of the fundamental theses of Marxism stressed by Lenin: 'Socialist dreams turned into the socialist struggle of the millions only when Marx's scientific socialism had linked up the urge for change with the struggle of a definite class. Outside the class struggle, socialism is either a hollow phrase or a naive dream.' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 9, p. 443).

The alliance of the national-liberation movement of Tropical Africa with the socialist community as its main bulwark and support is indeed one of the forms of linking the 'urge for change' with the struggle of a definite class. Life shows convincingly that the socialist world system, the chief gain and achievement of the international working class, is blazing the main trail of mankind's present and future development and is a reliable stronghold of the peoples' struggle for national and social liberation.

1. See *WMR*, January, February and March 1977.
2. K. Phomvihan. 'The victory of creative Marxism-Leninism in Laos,' *WMR*, March 1977.
3. *Etumba*, No. 404, June 12-19, 1976.
4. *Horoya*, 20,3,1976.
5. *Granma*, 28,7,1976.

Export of capital — one of the essential bases of imperialism

John Purton
British economist

In the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, with its entangled knot of acute contradictions, imperialism is attempting to bolster its shaken positions by mustering internal resources. From the catalogue of capitalism's 'adaptive reactions' we shall examine the export of capital described by Lenin as ' . . . one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 277).

Export of capital is crucial to capitalism's international economic intercourse. There has been a growth of foreign investments in the postwar period as a result of state-monopoly measures encouraging capital export, expanding capitalist integration and lifting barriers to international migration of capital. This growth is propelled by the race for maximum profits just as it was at the writing of 'Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,' 'The need to export capital,' Lenin wrote, 'arises from the fact that in a few countries capitalism has become "over-ripe" and . . . capital cannot find a field for "profitable" investment (*Ibid*, p. 242).

In its present stage capital export is closely bound up with operations of the multinational corporations whose rapid expansion in the last 15 years has become a prominent feature of the development of modern capitalism.

The first international imperialist monopolies appeared at the dawn of the 20th century. Although at the initial stages of imperialist development, such a level of concentration and centralization of capital and the transformation of national monopolies into international was not yet typical, it was already noticed by Lenin. Examining the formation of international cartels, of 'supermonopolies,' he wrote:

WMR received this article by John Purton not long before he passed away.

'This is a new stage of world concentration of capital and production, incomparably higher than the preceding stages' (*Ibid,* p. 246).

At the onset of the 1960s the intensity of mutual penetration of foreign capital had reached a level suggesting new types of international monopolies and of a definite departure of state-monopoly capital from a national environment.

International monopolies are already in control of approximately a third of the total gross national product of the non-socialist countries. According to statistics for the first half of the 1970s, foreign branches of the international monopolies produce more goods in volume than the world capitalist export.

Such transnational giants are vigorously integrating themselves into the world capitalist system. Internationalizing the phases of the production cycle and circulation and supported by the governments of the base countries, the international monopolies are putting the advantages of international division of labor to good use.

Bourgeois economists like J.K. Galbraith have maintained that the scope of such giants permits effective economic planning (*The New Industrial State,* New York, 1968; *Economics and the Public Purpose,* Boston, 1973). This vain hope has been dashed by the unforeseen depth of the 'recession' in the middle 70s. Indubitably, such developments extend what Engels called the 'socialization of production.' It failed, however, to eradicate the basic contradictions; it only reproduced them on a larger scale.

The escalating growth of the transnational corporations is a clear example of the contradiction deriving from the uneven development of monopoly capitalism, stressed by Lenin, and the sharpening struggle between the three main centers of capitalism — the USA, Western Europe and Japan. For their part, the international monopolies, effective levers in inter-imperialist rivalry working for the economic and political goals of certain capitalist countries and for the economic reshaping of the capitalist world, operate in their own interests which often contradict the interests of the base countries. This injects additional chaos and instability into the world economy, is a factor of the uneven development of capitalism and the material base for a further worsening of inter-imperialist contradictions.

Most transnational giants are based in the United States. Of the 7,276 international corporations existing in the early 70s, a third and the most powerful, have their main centers in the USA. The United Kingdom is in second place with about 25 per cent, and the FRG is in third place.[1]

In the last 25 years the U.S. international monopolies had established over 10,000 foreign branches.[2] These international monopolies, however, have been seriously rivalled in recent years by West Euro-

pean and Japanese multinational corporations, whose role in export of capital is growing. The cost of articles manufactured by multinational corporation branches in Europe and the direct foreign investments are almost level with the identical indices of U.S. international monopolies. Economists predict that Japan could become a leading capital exporter by 1980.

Besides their rivalry there also seems to be a definite trend among the multinational corporations (MNC) to form blocs, particularly in countries where the foreign monopolies are threatened with nationalization. For example, the 'Council of the Americas' is made up of over 200 U.S. corporations with interests in Latin America.

But, the MNC never lose sight of their main goal of ensuring conditions for broad economic expansion, growing profits, strengthening imperialist positions as a whole and of national imperialism in particular. The MNC strive to create a socio-political climate in the emerging nations for their unhampered exploitation of raw materials and labor.

However, when considering MNC operations there emerges an apparent contradiction of the neo-colonialist character of their activities.

In the postwar period the rate of growth of capital export and trade among the industrial capitalist countries was greater than it was between them and the emerging nations. Direct international monopoly investments in the emerging nations dropped in the 60s. Bourgeois and reformist thinkers have suggested that imperialism was over because it did not appear to depend in the main on capital export to colonies. It was supposed to have been replaced by 'free' international investment and trade within the orbit of managed 'mixed' economies. However, 'imperialism in its basic essence does not change but it is forced to operate in a changing world.'[3]

There can be no doubting the fact that the developed capitalist countries still bank heavily on direct investments in the economies of emerging nations. At the end of the 60s, according to UN statistics, the emerging nations accounted for approximately a third of the investments of 16 developed capitalist countries. The share is almost identical for U.S. and West European MNC investments in Asian, African and Latin American developing countries. The Japanese international monopolies, however, have placed a much larger share of their foreign investments (almost 60 per cent) in the developing areas of the world.

British, French, Dutch and Portuguese foreign investments hold a special place in Western Europe for in the past these countries possessed large colonial territories and their MNC aim mostly at the developing world. In the case of Britain, still the second center of

capital export, the essential colonial (now neo-colonial) direction of capital export remained characteristic down to recent years. Just before 1914, nearly half of British foreign investments were in the colonies and dominions. From 1914 to 1970 more than half were in the area comprising the British Empire.

Furthermore, in search of strategic materials and superprofits, U.S. monopoly capital did not neglect the less developed countries. U.S. investments in Africa multiplied 4.4 times between 1960 and 1973 while private U.S. investments in all the developing countries went from $11.1 billion to 27.9 billion (*Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1975, p. 801). So, in absolute figures the export of capital to the developing countries did not decrease, but increased everywhere.

Statistics show that during the present fuel and raw materials shortage the developing countries account for a large share of direct investment by the developed capitalist countries. In 1975, for example, the U.S. oil corporations doubled their new investments and showed a 20 per cent increase of reinvestments despite the drop in rate of U.S. export of capital because of the economic crisis and despite the restrictions enforced by several emerging nations. In other words, exploitation of the peoples of the emerging nations on a world scale remains one of capitalism's characteristic traits.

In dealing with the export of capital to the advanced and to the developing countries, mention should be made of the enormously increased role of finance capital. One of the means by which U.S., West European and Japanese finance capital extended its grip externally was by extending its banking network overseas, correspondent banks, subsidiary corporations and branch banks. The number of U.S. bank branches overseas increased steadily between 1965-72 from 303 to 1,009. By 1973 British banks had 192 overseas branches, Japanese — 145, West German — 103 and French — 91 (*Multinational Corporations in World Development*, p. 12). This banking-capital expansion merged with the industrial expansion of the monopolies.

The international banking monopolies or multinational banks that appeared in the 70s were a new stage of concentration and centralization of loans. There were two basic reasons prompting the formation of such banks: growing economic internationalization and rapid expansion of MNC and the sharpening rivalry in the capitalist credit-banking system.

The operations of such giants as EBIC (European Banks International Company), ABECOR (Associated Banks of European Corporation), CCB (Commerzbank, Credit Lyonnais, Banco di Roma), Orion and the International Energy Bank show that the international banking monopolies were set up mainly for the convenience of the

international industrial monopolies not only as concerns banking operations, but also in repatterning spheres of influence. The formation of these multinational banks is a sign that the structure of finance capital is growing and becoming more complex, thus creating new, and worsening old forms of rivalry.

Capital export, we have established, is inseparable from the expansion of international industrial monopolies and banks and they play the leading role in the export of investment and loan capital. Let us examine certain aspects of foreign investments. But first, why the accelerated rate of capital export to the developed capitalist countries?

First of all, the science-technical revolution greatly extended the field of profitable investments in the developed capitalist countries, one of the reasons for the sharp shift in the flow of capital balance in favor of U.S. monopolies over the West European during two postwar decades. West European monopolies were in a position to launch their counter-offensive only in the middle 60s after accumulating a sufficiently large financial and technical potential. The other reason for the flow of capital to developed capitalist countries was the prospect of losing property as a result of nationalization in emancipated countries.

Among the favorable conditions attracting capital to Western Europe, for example, is their more or less stable economic growth in the postwar years and the temporary success of state-monopoly capitalism. This growth, covering almost a quarter of a century, and nostalgically called the 'long boom,' provided fertile ground for fast accumulation. U.S. capital export was a part cause of as well as being attracted by the 'boom.'

Another important factor in growth of capital export to developed capitalism is the quest for additional means of securing entry to the former colonial and dependent territories. 'When a U.S. corporation or a bank attains an interest in a West German, Japanese or French corporation, it also becomes a partner in their foreign colonial operations' (Gus Hall, *Imperialism Today*, p. 55).

The activity of U.S. monopoly capital in expanding its industrial and financial network has been furthered by the position of the U.S. dollar as the major currency in the capitalist world. Using this advantage, U.S. monopolies, increasing their direct investments, created a flood of investment dollars in the world's currency markets. This obviously caused a deficit in the U.S. balance of payments and later was one of the factors stopping the free conversion of dollars into gold. A large part of the dollars circulating in the West European currency markets (the so-called Euro-dollar), together with the U.S. banking network covering the entire capitalist world, let financial

capital profit by financing the 'boom' in the countries of Western Europe.

Another important side of capital export is the growing significance of direct foreign investments by which the international monopolies gain control over exploitation of overseas raw materials and labor. Capital export in the form of portfolio investments not allowing for such control, has been relegated to the background.

Also, there are the many methods used to achieve neo-colonialist goals. The collapse of the system of direct colonial rule has called for a new, more flexible strategy which would ensure monopoly capital's entry into the economies of developing countries and control over certain spheres of capital investment in these countries.

International capital is banking on the support of the bourgeoisie and ruling circles in certain emerging states and is striving to arouse their interests economically in cooperating with the monopolies. The sole aim is to keep the countries within the capitalist orbit and be able to exploit their raw materials. Also popular are the so-called mixed companies with the foreign monopolies attracting participation by local private and state capital. The international monopolies gain certain advantages from neo-colonialist methods: local capital is centralized, support is ensured of multinational monopoly control of resources at lowest cost.

In other words, international monopoly capital continues exploiting the developing countries, with the only difference that the crude methods of colonial days have given way to more refined neo-colonialist economic methods of plunder.

Monopoly capital exploits not only the industrially poorly developed emerging nations, acquiring superprofits on the cheap labor and raw materials, but the comparatively industrialized emerging nations also. One effective way the monopolies pump profits out of these countries is by using the existing system of international division of labor and their own technological and economic superiority. Another sign of exploitation is the unfavorable foreign trade balance of the 50s and up to the present day when developing state-monopoly capitalism was accompanied by a neo-colonialist policy.[4]

President Geisel of Brazil, visiting Britain in 1976, declared that he aimed to make Brazil a leading industrial country. However, for a more complete picture it should be added that one of the main features of the 'Brazilian model' is the wide attraction of foreign capital. For this reason Brazil, occupying a special place in the monopolies' Latin American strategy, and in the 'third world' in general, remains a client state of finance capital with an industry working mainly to pay the country's debt to the imperialist countries. Judging by 1977 appraisals payment of interest on foreign loans will

amount to $2.3 billion while debts will consume $3.6 billion. By the end of 1977 Brazil's foreign debt will total $25.8 billion against $22.6 billion in 1976 (*Financial Times*, January 14, 1977). By comparison Brazil's exports in 1976 amounted to $10.1 billion.

As for the developing countries as a whole, the export of profits made on investments more than doubled in the ten years 1960-70. This tendency, reports the UNCTAD secretariat, will continue and by 1980 the emerging countries will lose about $25 billion.

Yet another means used by monopoly capital for pursuing its neo-colonialist exploitation is to make use of worldwide capitalist economic organizations, specific to the period of state-monopoly capitalism, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, etc. The IMF, for example, has been used as one means of stabilizing the economies of 'advanced' capitalist countries that get into balance of payments crises, as happened with Britain. It extends loans enabling these countries to resume their role in the world system of monopoly capitalism. The IMF has likewise been used to 'stabilize' the economies of developing countries in the interests of neo-colonialist exploitation. Such 'stabilization' is aimed at securing the payment of interest on loans and the remittance of profits on monopoly capital investments. Needless to say, loans on these conditions only serve to intensify exploitation, increase debt and interest payments.

An indication of the exploitation of the developing countries is their overall external debt. In 1965 it was $34 billion (more than four times the 1956 figure), and $89 billion in 1972. Interest payments increased accordingly from $2.7 billion in 1965 to $7.5 billion in 1972 (*World Bank Annual Report 1974,* Washington, pp. 85, 86, 91). According to the World Bank, this external debt increased to $151.4 billion by 1975 while payments on loans were at $10 billion in 1975, and $12.5 billion in 1976. Clearly such 'development' is a sign of mounting exploitation of the emerging nations in the interests of finance capital.

World economic development in the 70s is characterized by the growing role of the oil producing countries in large-scale capital export. The increase in oil prices by OPEC countries has sharply raised their incomes and accumulation of capital. And most of these countries cannot, as yet, economically assimilate this capital. Part was used by the OPEC countries to increase imports of commodities from the main capitalist countries, and for industrialization. However, a large part of the income on oil was placed in West European and U.S. banks, in Arabian multinational banks established with the help of the leading imperialist nations. The imperialist powers, apprehensive that with the continuing monetary crisis concentration of large sums of oil dollars in the oil-producing countries could cause

another upheaval, took measures to channel this money back to their own economies, to start circulation of surplus oil capital and help ease the economic difficulties. The Euro-dollar market, the international monetary market and international organizations played a big role in siphoning capital from OPEC countries back to the citadels of imperialism, thereby complicating the struggle of the emerging nations for economic independence.

The new multinational banking systems set up in the OPEC countries have the same goal. Through them the international banking monopolies hope to grasp control of the growing financial resources of the oil-producing countries, making them available to the monopolies and relegating the oil countries to the state of nominal possessors of 'oil money.' So far the capitalist banking systems have successfully returned a large portion of the oil dollars to finance capital channels.

If before, the imperialists profited by the exploitation of raw material and labor resources of the oil-producing countries, today, they are persistently attempting to do the same through capitalization of oil currency. The oil-producing countries, however, intend creating conditions to deal independently with their resources, and the balance of forces in the world today makes this a reality. Important in this respect are the loans and credits some emerging countries extend to other emerging countries, usually with no compensation.

Another aspect of this problem worthy of attention is that in 1974-76 certain oil-producing countries extended large credits to Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the FRG. This partnership between the developing oil-producing countries and the leading capitalist countries broadens the ties of international finance capital which exploits the labor of both sides. There was wide coverage in the press, for instance, of Japan's negotiations with several Mideast countries on oil deliveries in exchange for manufactured articles. This joint project would be financed by loans from finance capital which, in turn, is refurbished by 'oil money.' Finance capital seems to be an independent force here controlling the manufacturing industry in both the developed and developing countries.

In examining finance capital operations it would be wrong to disregard the sharpening of contradictions between nationally isolated imperialism and between developed capitalism and the emerging nations, the result of the new situation on the oil market. It would be equally wrong to ignore the fact that the price rise following the action of the OPEC countries is in opposition to the immediate interests of the working class in imperialist countries, through raising the cost of living. The bourgeois media immediately laid the blame on the OPEC countries. But, in the long run, the working class in the im-

perialist countries, and this includes Great Britain, is fully aware of who is to blame and support the anti-imperialist struggle in the developing countries.

The role of the bourgeois states must be considered when examining international monopoly expansionism. State-monopoly control of capital export has a large assortment of methods at its disposal, ranging from tax exemptions, financial support, overseas investment guarantees and information services, to political support. Weaving its extensive neo-colonialist network, monopoly capital strives for state support in imperialist and in developing countries. The state provides investments in the least profitable economic spheres of the receiving countries, say, the infrastructure and helps the monopolies take in the required profits. A new trait in export of loans, an effective neo-colonialist lever in itself, is the monopoly intention to saddle the state with the risks connected with foreign loans and credits. In state-monopoly capitalism, the state extends vitally important aid to the monopolies in their neo-colonialist operations, also providing export capital and guaranteeing private investments.

The relations of the state to monopoly capital have become subject to the growing need for a supportive role of the state. The alliance between the bourgeois state and internationalized finance capital is contradictory. However, individual states may, at times, pursue policies antagonistic to individual monopolies, in the interests of national capital as a whole. It appears wrong, therefore, to regard the relationship as one dominated solely by the monopolies, on the one hand, or solely by the state, on the other. Rather, state-monopoly capitalism is an entity which involves not a complete fusion, but unity in contradiction.

The situation differs in the emerging nations, where the bourgeoisie is not sufficiently strong and where the state plays the leading role either as obedient ally of the imperialist monopolies, or, on the contrary, employs an independent economic policy. The position of the state on domestic economic development, the direction of overseas ties, its attitude toward national capital and the international monopolies, can undergo radical changes depending on the correlation of national and external class forces and the pressure applied to it.

Apparently the period of rapid and relatively easy accumulation by state-monopoly capitalism is over; a possibly long period of much greater difficulties in maintaining its general rate of profit has begun, a period of deepening cycles of overproduction and increasingly endemic inflation. In these condition, it is to be expected that state-monopoly capitalism will turn to its tested means of increasing exploi-

tation and attacking existing democratic rights. This will sharpen the class struggle.

Finance capital, dependent as before on neo-colonialist exploitation, on the labor and materials and even on the industrialization of the less developed countries, will apply itself more and more to linking the resources of the developing countries to the monopolies. As the general crisis of capitalism deepens finance capital will take advantage of the uneven development of production, trade and investments in various countries in a bid to 'spread its nets,' as Lenin put it, and to turn to ever new forms of neo-colonialist exploitation. Sections of the ruling circles in the developing countries may, in some cases, be lured into the spider's web of finance capital. The latter grows even faster, but it will outgrow its strength, brought down by its internal contradictions and by the conscious struggle of the peoples.

Crises in the capitalist world will deepen as the competition between the two world systems continues, as socialism progresses and strengthens its positions. The developing countries are also challenging imperialism. As they fight for a new economic order, supported by the USSR and the other socialist states, these countries threaten to undermine imperialist exploitation.

WMR plans to continue publication of articles analyzing key features of present-day capitalism in the light of Lenin's theory of imperialism. The worsening general crisis of capitalism and its influence on the class struggle; national and international monopolies under the system of state-monopoly capitalism; state-monopoly regulation; finance capital and the credit system; the main centers of inter-imperialist rivalry; economic essence of neo-colonialism; détente and the capitalist economy, are among the subjects the articles will deal with.

1. *Multinational Corporations in World Development,* UN, New York, 1973, p. 138.
2. Gus Hall, *Imperialism Today,* New York, 1972, p. 49.
3. *Ibid.,* p. 53.
4. In the period 1951-56 the developing countries had a favorable trade balance with the imperialist powers. In the five years of 1957-62 it showed a deficit of $8.4 billion. In 1973 the overall export of the 'third world' countries topped imports by $11.8 billion, and $21.1 billion in 1975. Without the oil producing countries the unfavorable balance was $10 billion in 1973, $28.9 billion in 1974 and $37.9 billion in 1975. (Monthly Bulletin of Statistics. UN, November 1976, Vol. XXX, No. 11, pp. 110-111.)

Party experience

Roads of revolution

Jorge Insuza
Political Commission member,
CP of Chile

The revolutionary process in Chile is the first prolonged experiment in the peaceful development of revolution. The international communist movement regards it as an event whose analysis could contribute significantly to perfecting revolutionary strategy and tactics. Study of the class struggle in this period yields conclusions that enrich the theory of the development of revolution by peaceful means, show exactly how limited these means are, and how relevant is the Marxist-Leninist proposition on ability to use all forms of struggle.

For us Chilean communists a precise assessment of the process as a whole with an analysis of its victories and failures is essential to the success of our efforts both now and in the future. This task, to which attention was drawn immediately after the coup, is still as important as ever.

Our experience confirms that the roads of revolution — peaceful and non-peaceful — cannot and should not be regarded as mutually exclusive. Treating them as opposite poles is dangerous to the whole revolutionary process.

Marx, speaking for the revolutionary workers, warned the reactionaries, ' . . . We shall act against you peacefully where it is possible for us to do so, and by force of arms when that becomes necessary.' This definition of tactics has lost none of its significance today. A striking example of such an approach to development of the revolutionary process, when the different roads to power and its consolidation are considered in their dialectical unity, was Lenin's conception, put into practice in 1917. In April of that year he pointed to the possibility of the peaceful development of the revolution; after the July events he spoke of the necessity of preparing for an armed uprising; in September he again considered peaceful development possible and called for efforts to realize this possibility; and finally, only a little later he drew the conclusion that there must be an armed uprising, which in fact led to the victory of October.

This is the fourth in a series of articles on the lessons of Chile. See *WMR*, January, February and March 1977.

Our party's interest in the problem of the peaceful development of the revolution goes back a long way. In the 1960s we made a deeper study of these problems, using the conclusions drawn from past experience to work out and creatively apply the Marxist propositions on the peaceful transition to socialism. Our notion of how this road should actually be travelled in Chile was gradually perfected on the basis of the general laws of revolution and the country's national peculiarities. The communists proposed that the working class should become a rallying point for the majority, for all the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic forces, so that a government capable of effecting the revolutionary changes necessitated by the mounting crisis of Chilean society could be formed. The aim was to carry out an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and agrarian revolution with the long-term goal of moving on toward socialism. Having established two strategic stages of the revolution, we planned to put them into effect as a single unbroken, revolutionary process. This possibility rested on the objective interconnection between the goals of the two stages, and also on the leading role which the working class could and should undertake in a broad alliance with the forces interested in change. Our party pointed out that the revolutionary crisis was imminent and at the same time noted the combination of objective, subjective, national and international factors that would allow the people of Chile to gain power without the use of armed force as the chief means of struggle. This gave a powerful impetus to the development of the mass movement and greater scope for rallying the majority of the population around the working class.

The party had to explain its plans. It had to defend them from numerous attacks and to overcome misunderstanding. The revolutionary character of this road was proved both in theory and practice. To avoid any misunderstandings a precise definition of the word 'peaceful' was given. Peaceful development of the process did not mean that the struggle of the people's movement should proceed only within the framework of bourgeois legal forms; nor was it necessarily, let alone exclusively, to be associated with electioneering. The peaceful road (we also called it the 'unarmed' road) did not, and could not, mean total repudiation of the use of force for removing the reactionary classes from power. A revolution, as we realized, always entails force and social coercion, although it does not always assume armed forms.

In all the documents of our party it was noted that the choice of road did not depend only on the subjective decision of the revolutionaries. Changes in the situation should be foreseen and prepared for in advance. This idea is clearly expressed in our 1969 program. Whereas, previously, the stress was laid on the possibility

of peaceful development of the revolution, now, as Luis Corvalan said at the 14th National Congress of the Communist Party of Chile, 'the new program declares that revolution is a complex process comprising all forms of the struggle that our people are waging, and that *its roads are determined according to the historical situation, but must invariably be based on the activity of the masses*.

'In view of this the revolutionary solution should not necessarily be linked in advance with any one definite road.'

This assessment was not associated with any change of the tactics we had adopted, but was a result of their better elaboration.

In the light of our experience it can be seen that a deeper study of the concepts of the 'peaceful' and 'armed' roads must be made, that they must be stripped of all ambiguity, that we must realize that they belong not to the sphere of strategy but to that of tactics, which changes according to circumstances. The political line must be analyzed and checked from the standpoint of the interconnection and dialectical unity of its components. As I have noted above, our view on this point of dialectics was made more precise. But a tendency to absolutize the peaceful road still persisted. We sometimes referred to it as 'the natural channel,' and the correct proposition that it would be necessary at a certain stage to follow 'only one line' was taken by many people as meaning that the road we were following at the given moment would be that one line.

. Lenin said that a revolutionary party should be able to command all forms of struggle. He emphasized, however, that one should not confuse 'fundamental recognition, *in principle,* of all means of struggle, of all plans and methods, provided they are expedient, with the demand *at a given political moment* to be guided by a strictly observed plan . . . ' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 5, p. 391).

When you are in the thick of the fight it is not always easy to reach a practical decision. You have to take into account what forms of struggle are dictated by the objective situation. Lenin noted this in his day and it came out very plainly in the Chilean events.

'Every form of struggle requires a corresponding technique and a corresponding apparatus,' Lenin emphasized. 'When objective conditions make the parliamentary struggle the principal form of struggle, the features of the apparatus for parliamentary struggle inevitably became more marked in the party.' (Vol. 11, p. 354). Intensification of such features is dangerous in the sense that it can hamper the skillful change of tactics that a change in the situation demands, and this danger can be diminished only by very attentive and thoughtful action by the leadership and the whole party. We were thoughtful and attentive, but this was not enough.

Despite some oversights, the basic theoretical propositions of a

strategical and partially tactical character evolved by the party helped to mobilize the broad masses in the fight for revolutionary goals. The conditions that brought the developing revolutionary situation to a head were created mainly by unarmed means. Practice showed that a political line which correctly defined the main enemies and the direction of the main blow, put the main emphasis on development of the mass struggle, and was geared to the pre-election situation, could lead to victory. Following this line through stubborn class battles in all spheres of social activity enabled the Popular Unity alliance to win the post of President of the Republic. The victory of 1970 gave the revolutionary government access to power (or rather partial power) with the help of the bourgeois electoral machinery and the laws of bourgeois democracy. Lenin's theory of revolution thus became reality.

Does this mean that the reverses that followed prove the impossibility of carrying out a revolution by peaceful means (as the ideologies of the big and petty bourgeoisie are now saying)? A genuinely scientific analysis certainly does not warrant this conclusion. At the same time, in analyzing the situation we see what steps should have been taken but were not taken or not taken energetically and resolutely enough to exploit the advantage already gained by peaceful means.

The following general conclusion may also be drawn. The peaceful development of revolution is a process that is completed only when the question of power is finally decided, when the possibility of restoration of the power of the old classes has been ruled out, and the new democracy and new leadership of society have been firmly established. Certain phases can be defined in this process. The popular forces' winning of power (at first only partial power) completes the first phase. Then comes the period of solving the 'second-day' problems — the assertion of the revolutionary gains and the consolidation of forces, when the question on the agenda is "who will win?" The general preconditions for victory in both phases exist, but the pressure on the revolutionary movement in each differs. And reaction may be so fierce that it imposes the need for use of revolutionary armed force. This means that the revolutionary process in the second phase must follow a different course from what it did in the first. But, on the one hand, this does not cancel the first step, the first victory and, on the other, reaction's chances of provoking civil war are diminished if the revolutionaries do their work well.

The experience of Chile up to 1970 and for a certain time afterwards suggests that the peaceful development of the revolutionary process is the most acceptable road, if there is the opportunity and, of course, only while that opportunity exists. In a revolutionary situation only the absence of conditions for the peaceful development of the revolu-

tion or their having been whittled down, makes it possible and imperative to take the road of armed struggle.

The possibilities of developing the revolution by peaceful means in present-day conditions are closely linked with the substantial changes that have taken place in the world since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The growing prestige of the socialist countries makes these possibilities more and more realistic. It is becoming increasingly difficult for imperialism to export counter-revolution, to engage in direct armed intervention that has to be answered by the use of armed revolutionary force. The victory of the Vietnam revolution, which struck a serious blow at the export of counter-revolution, is a symbol of our times. This is also true of the victory in Cuba, which showed, apart from everything else, that these are situations in which imperialism cannot intervene successfully with its own forces. And although both revolutions involved a fierce armed struggle, they nevertheless confirm that the existence of international preconditions offer revolution a peaceful road in cases where the international factors combine with the national.

The Chilean events also reaffirmed the fact that the influence of international factors depends largely on the position taken by the political leaders of the revolutionary process, on their ability to use these factors as a lever, on their attitude to the support that the socialist countries are quite prepared to offer the progressive movement without any strings attached.

Some groups stress the difficulties of the peaceful transition arising from the domination of imperialism in Latin America. They focus attention on the ferocity with which imperialism defends its 'strategic reserve.' To this they add the argument that geographical position is a factor of political significance. Here we are certainly dealing with real facts, but they can be compensated, and more than compensated, if the revolutionary movements are firmly oriented on support from the forces of existing socialism and proletarian solidarity. This is an extremely important question of principle and practice. It is not isolation from the socialist countries but, on the contrary, strengthening of ties with them that improves the chances of success on the peaceful road, or come to that, any success at all for the revolution, no matter what road it takes.

The new international situation is one of the main justifications for the general assertion that today peaceful revolution stands a better chance. However, the improvement of the balance of world forces does not imply the conclusion that this road must always be followed in all circumstances. The real possibilities of success on this road, possibilities that in the past were regarded as extremely thin, are now somewhat better.

On the other hand, the Chilean experience shows that imperialism has adapted its tactics to the new world conditions and evolved a practical alternative to direct armed intervention as a means of terminating the revolutionary process. We have in mind action in the sphere of economics, international relations, ideology, the armed forces, and so on. Chile offers a wealth of material for studying these methods. Their detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this article, but it should be noted that the success the revolutionaries have in combating these methods is linked with the question of their close cooperation with the socialist countries, their reliance on international solidarity — which was something that we did not have enough of.

Given a close interlocking of international and national factors, the key to the success of the revolutionary process undoubtedly lies with the internal factors. In Chilean conditions the revolution was based on the winning of a solid majority united around the working class. As we know, the victory at the 1970 elections that made it possible to form the Popular Unity government had the support not of an absolute majority, but of only 36 per cent of the voters. The government took up its duties after an intense class struggle that lasted for two months. During this struggle the Popular Unity alliance was able to thwart imperialism's first secret operation, which ended in an unsuccessful attempt at a coup d'état. Popular Unity won over the majority of the public and forced the class enemy onto the defensive. Without this there would have been no respect for the results of the elections and the struggle for power could not have been won.

So, we have a factual basis for regarding the victory in the elections as a step that was of great importance but was not a sufficient guarantee that the oligarchy and imperialism, which still had dominant positions in society, would respect the expression of the people's will. We believe that the gains of Popular Unity were determined not just by the victory in the elections, but by the struggle before and after the elections.

Whereas the basic condition for the initial victory was the creation of a tested and effective majority for the achievement of immediate goals, the decisive condition for completion of the process was expansion of this majority, its consolidation and activation. Comrade Luis Corvalan wrote at the time: 'The priority task now is to strengthen unity of the people, which could and should become an invincible force in advancing the Chilean revolution and the interests of various classes and sections of the population, isolating reaction, thwarting its subversive plans, preventing foreign interference, rebuffing imperialist pressure and building up wide support for the government.

'That is a crucial task, and it has to be accomplished in the very near future.'

Action should have been taken to change the unstable, indecisive balance of forces in favor of the people and make it decisive. Use should have been made of the positions of power already gained, and the required government measures should have been carried out from these positions. This was an essential condition for consolidation of real people's power, for the victorious completion of the democratic revolution and a swift transition to the socialist revolution. This was the main condition for achieving revolutionary goals by peaceful means, for preventing reactionary violence.

Undoubtedly, the key problem, as we have already noted, was to achieve monolithic working-class unity and gather around it, under its leadership, a strong alliance of the intermediate sections of the population, above all the peasants, and also the broad middle strata of the urban population, which in Chile have considerable social weight, while at the same time neutralizing the national bourgeoisie. The intermediate strata, as we know, are between two poles, the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary, and have a tendency — first, economic, then political and ideological — to waver between these poles. The counter-revolutionary pole of Chilean society is represented by the financial and land-owning oligarchies and imperialism, and to ensure victory the working class had to do everything possible to isolate them. It had a very wide circle of essential and possible allies. But this opportunity was not used to the full. On the contrary, as the revolution proceeded the working class became noticeably isolated, particularly at the time of the coup, and this isolation was, in fact, the chief factor in its defeat. Not that the working class failed to acquire powerful allies, but it fell far short of taking in a wide enough circle to secure its victory.

Formidable battles were fought over this crucial question in the three years of the Popular Unity government's activity. The leftist elements played an extremely negative role from the standpoint of working-class interests. Their incorrect actions, which came from mistaken notions of the character of the Chilean revolution and were widely exploited by imperialism and the reactionaries, aroused first anxiety and then panic among the broad intermediate strata.

Obviously, one can win over the majority of the people only when tasks are set that have really become relevant to the given stage of the revolution and the given political situation. This means finding the key to each stage and taking a responsible stand on the conclusions drawn. At the same time the working class can become a focus of unity and spread its influence to the intermediate strata if, in conducting its general political line, it is able to undertake the defense not only

of its own interests but also the essential interests of these social strata and develop its own revolutionary momentum. These are the principles on which government policy and the forces of Popular Unity should have worked to win over allies, consolidate the alliance and at the same time, prevent reaction from influencing the strata that both sides wanted to win over.

Analyzing events from this standpoint we can see that along with considerable, truly historic achievements, such as nationalization of the major copper mines, agrarian reform, creation of a state-owned sector in the economy there were also clear weaknesses in the Chilean revolutionary process. A host of complex problems had to be dealt with in the unusual situation created by the imperialist economic blockade. This means that even the revolutionary changes that had been carried through could not be exploited to the extent that circumstances required. The disunity in the leadership of the political alliance led to right and 'left' deviations. There were failures in the drive for real democracy that should have united those forces that had an objective interest in change. Reactionary schemes were not always countered. On the contrary, they were actively promoted by the press, most of which was under reactionary control, and with the help of the press the government and the popular movement were attacked with a viciousness unusual in Chile. All these factors hindered consolidation of the majority.

But winning over the majority was not enough. The power of the majority had to be used to gain the upper hand over the enemy in all spheres. As Lenin wrote ' . . . in time of revolution it is not enough to ascertain the ''will of the majority'' — you must *prove to be stronger* at the decisive moment and in the decisive place; you must *win*.' (Vol. 25, p. 201). The revolution must be able to defend itself. The main weapon in this defense is the new state that the revolution must create. In the context of peaceful transition this gives rise to some very complex problems, which again reveal the dialectical unity of the possible roads of revolution.

The development of the Chilean revolutionary process along the peaceful road, as has already been noted, gave the popular movement partial power. This success proved, on the one hand, the strength of the popular movement and, on the other, its inability at that moment to win full state power.

There is no reason to believe that such a situation is bound to repeat itself in any revolution developing on peaceful lines. In principle, it is possible 'on the very first day' to capture all the commanding heights or at least all the civil authorities in the government apparatus (executive and legislative). But this will still be the old state apparatus and in all probability there will be within it and almost surely outside it

organs of power that are not controlled by the revolution. The whole apparatus, as experience has shown, will be highly reluctant to carry out transformations and apply the coercion that is needed in such cases, until substantial changes have been made in its content and form. The decisive factor is the deep-going democratization of the state apparatus, the creation of mechanisms instituting genuine popular control over the functioning of the state, and transfer of as many as possible of its powers to the masses. The positive experience gained in this field, for example, in the control of supply, the distribution and pricing of staple goods, offers a convincing picture of the possibilities in this sphere. Control 'from below,' from the masses, allows them to realize their power in practice and to promote essential changes in the state apparatus from outside, changes that are effected with the assistance of the revolutionary leadership from within.

One of the aspects of this problem, as has already been suggested in other articles in this series, is connected with observance of bourgeois legality, which made it possible to win power in the first place. This problem loomed particularly large in Chile precisely because the popular movement had won only executive power, while its adversaries had retained strong positions in other organs of state power: parliament, the judiciary, the inspectorates, and so on. This unique situation created barriers to the passage of the new laws that were needed to consolidate real democratization and revolutionary reforms. On the basis of our own experience, however, we can draw the conclusion that, thanks to the democratic gains that were achieved by the working class and the people in the course of the whole preceding struggle and that is one of the major factors in ensuring the peaceful development of the revolution, the revolutionaries can by working from their position in the state bodies make very effective use of existing legislation. The use of the legal machinery must, of course, be combined with active campaigning on the part of the masses. Nationalization of the big monopolies proved the existence of such possibilities.

When all this has been said, however, our experience indicates that the struggle of the masses, even under a popular government, cannot be restricted to the very narrow limits of the previous legislation because there is no room within this framework for all the revolutionary activity that is needed.

This leads us to the conclusion that there must be a unitary organization embodying the people's power that has been generated 'from below.' Attempts to solve this problem were begun more or less spontaneously in Chile. From the experiment in setting up councils on supply and prices we moved on to setting up other bodies bringing together representatives of the masses. But this process did not

culminate in the formation of new organs of state power. At the same time we do not hold that some special organization has to be set up. In many countries, probably, one of the existing organizations could become the required organ of state power. As Lenin observed in his day: 'The proletariat has approached, and will approach this singular task in different ways.' Analyzing the actual situation at the time, he went on: 'In some parts of Russia the February-March Revolution puts nearly complete power in its hands. In others the proletariat may, perhaps, in a "usurpatory" manner, begin to form and develop a proletarian militia. In still others, it will probably strive for immediate elections of urban and rural local government bodies on the basis of universal, etc., suffrage, in order to turn them into revolutionary centers . . .' (Vol. 23, p. 331).

The main thing, then, is to see to it that the people can express their will and effectively exercise power 'from below,' that they take a direct part in building the new democracy. Without this the 'power at the top' cannot carry out its revolutionary task in the face of the embittered opposition of the reactionaries.

In Chile mistakes were made in this respect. There was not enough clarity and unity among the revolutionaries regarding the type of state that had to be created, or the form and content of democracy. This vagueness led to hesitations that were expressed both in repudiation of the need for any dictatorship (which inevitably weakened the campaign for transformation of the bourgeois state), and in the urge to immediately set up proletarian dictatorship, for which at that moment the right conditions were lacking, and which would have meant a leap into a vacuum and would have led to the isolation of the working class. This lack of clarity created a kind of anarchy, because weakness in revolutionary theory means weakness of the subjective factor, of any guiding influence upon the efforts of the masses to strengthen the people's government.

The successful completion of any revolutionary path is bound to entail solving the specific problem of building up a favorable balance of armed forces. The elements of tactics evolved by Marx, Engels and Lenin are well known. We have in mind their statements referring mainly to the road of armed struggle. Without going into a detailed analysis, however, it can be said that all these elements should also be taken into account in evolving a conception of the revolution on peaceful lines. This kind of development does not presuppose an armed uprising or civil war, but care must be taken to achieve a balance of forces favorable to the revolution, and precisely for the purpose of preventing the reactionaries from unleashing armed conflict.

It is clear that one of the crucial factors is the situation in the armed

forces and the forces for maintaining public order. How did we in Chile approach this problem?

During the first stage, right up to its victorious conclusion in 1970, we tried to arrange matters so that the armed forces would not act against the popular movement, and thus to create conditions in which a reactionary putsch would be impossible. In doing so we relied on the tradition that the armed forces did not interfere in party politics (a line they had more or less observed for about 40 years), and on the forces within the army that were loyal to the constitution and were oriented toward recognition of the popular victory achieved at the polls.

We stressed the fact that the Chilean armed forces were not *directly* connected with the big monopolies, that the officers came mainly from the middle strata, who had themselves experienced the effects of the crisis, that the junior officers, NCOs and rank and file from the working class or the peasantry, from the poorest sections of the population. We said that the armed forces could not therefore remain indifferent to the process of transformation.

At the same time we pointed out that the deepening of the crisis created a new situation. 'It has become a reality, for instance, that the armed forces are a new factor in national politics. It may be said that the period of the non-participation of the armed forces in political life, a non-participation that was never absolute, has ended or is nearing its end.' (Luis Corvalan. *Camino di Victoria,* p. 315). And he added, 'Of course, one must take into account the conditions in which the armed forces were built up, and particularly the fact that in the recent decades their professional training has experienced the influence of the Pentagon' (Ibid., p. 425).

It may, I think, be asserted that the basic orientation on securing first and foremost non-interference by the armed forces, what we called their 'neutralization,' was correct, just as it was correct for us to base ourselves on certain existing democratic traditions and consideration of the class composition of the armed forces. We see clearly now, however, that this was totally insufficient, in addition to which our policy in this field was based on certain theoretically unfounded assumptions.

For example, we regarded the armed forces' 'professionalism' as something valuable, something on which one could rely in trying to prevent anti-popular action. In reality, this feature does nothing whatever to strengthen progressive positions in the armed forces. On the contrary, it tends to make them even more isolated from the people and their problems. Its encouragement creates a habit of mind that puts professionalism above everything else and takes the place of the class attitudes that are determined by the soldier's social origin.

The Chilean experience has shown that while 'neutralization' was necessary and sufficient as a first step, for getting the Popular Unity government into power, the completion of the revolutionary process makes demands of a different order. Neutralization is a passing phase. It cannot by its very nature be anything else. As time goes on, the contradiction is bound to be resolved in one direction or another — for revolution or for counter-revolution. So, in the course of the process a solution must be found to the question of winning the armed forces over to the people's side by thoroughly democratizing them, and this can only be done as a result of a very bitter confrontation on all fronts.

Here the dialectic that Marx discovered between revolution and counter-revolution is revealed to the full. The demands upon the revolution increase as it advances, because the revolution must go on right up to the point when it becomes irreversible, and as it consolidates its positions it evokes increasingly furious opposition from the counter-revolutionary forces. Consequently, things that sufficed during the first stages do not suffice later on.

Experience shows that persistent efforts must be made to transform the armed forces, using all the acceptable means. The chief method, we repeat, is thorough democratization with the help of the growing influence exerted on the armed forces by the working class and the people. Certain steps were taken in this direction. To some extent the process of drawing the military into the drive to transform the country was achieved, and this helped to bring them into closer contact with the people and give them an understanding of the people's problems. Some patriotically minded regular servicemen gave a good account of themselves in the state apparatus; in the complex situation in October 1972, for example, during the counter-revolutionary attempt, it was the alliance of the popular movement with the patriotic sections of the armed forces that ensured the people's victory. Moreover, it must be admitted that the shortcomings in this field were not caused by any constitutional restrictions, but were due to the political oversight of the revolutionary forces. Here, too, the leftist sectarian element played a negative role.

During that period we stated: 'The military establishment too, needs change, but that change should not be imposed on it. It must be initiated by the military, as a matter of their own conviction.' This assertion obviously does not take into account all aspects of the problem. To achieve change, it is not enough to take action within the army alone. There must also be a struggle for the armed forces from outside. It must be waged by suitable means both in the context of armed revolutionary struggle and in the context of peaceful revolutionary development. As the Vietnamese military strategist Vo Nguyen

Giap said, the essence of the law of revolutionary force lies in the combination of political forces with armed forces. This is applicable to any revolutionary road.

As already noted, we did achieve some successes on this road. But we did not do all that we needed to do or all that we could have done. We did not succeed in winning over the army to the people's side, or in ensuring a favorable balance of military forces in other respects. And when the balance of political forces was upset this position led to a crisis.

If we consider only the *result* of our experience, it may be asserted, as some people do, that we are discussing an insoluble problem, that an armed conflict is always inevitable. On the other hand, if we examine the development of our revolution *as a whole,* the conclusion is different: the problem can be solved in conditions when the revolutionary process is following a basically peaceful path, and the better the revolutionary movement is prepared to defend its gains in all fields, the more likely it is to be solved.

The Chilean revolution has suffered a temporary defeat. This does not mean, however, that there is nothing left of the successes achieved thanks to the people's government, that great historic creation of our people. The efforts of reaction to deny them have yielded no results. The contrast between past and present is so striking that many of those who only yesterday stood aloof from the popular movement or even acted against it, are today becoming ever more convinced of the need for unity with that movement. The critical analysis of the Chilean events and fair assessment of the great advances made by the masses in that period also encourage unity. The party's policy is maturing on the basis of a profound assimilation of the lessons of the past, which will enable it to overcome present difficulties and in the near future confidently blaze the trail for further struggle.

Investigating the economy

Jeronimo Carrera
CC member, CP of Venezuela

Scientific research into the national realities amid which our party is operating is an urgent and highly important task facing us Venezuelan communists.

Marxism-Leninism is something more than the theory of proletarian revolution. To be sure, it is primarily the doctrine guiding the working class, but in today's world it is accepted by consistently anti-imperialist national liberation movements. Experience has confirmed this fact on more than one occasion. However, the theoretical principles evolved by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and being carried forward by the collective effort of communist and workers' parties can actually link up with revolutionary practice only if the revolutionary vanguard party is capable of accurately assessing the situation in its country. And this can only be done by carefully and systematically studying all data characterizing society.

Our experience suggests that inadequate analysis of the facts or wrong conclusions from such analysis are likely to lead one astray just as much as abstract theorizing. Overestimation of the gains of the revolution or of the degree of maturity of the conditions needed for this or that action results in mistakes and reverses. So does underestimation of the opportunities and potentialities of the revolutionary forces.

We Venezuelan communists have to rectify mistakes in party work caused by specific circumstances. The fact is that ever since it was founded, that is, over 46 years ago, the Communist Party has generally had to operate in the face of brutal repression by successive governments subservient to imperialism. It should be clear that a party fighting for survival, a party most of whose leaders have passed through the ordeal of imprisonment and whose every activist must devote his energies above all to struggle against dictatorial regimes, could not concern itself adequately with organized research. We still meet with serious difficulties in this matter, as well as in the Marxist-Leninist schooling of our cadres.

The party came up against these difficulties, first of all, in drafting its Program, approved in final form by the Fifth Congress (November

1974). Naturally, we did our best to generalize in the Program the knowledge acquired by scientifically analyzing the situation at home and in the world. The party carried on this work for years, with varying success. That we were not always successful was a result of our inadequate ability to estimate national realities correctly. The Third Party Congress made a fruitless attempt at such an estimation. It is highly probable that the negative consequences of that attempt translated themselves into the serious mistakes made by us in the period immediately following, and described by us as 'years of armed struggle.' Afterwards, from 1967 on, when our central committee proceeded to the greatly needed rectification of our policy, the urgency of serious research enabling us to interpret correctly the deep changes which we were witnessing in the domestic economy and in society and which we had been unable to assess, let alone forecast, became perfectly obvious.

The gradual transition from underground work to work in conditions of legality (1968-70) was effected easily enough due to a combination of several factors, first of all the split in the government party and its electoral defeat in December 1968. However, it was attended by serious inner-party problems that developed into dangerous crises. This prevented deeper analysis of the causes of the left deviations that had lost us those of our supporters among the masses whom we had won over as a result of the defeat of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship in January 1958. It also hampered the conduct of research demanded of us by the changing realities of a country that was developing fast along capitalist lines but was seen by us as it had been 20 years earlier.

A daily output of three million barrels of oil over more than two decades led in the end to the complete disintegration of the antiquated semi-feudal structures typical of Venezuela. It was at this stage, when the country was under the pro-U.S. dictatorship of Juan Vicente Gomez, that the CPV was founded in 1931. Imperialist penetration made for the rapid and intensive development of a capitalist economy that was, however, lopsided and dependent. In turn, these changes told strongly on the class composition of our society. The working class gained in numbers and strength, but then, so did the section of the bourgeoisie that was linked with imperialism and was carrying on financial and industrial activities encouraged by the patronage of foreign monopolies.

These new Venezuelan realities were examined by the Fourth CPV Congress (January 1971). It adopted 'General Principles for a Program for the CPV' analyzing the changes that had occurred. The document made the following important statement: 'In these 10 years, the consolidation of certain sections of the bourgeoisie linked with

imperialism and of state capitalism, as well as increased budget appropriations, have produced results favorable to the ruling class.' The congress also passed a 'Resolution on Program Principles' empowering the CC to appoint a committee that would draft the program for discussion by the next congress, and emphasizing that it must be a 'document in a Leninist spirit, succinct, simple, expressive, clear, and enriched by the analysis to be made by the CC.' The resolution said that this called for 'collective research in an atmosphere of validity and creative application of Marxism-Leninism to Venezuelan reality, in the spirit of loyalty to the working-class cause. These requirements were largely disregarded owning to factional activity in the party.'

Having accomplished this difficult task at their Fifth Congress, the communists now have, for the first time ever, a program combining, as we see it, the general principles of Marxism-Leninism and conclusions from the experience of brother parties, our own experience and specific analysis of the social and economic conditions of our country.

In drafting the program and continuing our research, we have always concentrated on economic problems. Why? First of all, because political processes cannot be understood without analyzing economic relations; this classical Marxist-Leninist tenet has been confirmed by our own experience, too. Secondly, we realize that man's liberation is unthinkable without freeing labor. Lastly, and from the purely practical point of view, we cannot defend the working people's present-day interests, let alone create a long-range alternative to the economic policy of the bourgeoisie, without an in-depth study of the economy. In the absence of such a specific economic alternative, political struggle, for its part, ceases to be concrete and meaningful. It is important that the working people fully appreciate that they are fighting for a better life, for a position in the production sphere and in a society more fit for man, and that the outlook for fundamental improvements through struggle is definite and real.

Experience tells us that economic problems should always be investigated according to the Marxist postulate that one must take account of realities and eschew subjective prejudices and views. After all, we communists do not study economic reality to become university professors excelling in erudition. To us, economic research is a revolutionary task we carry out to help the working class to free itself from exploitation and to build a new society. This means that we must begin by studying the working people's condition and the wages they are paid, so that the party may advance concrete, scientifically sound slogans understandable to the masses, and direct the class struggles toward its ultimate goal by joining in the activity of trade unions and other mass organizations of the working people.

The communists of Venezuela have learned the lessons of past mistakes and are rectifying them. This is seen, among other things, in an appeal published by the United Workers' Center of Venezuela (CUTV),[1] which proposes to other union centers united action against the rising cost of living. One has only to look into the domestic economic situation to realize that at present the struggle against the mounting cost of living is the key to mobilizing the masses, which, in turn, is necessary for the defense of democratic gains, to say nothing of furthering nationalization in the interest of national sovereignty and in keeping with the people's vital interests.

The chief subject of the party's economic research has been changing in step with the evolution of the national economy, which had an agrarian basis at first, then came to be based on mining and has since been assuming a more and more marked industrial character. Over a long period, the agrarian question was the basic subject of research and we may say that we have made noticeable headway in this sphere, as two books on rural Venezuela written jointly by two of our comrades, Alonso Ojeda Olaechea and Jorge Santana, indicate.[2] They were published by the agrarian department of our CC. Afterwards we moved on from agrarian questions to oil problems, a thorough study of which is indispensable now to any Venezuelan political party.

The communist position on oil policy has consistently favored nationalization of this vital industry, an idea put forward by the communists as far back as 1931. We have for years stressed the need to wrest the nation's principal asset from the grip of imperialist monopolies, exposed their price-juggling, and proposed steps to make better use of oil royalties.

The range of economic problems claiming our constant attention has widened considerably. Once purely national, these problems link up more and more with the world economy and growing international trade. Such is, in particular, the oil problem, which positively cannot be treated as a domestic matter any longer. The world energy crisis, which took dramatic forms in 1973, made it clear that the oil problem can no longer be solved separately by each country or even through bilateral agreements. The Venezuelan government saw the new reality early enough and has for a long time sought international cooperation formulas for the most profitable utilization of oil. Venezuela is a founding member of OPEC. The CPV has firmly supported OPEC membership, but, on the other hand, has invariably urged the government to take a more militant stand on imperialist monopoly in this international organization.

Of course, we communists must study fluctuations on the world oil market very carefully, for they tell inevitably on the home policy of

our country. We follow with unremitting attention the policies laid down by OPEC resolutions. At the same time, we call on the ruling quarters of our country to end the restraint which Venezuela has traditionally shown in the organization and to side firmly with Algeria, Libya, Iraq and other countries which demonstrate their ability and readiness to pursue within the organization a policy differing from that imposed by the multinationals.

Our party also looks carefully into the integration processes under way in Latin America. Integration policy problems are admittedly very delicate and complicated. In spite of their overall dependence on U.S. imperialism, Latin America's national economies are at very different stages of development and differ greatly in many respects. Besides, U.S. interference and the ambitions of the domestic bourgeoisie, which is not really agreeable to integration (these two factors have made integration impossible so far), are serious obstacles to progress in this direction in the foreseeable future. There is no doubt, however, that all Latin American countries are increasingly aware of the objective need to join in integration processes. This need resulted in the successive formation of the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), Central American Common Market (true, both organizations proved unviable) and, later on, the Andean Pact, as well as the Latin American Economic System, which is a novel development and attracts attention.

The Fifth CPV Congress took an explicit stand on this issue. 'Economic integration — LAFTA and the subregional Andean Pact,' says the party program, 'are intended to curb the economic policy of imperialism in a certain way and to a certain extent with a view to making better use of natural resources and diversifying trade and foreign markets. The Andean Pact, which is backed by progressive governments resisting imperialism, has assumed a progressive trend. Venezuela's entry into the pact was a correct step and can be used as a means of resistance to imperialist domination.'

The CPV program makes principled estimations and stresses that owing to a predominantly dependent economy, economic integration processes in Latin America will always be contradictory. 'It will depend on the peoples' fight,' it states, 'whether integration has a positive meaning and serves economic liberation, or whether it becomes an ineffective instrument controlled behind the scenes by multinational monopolies.' In effect, this idea is expressed in the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean (Havana, June 1975). We Venezuelan communists note with satifaction that as far as analysis of the potentialities of the Andean Pact is concerned, our position fully coincided with the position stated in the brother parties' collective document.

However, we must say for the sake of accuracy that our party had some difficulty in taking so realistic an approach to the issue. This is seen, for instance, in the confused joint statement made in mid-1968 by the economic research committee and political bureau of our party, both strongly influenced at the time by experts who were actually prompted by disastrous petty-bourgeois nationalism and had to withdraw from our party somewhat later.

The experience of drafting the CPV program shows how very difficult it was for the party to make a creative, Marxist-Leninist study of Venezuelan reality. However, we must apparently add that our lag in this matter, as well as in the study of social sciences generally, was also due to the fact that Venezuela's universities began to teach these subjects much later than other universities of the continent. Central University began economic research slightly more than 30 years ago. Until then, the country had virtually lacked even elementary statistics on its economy. The first attempts to study the national economy, made by Venezuelan Marxists individually and in the absence of a serious statistical basis, inevitably led to inaccurate and at times even unscientific conclusions. Moreover, the universities were for a long time dominated by the adverse influence of bourgeois economic thought, such as Keynesian theories brought in by people educated in London. Fortunately, political changes in 1958 and the introduction of university autonomy made it at long last possible to teach Marxism in the faculty of economic sciences.

Ever since then, the universities have been specializing in economic research, expanding it by adding new themes. Researchers understandably show particular interest in problems of the developing countries and in everything relating to oil. Similar progress has been taking place in other fields of research, such as agrarian economics, planning, foreign trade, demography. At the same time, other faculties have greatly expanded historical, political and sociological research. All this has produced a large amount of scientific information, made available to use in the form of numerous private or government publications. Valuable works have been written by university lecturers, including D.F. Maza Zavala, Ramon Lozada Aldana, Armando Cordova, Jose Eliseo Lopez, German Carrera Damas, Pedro Esteban Mejia, Rodolfo Quintero, Hector Mujica, Hector Malave Mata and Miguel Acosta Saignes. They belong to a group of researchers who have used Marxist methodology to analyze life in Venezuela, past and present.

Of course, we communists do our best to use this increased flow of scientific evidence. At the same time, however, an intensive anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign is being conducted in the universities, causing ideological confusion among teachers and students

holding left-wing views. This can be seen in works of recent years written in universities and imbued with *tercerism* ('third-worldism') and distrust of existing socialism. We communists take this into account in our activity.

As détente spreads, the worldwide ideological struggle becomes sharper. In particular, reformist ideologists, who are always in a privileged position because they can use the powerful mass media, are carrying on divisive activities, advocating a sort of nihilism in regard to the nation in countries where a strenuous struggle is being waged against powerful foreign monopolies, as in Venezuela. For us communists the best answer to this is to publicize our contribution to the study of Venezuelan reality, specifying the country's problems and saying why our party proposes this or that solution.

This contribution is still very modest (we do not say so to pay lip-service to self-criticism). However, there is evidence of the early fruits of our effort to study fundamental economic problems of great importance to the Venezuelan nation today and in the future. A few months ago, two interesting works by noted CPV leaders came out in Caracas: Hemmy Croes *Whither the Andean Pact?* and Radames Larrazabal and Eduardo Lopez Perez, *Oil — the Public Sector of the Economy — and Socialism*.

We will certainly carry our research deeper to ascertain current economic trends and foresee their most likely political effects. In the new situation created by steps to nationalize oil and iron ore,[3] which the Venezuelan government has negotiated with foreign companies and which should have a strong impact on the country's policy, the Fifth CC CPV Plenum (February 2, 1976) adopted a detailed statement analyzing the people's economic difficulties. The problems which the resolution deals with are related to the modified terms of operation in the oil industry, the government's tax policy and investments plans made in the interests of the domestic bourgeoisie, and an unwarranted foreign debt which increases our dependence on the financial centers of international monopoly capital.

The CC CPV, confirming this orientation, made a new detailed analysis of the national economy. At its Seventh Plenum (November 13, 1976), it circulated a new statement in this connection revealing the plight of the masses and criticizing, with good reason, the economic policy of the government. At the same time, the CC reaffirmed its attitude to technological and trade problems seriously affecting the interests of Petroleos de Venezuela, the national oil company. The only solution to these problems is large-scale cooperation with such countries as the Soviet Union, of the world's biggest oil producers. 'Venezuela,' the statement says, 'has the resources needed for a constructive solution of these problems. There are

countries willing to cooperate in solving them. Everything depends on whether Petroleos de Venezuela will take this road, which we will have to take sooner or later. There can be no doubt that in the long run Venezuela will put an end for all time to dependence on imperialist powers and find ways of mutually beneficial international co-operation.'

The concept of independent development of the nation's leading industry set out by the CPV is based on the socialist countries' solidarity with the peoples fighting for the right to dispose of their natural resources. We consider it very important that during the Soviet visit of President Carlos Andres Perez of Venezuela (November 1976), these views of the country's economic progress found expression in the signing of a basic agreement on economic and industrial cooperation in addition to the announcement of forthcoming 'negotiations to study the possibilities of concluding a trade agreement and examine other problems of trade and economic co-operation.'

The very fact that these questions were raised suggests that we communists will have to devote increasing effort to a systematic study of all the intricacies of today's dynamic economy, especially those of its aspects which have so far received comparatively little attention from us. This is why the CC plans for inner-party education now being put into effect throughout the country in close cooperation with regional committees devote much attention to more thorough training of party cadres on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and to cultivating an interest in research and in closer study of the people's life.

1. Influenced by the communists. — *Ed.*

2. *Situacion Actual del Campo Venezolano* (Caracas, 1970) and *Tesis Agraria* (Caracas, 1961).

3. It was discussed at length in 'Venezuela: Problems Unsolved by Nationalization,' *WMR*, July, 1976.

Why we are with the communists

Pierre Schoemberg
Worker

I made my political choice a long time ago and was one of the the first to join the Communist Party of Luxembourg. I have never had cause to regret my choice because only the Communist Party is capable of understanding and sympathizing with working class interests, and only as a member of the party is it possible to wage a consistent struggle for these interests.

My case is most likely very similar to that of many other workers. In 1927 my father advised me to go into the engineering industry, and as a youth I experienced capitalist exploitation. Wages were low and labor conditiocs terrible, the speed-up system was pushed to the limit and the bosses, from manager down to shop superintendent, had unlimited powers to hire and fire.

I soon felt a strong resentment rising in me against this system and I do not know how this would have ended if I had not met some people at the plant where I worked (ARBED — Belval) with experience and foresight, and who knew how to wage an effective struggle. It was from them that I learned about Soviet Russia, and that there existed an organization in Luxembourg that was fighting against exploitation and social injustice. I joined the party after meeting and talking with the then party chairman Zenon Bernard.

The 30s were difficult years for us. The party was still weak but, nevertheless, was able to achieve a measure of success. In 1934, Zenon Bernard became the first Luxembourg communist to be elected to parliament, and in 1937, when the government planned to ban the Communist Party, a nationwide poll showed that the majority were against such a law. During the Second World War our party revealed its genuine patriotism and from then on the Communist Party became firmly established in the country's political life.

Our party's consistent policy in the course of all these years, its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and its active proletarian internationalism, its courageous actions in defense of the working people's demands have won it respect and influence. I am proud to be one of the oldest members of the Communist Party and I shall continue helping to achieve working class victory in Luxembourg.

Anny Müller-Schoup
Nurse

I think I joined the party because I was against the fascists and against war and it was the communists who were always so outspokenly for peace.

I come from a working-class family. My father is a house painter and during the last war he was in the Resistance Movement. Although my parents were not party members they always supported solidarity movements with other peoples, often took me to meetings they attended and I think that is where my anti-war feelings started growing. They became even stronger when several years later I saw the remains of the Ravensbrück concentration camp in what is now the GDR. The head of our group, a member of the CP of Luxembourg, described her experiences in that camp where she was interned during the war and told us about fascism. I was deeply moved by what I heard, by what I saw at that concentration camp, and by the people, particularly the many anti-fascists I met in the GDR.

Soon after, I joined the Luxembourg Progressive Youth organization that was opposing war and fascism and advocated friendship among the peoples. Its program expressed my feelings and I was an active member. There were many communists in this youth movement, among them the man who later became my husband. Their talks and discussions helped us to see and understand a great deal.

It was some time, however, before I joined the party, for I still had many prejudices, especially religious ones. The patience and tact of the party members with whom we worked in the youth organization helped me to gradually overcome my prejudices and then I joined the Communist Party. This step changed my whole life. My party work helped to form my consciousness. Party studies and the fact that I could see for myself the successes of existing socialism strengthened my convictions still more. The daily struggle for man's most noble aspirations — peace and social equality — is a source of strength and confidence. I feel that my activities are helping people and that I am making a modest contribution to the common cause. For me it is very satisfying that I can live in just this way.

Fernard Pasqualoni
Welder

I was an apprentice in a steel plant when I got my first taste of politics. Our training was designed to provide the plant with skilled but obedient workers brought up in a spirit of 'social partnership.' This in itself, together with the social barriers raised against youth, and the first bombs dropped on Vietnam — impelled us to discuss politics.

At that time left-extremist groups used to hand out leaflets at the factory gates and they were the cause of heated debates. We, a group of apprentices, got in touch with a Trotskyist organization and for a time were under its influence. The members of this organization were mainly petty-bourgeois, better educated than we, and at first we were not able to argue with them on an equal footing, nor to counter their reasoning. And they naturally took advantage of this. But, we studied Marxist literature and little by little started analyzing what the Trotskyists said and did.

Our working conditions, the work of trade unions, our meetings and talks with Communist Party members helped us to see that the goals of the Trotskyists did not go beyond a petty-bourgeois utopia. The members of their oganization, petty-bourgeois to the core, were not able to comprehend the worker's problems and did not express their interests. And almost all the workers in that organization decided to leave it. After breaking with the Trotskyists, we realized that the only correct thing to do was to fight for the working class cause as members of its vanguard — the Communist Party. We agreed that this was a realistic party, defending the people's needs, a party that aspired toward scientifically grounded goals.

It is indicative that at the present time the so-called ultra-leftists are losing influence in Luxembourg, they are no longer as active as before. And the workers and progressive intellectuals are beginning to see the true character of these groups, while the Communist Party is increasing its influence and is steadily defending the interests of the country's working class and the youth on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and a profound analysis of reality, and not on a utopian basis. Together with the countries of existing socialism, our party is working with energy for détente, peace, democracy and for socialism.

Sylvie Wagner
Housewife

Neither I nor my husband, who works for an automobile sales company, has ever been a member of any of Luxembourg's political parties. But at the last municipal elections we voted communist. There were several reasons why I preferred the communist candidate to the socialist, social-democratic, democratic, or Christian-Social.

Just as most people, we think of our future and the future of our children and we see that there are many problems still to be settled. For example, the secondary school system, its program and methods should be improved. The problem of old people is acute and the attitude toward the aged is very unjust. I believe that the communists sincerely wish to improve the existing situation and that is why I voted for their candidates.

I also think there should be a certain unity among all who wish to improve the conditions of the working people, and most important, they should share common goals and ways of achieving these goals. Strengthening the positions of the Communist Party could help to build such united action, and, consequently, more could be done for all the people and not just for the rich who are not concerned with the needs and cares of the common people. That also, is one of the reasons I voted for the Communist Party even though I do not agree with all its statements.

Ali Ruckert
Journalist

Apparently I have good heredity, for my grandfather, who was a miner, was a Communist Party activist back in the early 30s. I grew up with the stories he used to tell me of the workers' movement in our country, how he took part in demonstrations that were broken up by mounted police, and about the communist resistance during the years of Hitler's fascism.

He was always enthusiastic when he spoke of the Soviet Union where the workers took power into their hands. Several years later, as a member of the Progressive Youth of Luxembourg, I visited the Artek Childrens' Summer Camp on the Black Sea Coast of the USSR where I saw for myself everything that my grandfather, an old communist, had told about the country in which he had such faith, about existing socialism.

Together with my father, a steel worker, also a party member, we took part in many party activities and May Day demonstrations. We lived in the worker's neighborhood of Differdengen and from my childhood I experienced the inequality that workers' children came up against everywhere. And in school I felt this even more acutely, because the teachers were anti-communist minded and the children were mostly from the upper classes.

Naturally, I was affected by all this, and when I joined the party — on its 50th anniversary — although I was only 16, I was fully aware that I was joining a party in which I believed implicitly.

viewpoints

Global forecasts and realistic solutions

Nikolai Fedorenko
Academician (USSR)

SOME BOURGEOIS CONCEPTS OF ECONOMICO-MATHEMATICAL ECOLOGICAL MODELS

The long history of man's interaction with nature is replete with sharp contradictions and conflicts. In this age of the ongoing scientific and technological revolution such problems as rational use of natural resources, preservation of the biosphere and its principal components, world and regional ecological equilibrium harmonized with society's production activities, have gone far beyond national bounds.[1] To one or another degree, they concern every country, and all countries have an equal interest in their solution.[2]

But they are posed differently in different regions and countries. In the developed capitalist countries, for instance, the most acute are the problems of environmental pollution, fresh-water and land-usage balance, and consumption of finite natural resources, notably imported fuels. The crucial problem in many developing countries is the supply of food and fresh water, preservation of the soil and of ecological systems. For instance, the severe drought of 1968-74 in Chad, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta, with their combined population of more than 20 million, drastically reduced grain harvests and cattle herds, with resultant hunger for millions. In fact, the droughts threatened the very existence of ecological systems vital to agriculture. Meteorologists and climatologists are inclined to the view that the drought, the longest for many years, was largely caused by factors related to the global pollution of the atmosphere.

The socialist countries, too, have ecological problems, but they stand no comparison, in scale and gravity, with ecological crisis developments in the capitalist countries. For in socialist societies, with public ownership of the means of production, there is an incomparably more rational pattern of consumption of key natural resources. Thus, ecological crisis phenomena at various levels are not a fatal inevitability under socialism.

It will thus be seen that, though ecological problems are worldwide,

their scope and gravity are to a decisive degree determined by the nature of the social system. And it is no mere accident that the developed capitalist countries, with their powerful economic and technological potential which, one would think, should enable them to prevent or at least moderate ecological conflicts, exert the greatest destructive influence on the environment. In fact, the general deterioration of the world ecological situation is primarily due to the aggravation of the many social and economic contradictions of capitalism. It can be said that the ecological crisis has, in a certain sense, become the focus of all the structural defects and social antagonisms of modern bourgeois society.

The scope and gravity of the ecological crisis have prompted bourgeois scientists to search for a way out, relying heavily on the use of economico-mathematical methods and computers. The use of sophisticated techniques, it was believed, would provide a comprehensive prognosis of mankind's future.

In the veritable deluge of literature on the subject, these experiments in global modelling are of particular interest. For they cover the main factors of world development; analyze their totality and demographic, economic, geographical, geological, etc., interaction; produce a dynamic, rather than static, picture of ecological processes, and employ quantifying methods based on the latest computer techniques.

But it should be borne in mind that these global models can have a mystifying effect if the modellers use their sophisticated methodology to substantiate speculative conclusions. Hence, all global models should be subjected to exacting and detailed Marxist analysis, both from the standpoint of methodology and the authenticity of primary data.

An analysis of global models devised in the past 10 years will reveal that bourgeois investigators, deliberately or unwittingly, strove to use ecology for class purposes, namely, to obscure the contradictions between labor and capital and the link between the ecological crisis, the general crisis of capitalism and imperialism's neo-colonialist policy.

One such global model, which in many ways predetermined subsequent work by bourgeois researchers, was World-3, worked out on assignment from the Club of Rome, an ostensibly independent non-government organization. But it is no secret that the Club is made up mostly of representatives of big business and work on its early models was financed by the giant West German Volkswagen concern.

The World-3 model and its later modification by D. Meadows[3] treats the global economic system as a whole, without geographical differentiation, and uses five basic factors: population, food, finite resources, industrial capital and pollution.

Meadows and his co-authors worked on the premise that the existing system of values leads to exponential, undifferentiated massive growth of the five factors. And from this the conclusion is drawn that mankind must achieve a state of 'global equilibrium' in order to ward off 'collapse of the world.' Meadows and his colleagues set out to prove that 'global equilibrium' could be achieved under capitalism. In doing so they revealed their understanding of the 'strategy of saving the system' through a combination of technical and social methods. In particular, one of the more recent, 1975, models suggests stabilizing existing industrial plant and population, recycling finite resources, reducing by three-quarters their share in per-unit of output, with a similar reduction in per-unit pollution, and priority development of food production.

Publication of the first results of Meadows' and his co-authors' project, in *The Limits to Growth,*[4] precipitated a sharp controversy in scientific circles throughout the world.

Marxist critics saw in this and in subsequent research by the Meadows' group an attempt to exploit the prestige of economico-mathematical methods to buttress reactionary Malthusian ideas and the neo-colonialist policy of blackmail. Significantly, bourgeois scientists, too, found themselves obliged to point out the large number of fundamental flaws in the Meadows' report. Thus, researchers at Sussex University in Britain, who produced the most comprehensive critical assessment of *The Limits to Growth,*[5] found that its initial premise, exponential growth in its main variables, was no more than a modern version of the Malthus theory.

There were serious objections also to the concept of 'global equilibrium.' Many bourgeois researchers accused its authors of advocating what amounted to stagnation, a 'ban' on economic growth in developing countries.

Important, too, is the fact that even the early critics of the Meadows model pointed to its fallacious approach to the world as a socially and politically undifferentiated homogeneous entity. And it was not by chance that later projects, of 1972-74 vintage, tried to overcome the basic shortcomings of the World-3 model. Among these the most interesting, in my view, are the following: 'Mankind at the Turning Point' (Mesarovic and Pestel),[6] the Latin-American global model (A. Herrera),[7] the Japanese 'Global Constraints and New Vision for Development' (Kaya and Suzuki),[8] the Dutch 'Problems of Population Doubling' (Linnemann)'[9] the Swiss DEMATEL (H. Thiemann and A. Gabus).[10]

Mesarovic and Pestel, the authors of the second Club of Rome report, 'Mankind at the Turning Point,' mindful of the criticism of World-3, discarded Meadows' 'exponential, undifferentiated' growth

in favor of 'organic' (differentiated and balanced) growth, treating the world as a system of 10 interacting regions: North America; Western Europe; Japan; Australia; South Africa and other developed market-economy countries; Eastern Europe, including the USSR; Latin America; North Africa and the Middle East; Tropical Africa; South and Southeast Asia, and China. And unlike Meadows, whose model covered a 130-year period, they chose a shorter, 50-year projection (1975-2025), on the assumption that regional catastrophies would occur within this period, though not simultaneously in different regions and for different reasons.

Having chosen what they considered to be the more acute aspects of world development — the national-income gap between developed and developing countries, the problems of energy, food, demography and the oil crisis — they constructed five partial models and, having analyzed typical crisis situations in different regions, arrived at the conclusion that a 'population growth — food shortage' crisis would first hit Africa and South Asia; a 'population growth — growing unemployment' crisis — Latin America; a 'production growth — raw materials shortage and environmental pollution' crisis — the developed capitalist countries. And though they tried to approach the problems of global ecology objectively, their recommendations are still of a purely defensive nature. For instance, in analyzing the food problem in developing countries all they recommended was assistance by developed capitalist countries. Their conclusion on another problem, 'oil suppliers — oil producers,' in effect supports the thesis that, instead of a confrontation with the multinationals and the developed capitalist countries, the oil producers would find it more profitable to invest in the oil-consuming, that is, the developed capitalist countries.

At first sight, the Argentine researchers (the Herrera model) seem to take the very opposite view. Their top priority is meeting the needs of the developing countries as a means of powering a general economic upsurge and warding off the ruinous consequences of ecological crisis. But they divide all the countries into 'poor' and 'rich,' thus lumping together developed capitalist countries. They counsel suspending industrial growth in developing countries and redistributing capital in favor of the 'poor' countries. This wholly disregards the all-important need to 'redistribute wealth' within the developing countries, in other words, eliminate the privileges of the industrial and landed interests and the wide incomes gap through progressive social and economic reforms.

The Japanese project, 'Global Constraints and a New Vision for Development,' outlines an optimal production structure within the 'developed-developing countries' framework. The first part of the

project analyzes the world raw-materials market and constructs a model for prognosticating changes in the world climate. The Japanese calculations show that the underlying problem up to the end of this century will, in all probability, be the disparity between the demand and supply of energy rather than a shortage of natural resources. If energy consumption grows no more than 10-fold, the authors do not anticipate any serious impact on the world climate.

Like the authors of 'Mankind at the Turning Point,' the Japanese researchers, in the second part of their project, divide the world into regions (North America, Oceania, Western Europe, USSR and the East-European socialist countries, Central and South America, Japan, China and the other Asian countries, and Africa). Each region is divided into six production sectors: agriculture, the extractive, light, heavy and assembly industries, and services. The purpose of these regional models is to optimize production structures to raise living standards within a balanced pattern of foreign trade. The Japanese authors urge more attention to agriculture in Latin America and Africa as well as in North America and Oceania.

This stress on the need to boost agricultural production against the background of ecological crisis is the result of the aggravated problem of hunger and malnutrition in the developing countries, which the authors of this and other models associate chiefly with population growth.

Indicative in this respect is 'The Problem of Population Doubling,' a special study of the Club of Rome directed by the Dutch scientist Linnemann. His project, based on the 'agriculture-food production model,' divides the world into three groups of countries: those with 'free market economies' (capitalist), 'centrally-planned economies' (socialist) and 'developing.' Then there are 10 regions which more or less coincide with those of the Mesarovic-Pestel model, and 108 geographico-climatic zones.

What distinguishes Linnemann's from earlier models is its differentiation of social strata within the developed capitalist and developing countries. In each of these it singles out six social groups,[11] based on income and food-consumption levels, and offers solutions of their food problems. This geographical and social differentiation also makes for more realistic conclusions and balanced computations. In particular, Linnemann shows that the world food shortage is not absolute but relative; the present level of production does not assure an adequate food supply because of disparate consumption levels due not to technological, but rather to social and economic factors, which are responsible for the tortuously slow introduction of efficient cultivation methods to increase production.

It will thus be seen that in recent years global modelling has

evolved toward a closer understanding of the geographical and social differentiation of the world, and a more business-like, 'non-sensational' examination of ecological problems.

In fact, even many bourgeois scientists associated with the Club of Rome have come to see that, in the final analysis, realization of partial demographical, ecological and other conclusions based on the results of global modelling, depend on society's social and economic strategy. Consciously or unwittingly, some of these scientists have actually discarded the widespread bourgeois propaganda thesis about the universal character of the ecological crisis which, allegedly, is due entirely to increased consumption, with scant regard to the class differentiation of society.

This has been accompanied by the growing realization that the present pattern of international economic relations has to be revised. On assignment from the Club of Rome, a group of researchers headed by Nobel Prize winner Jan Tinbergen submitted a report significantly titled 'Reshaping the International Order.'[12] It is directly linked with a number of UN documents adopted with the participation of developing countries, notably the Declaration of Cocoyoc.[13]

The Tinbergen report recommends introduction of an international payments unit to replace gold and the U.S. dollar; establishment of a new, integrated international trade system by improving the present division of labor; development of agriculture, etc. It also calls for disarmament and the use of resulting economized funds for peaceful purposes. Last, but not least, it discusses, albeit inconsistently, the social aspects of the ecological crisis, and this leads its authors to counsel changing the system of values in the 'consumer society.'[14]

However, despite their awareness of the connection between the ecological crisis and the economic and social foundations of capitalist society, bourgeois researchers virtually make no recommendations that might encroach on these foundations, nor on the interests of those who own the economy, notably the multinationals.[15]

But it has to be admitted that global modelling has made possible a new approach to a number of vital problems. For one thing, it has revealed the scientific and practical fallacy of partial prognostications — population growth, energy production, increase of cultivated areas, or exploitation of sea resources — though such prognostications seemed to be firmly backed by demographic, energy, agronomic and oceanographic data. True, our knowledge of the quantitative regularities governing the 'nature-society' ratio are patently insufficient, so that all global models are still a very long way from perfection. Nevertheless, the conclusions drawn from them, and considering the present higher degree of scientific substantiation, have served as the basis for a number of practical measures of state-

monopoly regulation of the use of natural resources. In the United States, for example, appropriations for environmental protection have increased from a very modest figure to billions of dollars. Japan and many West European capitalist countries are following a similar policy.

But no amount of global modelling can erase the deep contradictions in the capitalist countries' policy on the use of natural resources. One example is the multinationals' attempts to transfer 'dirty' industries (metallurgy, chemicals) from developed capitalist to developing countries, in other words, 'export' their polluted atmosphere under the slogan of "assisting industrialization.' The United States and a number of other capitalist countries, anxious to lower pollution levels at home, have introduced tough environment quality standards. But with the economic crisis they are often lowered or simply disregarded. One could cite numerous other examples of the restricted character of ecological solutions in conditions of capitalism and imperialist domination.

In the non-socialist part of the world there is an acute awareness of the need for a democratic and socialist alternative to state-monopoly regulation of the use of nature and its resources. The communists are campaigning for that, because bourgeois governments are not in a position to curb the monopolies, which are mainly responsible for environmental deterioration.

The advantages of the system based on public ownership of the means of production and economic planning stand out with especial clarity against this background. For whereas many aspects of the ecological crisis in the capitalist world continue to deteriorate, the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community are taking substantial steps to preserve and improve the environment. They are working out and implementing a system of measures to assure the socialist use of nature and its resources, a system consonant with the scale of social production and the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution. This should not be taken to mean that the socialist countries have no problems in the interaction of society and nature. The main reason for the emergence of such problems under socialism, in the view of this author, is that the environmental protection aspects of production are not always adequately taken into account in our overall system of economic planning and management. To set things right, Soviet scientists are working out guidelines for the rational use of nature and recommendations for environmental protection programs.

The socialist countries are devoting relatively less attention to global models, first, because they are concentrating on comprehensive economic-planning models, and second, because ecological prob-

lems are less sharply posed than in capitalist countries. Nonetheless, accumulated experience in devising a large number of big and super-big models has enabled Soviet scientists to run a number of experiments in global modelling. This work was conducted by the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economico-Mathematical Institute and Computer Center, and the Head Administration of the Hydrological and Meteorological Service under the USSR Council of Ministers.[16] And experience has shown that in devising global models of any type we have to contend with a number of objective difficulties: inadequacy and unreliability of our statistical base; the complexity of defining the correlation between factors and the transition from partial quantitative to general indicators; the contradictory criteria of investment priorities in a resources-deficit situation, etc. That being so, the degree of authenticity tends to limit the application of global models to general prognostications of the main tendencies in the conduct of modelized systems. At the present stage, this makes it difficult to combine these with operating economic prognostication and planning models.

In the opinion of a number of Soviet researchers, the use of nature in a socialist society should be regarded as a special type of social and economic activity aimed at fuller satisfaction of the rising requirements of all members of society by better utilization of natural resources, preserving and multiplying (or improving the quality, or supplying adequate substitutes) of natural resources in the interests of succeeding generations; preserving the equilibrium between industrial expansion and biological stability of the environment to assure the continued development of civilization and, in fact, life on earth.[17]

In recent years work has begun in the USSR on a uniform nationwide system of planning and managing the use of natural resources, a system that accords with social and economic conditions in developed socialist society and with the scientific theory of the unity and interdependence of all types of natural resources. This integrated program includes the following: elaboration of a nationwide system of accounting, planning and economic stimulation of the rational use of nature; establishment of an interdepartmental board to supervise the use of natural resources and protect the environment and, lastly, the development and perfection of uniform standards in the use of nature and its resources.

Along with this, economic-growth models are being worked out, providing for tight ecological restrictions, with natural resources (e.g., pure water and pure air) as the determinative factors in allocating materials and labor resources for technological processes.[18]

The methodological principles governing rational use of nature are complemented by the implementation of legislatively endorsed major

regional programs. These include measures to protect Lake Baikal, the Volga and Azov-Black Sea Basin, also comprehensive industrywide projects, such as new, non-waste lines of production, etc.

All these scientifically substantiated and practically applied measures — legislative and planning, regional and industrywide — show that real, and not merely hypothetical, solutions of ecological problems are fully possible.

The socialist countries are thus successfully solving the problems involved in the proper use of nature. But they believe that systematic extensive and close international cooperation is a *sine qua non* of any real solution of global ecological problems. They regard these questions in the general context of the Leninist foreign policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, in the context of continued efforts to extend détente.

For instance, the Soviet Union is now carrying out a number of research and practical projects within international organizations and on the basis of bilateral agreements. This work is being conducted most consistently within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, where all research is subject to a uniform long-range plan. In fact, measures to protect the environment are considered a major aspect of the CMEA countries' scientific and technological cooperation.

At the same time, the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries have an active share in the work of such authoritative international organizations as the UN Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), and others. Besides a number of environmental-protection projects are being carried out under bilateral agreements with the United States, France, Japan, Iran, Afghanistan and several other countries. The Soviet Union is thus making a weighty contribution to preventing the present ecological crisis afflicting the capitalist world from reaching global dimensions.

An effective system of equal and constructive international cooperation in protecting the environment is today the only realistic possibility of solving worldwide ecological problems. And such cooperation would make for a healthier political climate on our planet.

1. The emergence of a fundamentally new ecological situation should not, I think, be equated with individual negative processes, e.g., environmental pollution, despite all their unquestioned importance. A systems approach should take into account the totality of ecological factors: pollution of the atmosphere, hydrosphere and soil, fresh-water and cultivated land balance, food production, consumption of finite natural resources and, lastly, stabilization of global and regional ecological systems and the conditions for reproduction of their central link, their 'master' — man.

2. After repeated appeals by scientists, journalists, public and political leaders, discussion of the fundamental questions of man's interaction with nature was begun

at international forums. Thus, in June 1972 a UN-sponsored conference in Stockholm adopted a Declaration on the Environment, setting out the principles and goals of environmental protection, and an Action Plan for international cooperation in protecting the environment and natural resources.

Marxist scientists were among the first to discuss every aspect of the new ecological situation. Mention might be made of the international symposium, Marxism-Leninism and the Problems of Preserving the Environment, held in Prague in March 1972. A report of the symposium, 'Ecology and Politics', was put out by the Prague Peace and Socialism publishers in 1972.

3. D.L. and D.H. Meadows Eds. *Toward Global Equilibrium,* Collected Papers, Cambridge, Mass. 1973; D.L. Meadows et al. *Dynamics of Growth in a Finite World,* Cambridge, Mass., 1974.

4. D.L. Meadows et al. *The Limits to Growth,* New York, 1972.

5. H. Cole et al (Eds.). *Thinking About the Future: a Critique of the Limits to Growth,* London, 1974.

6. Mihajlo Mesarovic and Eduard Pestel. *Mankind at the Turning Point.* The Second Report to the Club of Rome, New York, 1974.

7. Latin American World Model (Preliminary Report). Buenos-Aires, 1974.

8. Yoichi Kaya and Yutaka Suzuki. *Global Constraints and a New Vision for Development.* 1. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change,* Vol. 6, No. 3, 1974, pp. 277-297.

9. 'Problems of Population Doubling.'

10. DEMATEL — Decision Making Trial and Evaluation Laboratory. For the latest projects see: M. Siebker and Y. Kaya. The Club of Rome Report from Tokyo. Toward a Global Vision of Human Problems. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change,* Vol. 6, No. 3, 1974, pp. 231-260.

11. The population of the socialist countries is treated as a single group.

12. 'Reshaping the International Order,' N.Y. 1976.

13. Environmental problems, the use of natural resources, and development strategy were discussed in October 1974 at a symposium in Cocoyoc, Mexico, sponsored by UNCTAD and UNEP. A declaration was approved emphasizing the need to supervise the use of natural resources and environmental protection on a global scale in order to protect the interests of the most underdeveloped countries and of future generations.

14. Significantly, one of the latest models, 'Goals for Global Society,' worked out by a group under Professor Laszlo, who works in the USA, directly links much of the environmental pollution to the ethics and aims of capitalist society. It suggests minimal changes in values which would markedly 'humanize' the world order. (For the methodology used in this project, see, E. Laszlo, 'A Strategy for the Future. The Systems Approach to World Order,' N.Y., 1974. A. K. Bobcast and A.J. Fedanzo Jr, 'Goals for Global Society. Third Generation Project for the Club of Rome.'' *Technological Forecast and Social Change,* 1975, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 327-330.

15. An assessment of the general theoretical aspects of global models will be found in a number of works by Soviet scientists. e.g., V. Zagladin and I. Frolov. 'Global Problems of our Time.' *Kommunist,* 1976, No. 16, pp. 93-104.

16. See, A.D. Smirnov. 'The System of Simulated Economic Decisions.' *Economics and Mathematical Methods,* 1973, Vol. IX, No. 3, pp. 395-406; G.I. Belchansky et al, 'Methodological Aspects of the Construction of Simulated Models of Natural Resources and the Tasks of Global Modelling.' In Reports of the 23rd International Geographical Congress, Vol. 8, *Regional Geography,* Moscow, 1976, pp. 230-234.

17. K.G. Gofman, M.Y. Lemeshev, N.F. Reimers. 'Social and Economic Problems of the Use of the Natural Resources.' In *Economics and Mathematical Methods,* 1973, Vol. IX, No. 5, pp. 812-822.

18. K.A. Bagrinovsky, M.Y. Lemeshev. 'On Economic Development Planning, With Account of Ecological Requirements,' Ibid., 1976, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 681-691.

The Dominican Republic: problems and prospects

Pedro Juan Persia
CC member, Dominican CP

The Third National Conference of the Dominican Communist Party, held in Santo Domingo last December, discussed and approved the report of the Central Committee which analyzed the country's economic and political situation and summed up the basic development trends in 1973-76. It examined the changes in the regime and in the opposition, the sources of the growing contradictions within the ruling faction, assessed the present struggle against the multinational monopolies, which are plundering our national resources, and stressed the importance of the forthcoming elections and of the nascent process of realignment of social and political forces.

The record of 1976 makes it clear that the economic improvement of the past two years has not prevented aggravation of the country's social ills, which affect the majority of its population, nor resolved its serious economic problems. The growth factors of the past two years no longer operate: growth of gross national product has steadily declined from an annual average of 11.2 per cent in 1969-73 to 8.9 per cent in 1974 and to only 6.2 per cent in 1975.

The drop in world prices of sugar, combined with rising fuel prices, a steadily increasing foreign debt, dearer international loans, and an unfavorable ratio between foreign investment and profit export by the multinationals, are impeding development. And this is attended by still greater economic dependence on foreign countries, stagnation in agriculture, and growing concentration of property and incomes.

It has become perfectly clear that an economic policy founded entirely, or mainly, on the uncontrolled inflow of foreign investment has proved utterly ineffectual and is contrary to the widespread demand for independent development.

All available data point to the deteriorating structural crisis. Thus, the foreign debt increased from $158.1 million in 1966 to $794.1 million on May 31, 1976. Last year's balance of payments deficit topped the $300 million mark. Export of profits has been running ahead of the infllow of new direct investments: in 1973 they amounted to $34.5 million, while profit exports amounted to $79.7 million, and the figures for 1974 are respectively $53.6 and $94.9 million.

There is relative stagnation in agriculture, the mainstay of the economy. The following figures are indicative of the sharp social contradictions in our rural areas. A large part of the farmland is being used for extensive cattle raising (2 million taeras)*; 2.4 per cent of landowners account for 62.5 per cent of latifundia lands which produce either very little or nothing at all, while 86.2 per cent of the peasant farms have a mere 19.3 per cent of the farmland. The result has been a constantly decreasing volume of agricultural produce for the home market, and there is now the danger of a food shortage.

Concentration of property and, consequently, of profits, has reached menacing proportions. Only six per cent of the population enjoy a monthly income of more than 300 pesos, 50 per cent of the rural population live on the border of poverty, with a monthly income of less than 60 pesos, or only 13 per cent of total income. Unemployment now stands at an average of 20 per cent and in rural areas is as high as 45 per cent. In other words, 75 per cent of Dominicans cannot afford even a minimum of essential foods.

If the situation does not change, the inevitable result will be accentuation of all the negative trends: continued inflation, concentration of incomes, unemployment, pauperization of the working people, greater dependence on foreign countries, a larger balance of payments deficit and, of course, a much larger foreign debt. This will drastically cut the economic growth rates of the past few years. The economy is being sustained mainly by foreign loans and more foreign investments. In the long-term, both are bound to exacerbate all our social ills, and will certainly not prevent continued deepening of the economic crisis.

Recent years have seen significant changes in the alignment of political forces. Since 1972, the Balaguer government has been following a reformist policy. Signs of a tendency opposed to the traditional policy of the oligarchy can be seen, in particular, in a series of draft laws generally known as 'The Agrarian Code of the Balaguer Government.' Some have been rejected by Congress, but the very fact that they were put before Congress is, in the opinion of the Communist Party, indicative of the sharp contradiction between government policy and the interests of the right-wing forces who have supported the president since 1966. The latifundist oligarchy desperately resisted government measures to resolve the agricultural crisis. The big landowners were dead set against changes in land tenure, and this precipitated a split in the ruling Reformist Party. Publication of the draft agrarian laws was followed by an unprecedented rise of the peasant movement.

Tension rose especially in 1973, when Balaguer put before Con-

*One taera equals 632 square metres. — *Ed.*

gress two other draft laws. One of them envisaged transfer to the agrarian-reform fund of the unused pasture lands owned by the big landholders. The other draft law, which likewise encountered fierce resistance from the reactionary elements, provided for legalization of the Communist Party. Both drafts were shelved. The rightist elements accused the government of dangerous 'condonation' of the communists. Julian Perez, a leading right-winger, resigned from the government, which was being pressured also by the extreme right-wing officers who had by this time won key posts in the armed forces.

In an effort to incite confusion in the country and thus create a favorable climate for a coup d'état, on March 17, 1975 the plotters assassinated Orlando Martinez, one of the leaders of our party and editor of the popular magainze *Ahora,* on the pages of which he had exposed the plans for a fascist coup. This aroused a nationwide protest which the ultra-rightists, both civilian and military, least of all expected. The impressive scope of this protest against political terror had very unfavorable consequences for the opponents of even the most timid reforms contemplated by the government. In particular, President Balaguer was obliged to remove some of the high-ranking military and police officials and replace them by more loyal and moderate-ones.

These measures, like the government's policy in general, were of a dual, contradictory nature. The government's political maneuvers and half-way decisions did not preclude repeated ultra-right actions. In fact, the pro-fascist elements still hold important positions in the government machinery and have the support both of the reactionary forces at home and of definite institutions and services in the United States. Nonetheless, the changes that have taken place in the country are more favorable for political activity and tend to dull the neo-fascist menace, facilitate reforms and strengthen unity of the democratic and patriotic forces.

There have been changes also in the opposition line-up. On the eve of the 1974 elections, the right-wing opposition to President Balaguer united in a number of coalitions to form a motley conglomerate of reactionary forces, including the latifundist oligarchy affected by the government reforms, supporters of retired General Elias Wessin y Wessin, who in 1965 led the troops which, together with the U.S. interventionist, fought the constitutionalists, and many smaller right-wing groups and parties. But after the elections most of them sided with the government, as the communists had foreseen, thus demonstrating their complete political insolvency.

The opposition is now made up of such parties as the fragmented and largely passive Dominican Popular Movement which has yet to formulate a clear-cut policy, and the Dominican Liberation Party

headed by Juan Bosch. Its distinguishing features are bourgeois-democratic narrow-mindedness, a policy of compromise and the absence of any consistent program on basic social-economic issues. Also in the opposition is the Dominican Revolutionary Party, which has wide popular support. However, following on a series of major errors and an unprincipled policy of alliance with the right forces, it is now in a state of deep crisis. Furthermore, the presence in its leadership of elements closely associated with the big commercial and landed interests restricts, not to say prevents, its participation in the anti-imperialist and anti-latifundist struggle.

The outlook for further political action and deep-going structural changes depends not on this 'opposition,' but rather on the formation of a new socio-political movement capable of giving voice to the aspirations of the people, implementing a radical agrarian reform and abolishing dependence on foreign countries. Only such a movement can stimulate social reforms within the state apparatus, secure complete sovereignty over our natural resources, and unite all the civilian and military forces prepared to fight the local oligarchy and the foreign monopolies.

Only by extending and deepening the struggle for the right to dispose of our national wealth, now foreign-controlled, the working class struggle against the big landed interests, the struggle against corruption and political terror, can we secure united action of the various parties and social groups. And only practical activity can bring about such unity, which accords with historical necessity and with the present trends of social development. In the past there was identity of positions on such issues as the predatory activities of the multinationals, on combating the political crimes of the ruling rightist groups, and on latifundism.

There was united action by the trade unions, a number of opposition parties, peasant associations, military elements, members of the government, officials and specialists in the government service, against foreign companies, and also in the anti-feudal struggle and the campaign of protest against the assassination of Orlando Martinez. These groups also united, though in varying degrees of consistency, on several other issues.

Such joint action on a widening range of national problems can produce a situation that would alter the existing pattern of political development, lead to the formation of a new alliance, make it possible to win power with the support of the masses, and pave the road to national and social liberation of our people.

Though the perspective is for continued aggravation of the crisis of the existing system, the government is still in a position to chart a new course in its economic and social policy.

This is borne out by some of its actions in recent years. The agrarian laws, changes in contractual relations with the big mining companies, hydropower projects, the establishment of state farms to boost the production of vegetables and other foods, the socially important 'rice law' envisaging the transfer to the agrarian reform fund of all rice plantations serviced by the state-owned irrigation system, abortive attempts to freeze prices — these and several other measures, despite their modest scope and restricted implementation, were the result of the objective requirements of economic development and were designed to moderate the more negative consequences of the crisis.

However, so far, these necessary changes have largely remained promises, the reforms were never carried out, enacted laws were not put into practice, and even the timid measures proposed by government commissions and technical specialists were later shelved.

If the government had been more consistent in carrying out these reform measures, it would have been possible, at least to a certain extent, to moderate the crisis and ease the heavy burden borne by the poorest sections of the people.

This would have opened the way to more profound changes that could remove the causes of the structural crisis. What the Communist Party has proposed amounts to a program of fundamental change of existing social and economic structures and abolition of all dependence on foreign capitalism. A program of deep-going change must include the following essential measures:

— nationalization of foreign companies, especially Alcoa, Falconbridge, Rosario Resource, Simplot and Gulf and Western, the oil refinery and the telephone company;

— accelerated enforcement of existing agrarian laws, effective application of the law on pasture lands; complete repeal of sharecropping and stimulation of collective farming and fair distribution of farm incomes; transfer of the Agricultural Bank to the Dominican Agrarian Institute;

— strengthening of the state sector as a key national asset;

— transfer to the state of the entire fertilizer industry;

— transfer to the state of all service enterprises;

— nationalization of foreign banks;

— gradual transfer to the state of foreign trade, and other measures.

While supporting all, even the most restricted, measures toward these aims, our party has no intention of abandoning its efforts to bring to power a regime capable of energetically carrying out deep-going structural changes. Though the points enumerated above are not a complete and final plan of social transformations, they can serve

as the basis for working out a program for our country's transition to socialism. That will require more vigorous efforts and effective cooperation with representatives of the revolutionary intelligentsia and all the people in order to mobilize the forces of social changes, so needed by our country.

And these forces include the working class, peasantry, marginal strata, low-income urban strata — in short, everyone concerned for the future of our country, everyone holding patriotic positions, believers and non-believers, civilians and servicemen. These are the strata committed to resolving the social, political and economic problems confronting our society.

The Dominican Communist Party has made significant headway in its campaign for legalization. It has scored considerable success despite the fact that the draft law on legalization, which the president presented to Congress, has not been enacted. We are factually bringing it into force.

Our constructive part in the nationwide discussion of crucial problems has visibly enhanced our party's prestige. The next task is to win full legality and restore our political and electoral rights and put an end to all discrimination against those who hold Marxist-Leninist views.

Experience has taught us that we do not have to wait for the adoption of some special law. The restrictions we have overcome and those still operative under anti-communist laws 6, 70 and 71, are in crying contradiction to such constitutional principles as freedom of speech, organization and ideology. The Communist Party has decided to take advantage of these principles, and by direct action surmount all obstacles and enforce all the constitutional rights enjoyed by every legal party. This means holding conferences, open meetings and rallies to explain our position to the masses.

The Dominican communists will openly and publicly carry out all these measures. More, they are prepared to discuss their policy and take part in the democratic struggle. This does not rule out participation in elections. On the contrary, in view of the elections appointed for 1978, and the start of the election campaign, and though fully aware of the limited character and defects of these elections, we have expressed our readiness to take part in them in order to uphold the interests of the working people and explain and popularize the Communist Party program on the pressing problems facing the country.

Purveyors of lies

NOTES ON THE METHODS OF THE BOURGEOIS MASS MEDIA

For almost two years after the Helsinki Conference, the bourgeois mass media virtually turned a deaf ear to the Final Act's appeal to disseminate 'an ever wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life in other participating states.' Far from contributing 'to the strengthening of peace and understanding among peoples and to the spiritual enrichment of the human personality,' they operated against this fundamental principle proclaimed in the 'third basket' of the Helsinki peace charter.

If imperialist propaganda has done anything in the sphere of international relations, it is essentially negative and is intended to shape them according to the interests of reaction.

The modern propaganda machine of imperialism, which commands powerful facilities using the latest achievements of science and technology, is working at top speed. It repeats battered ideological stereotypes over and over again, including the myth of 'freedom' of the capitalist press. Yet the methods used by the privately owned mass media serve only one purpose, which is to strengthen class rule in a society based on exploitation.

'Service to society'

Shortly before his death, Lord Thomson published an autobiography called *After I was Sixty*. In it the owner of 148 newspapers, 138 periodicals, many publishing houses and TV stations in Britain, Canada, the United States and elsewhere tells how, at the beginning of his 'wholly profit-oriented' career, he 'made a big fortune through radio and television and newspapers'[1] and won a high position in finance and business on either side of the Atlantic as well as the recognition of Britain's ruling quarters, to which the son of a Canadian barber owes his British peerage.

'What we did with our money,' Thomson writes, 'was to go wide

and far, to hunt out opportunities for expansion, to enjoy the real freedom of enterprise.'[2] The author's description of 'hunting' methods reads like a manual for men in the news business. Having made up his mind to 'conquer' Edinburgh, he offered to barter newspapers with Sir Harley Drayton, head of the United Newspapers trust. 'I knew exactly,' Thomson confides, 'what Harley Drayton wanted; he believed like me that a good deal was one in which both sides were satisfied. He genuinely preferred to have no one interfering when he and I were working to that end. That is the face of capitalism which is quite genuine.'[3]

In step with his transformation into a multimillionaire (he estimated the assets of the corporation's Canadian branch alone at £300m.), Thomson followed more and more punctually, as he himself admits, the example of 'most of the people who owned and ran newspapers in Canada and America and in Britain' and 'did so because they liked the prestige and the power that newspaper ownership gave them.'[4] He 'became very close friends' with successive British prime ministers, leaders of parliament and cabinet ministers, with presidents and heads of government of other capitalist countries, with top men in NATO and the Common Market. 'We helped . . . to spread ideas among men of influence and to bring opposing opinions closer together.'[5]

Just what sort of ideas Thomson helped to spread is not hard to guess. Every time he turns in his life story to the subject of labor or labor unions, his lines breathe hatred. Peter Preston, reviewing Thomson's autobiography in *The Guardian,* mocks at the lord's attempts to represent his every deal as a charitable act and evidence of heartfelt concern for 'freedom of the press.' He calls Thomson's methods 'warmly grasping by the throat' and the lord himself, 'a tough, imaginative operator who must have had a battle plan.'[6]

Other men like Thomson 'serve society' just as 'warmly.' Henry Luce, founder of Time Inc., stated his political credo in an address to the American Association of Advertising Agencies as follows: 'Yours is the only court in the land to which I hold myself accountable. My only law is the concordat between advertiser and editor . . . This is the very essence of democracy . . . Whether *Life* will endure depends upon you, the Appropriations Committee of the American Press . . . It is my firm belief that advertisers not only have the right, but the duty to become inextricably involved with the ethical and cultural standards of the American press.'[7]

The 'only court,' in turn, stints no expenditure to bolster the monopoly press. Last year U.S. big business invested over $10,000m. in newspaper advertising, or roughly three-quarters of the newspaper owners' revenue. The lion's share went to the press chains, which account for about 60 per cent of the total circulation of the dailies.

Strictly tentative assessments carried out by the Rand Corporation indicated that net profit in the American newspaper industry was 76 per cent higher than the national average for all industries.[8]

Fabulous profits enable the chain owners to buy more newspapers and TV stations. Late in 1976, Samuel Newhouse, owner of a major American media concern, paid $305m. in cash for eight newspapers and *Parade* magazine belonging to the Booth Newspapers chain. What makes the aged multimillionaire grab newspapers in dozens of American cities? 'Sam Newhouse,' said Philip Hochstein, a Newhouse editor for some time, 'never pretended to be a public benefactor. He doesn't claim to be with the people. He's a capitalist.'[9]

The trouble with the newspaper business,' writes Thomas Griffith, a former editor of *Life* magazine, in his book *How True,* 'is that it is becoming more and more just a business ... Newspapers become simply money-making machines ... Editors are chosen who will do their jobs without making waves. Such an approach is stultifying to good journalism, as anyone in the business knows ... Corporate managers soon free themselves of editors they regard as negative, trouble-making, shrill or otherwise inconvenient.'[10]

The ideal editors for monopoly owners are, to quote Lord Thomson, 'highly skilled and dedicated professional journalists.'[11] It is to men like them, whose convictions are accurately tuned to state monopoly interests, that the press and broadcasting are entrusted.

Theodore White, the American historian, had in mind editors and journalists of this kind when he described New York's information and propaganda machinery as 'the largest megaphone and finest brainwashing system the world has ever known.'[12]

'Pluralism' of the media

The colorful variety of the West German newsstands is deceptive, notes Paul Sethe, a liberal-minded bourgeois analyst of that country's mass media. The freedom of the press was fast becoming the freedom of a few hundred rich men to broadcast their opinions. Real diversity of critical opinion had, in the main, given way to the security of the consensus, as West Germany was a society where profitability and competitiveness had become the sole determinants of the fortunes of the press.[13]

By the mid-70s, three per cent of the West German publishers accounted for half the circulation of all dailies. The concentration process in the mass media is continuing, with the Bertelsmann and Springer multimedia complexes striving to take over the more prestigious and profitable newspapers, periodicals, publishing houses, and film production and distribution companies.

Private ownership of radio and television broadcasting is prohibited in the FRG. This is considered a 'public' field which must serve all classes and population groups. The eight broadcasting corporations operating in various states of the Federal Republic are expected to be seen as a model of 'pluralism' in covering political, economic and cultural problems: Their statutes contain such lofty principles as the duty to proceed independently and impartially, eschew preference for any particular political philosophy or ideology, promote international understanding, peace and social justice and uphold democratic freedoms.

As commercial advertising through radio and, above all, television increased, West German financial and industrial capital acquired an effective means of influencing the content and ideological trend of broadcasting. This influence was intensified by introducing a system under which supervisory boards of broadcasting corporations are appointed by state governments. Many of these boards are formed on the principle of so-called proportional representation, or according to the distribution of seats among parties in the landtag concerned, whose members are admittedly elected in violation of the rights of progressive parties.

In a book on the situation in capitalist television, Antony Smith, a noted British producer, stresses that in the FRG, 'it has become harder and harder for producers to get jobs carrying any weight unless they enjoy the sponsorship of a powerful political group within the State.'[14] There is 'a single program ideology,' he adds.

On West German television as, indeed, in the press, the much advertised 'pluralism' of ideas and opinions translates itself into purposeful psychological pressure on every social class or stratum to impart a hundred per cent bourgeois mentality and behavior to everyone.[15] The promise to work for peace and international understanding turns out to be chauvinistic talk, support for the aims of the military-industrial complex and an effort to whip up cold-war hysteria in the interests of the country's more reactionary and militarist quartars and of NATO.

As in West Germany, the bourgeois media in the United States widely publicized 'pluralism.' They cite numerous facts supposed to prove the existence of pluralism, and refer frequently to so-called liberal press organs, said to contrast sharply with the conservative and even the 'moderate' press. Some bourgeois publishers are particularly fond of showing off their alleged liberalism. They include Dorothy Schiff, who has inherited the *New York Post* from her grandfather, co-owner of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. After 37 years of ownership of this most 'liberal' daily on the East Coast, Ms. Schiff decided to get rid of it. She took her time choosing a purchaser. In keeping

with the tradition of Americans professing liberal views, everyone expected her choice to fall on a like-minded person and, incidentally, there were many in this category who would have liked to buy one of New York's three major dailies. Yet the 'lucky winner' turned out to be Rupert Murdoch, the ultra-reactionary publisher of Australian, British and North American gutter newspapers.

The point is not so much the cheque signed by Murdoch (*Newsweek* set it at between $27 and $30 million) as the make-believe liberalism paraded by bourgeois publishers. The average American paper, says *Columbia Journalism Review,* an authority on the American press, is completely conservative. It has no place for a 'broader spectrum of opinion' and refuses to keep pace with its readers. As for 'bulwarks of liberalism,' such as the *New York Times* and *Washington Post,* they are, in fact, "more conservative on many issues than their readers, and only appear to be far-out in comparison with their 1,748 daily siblings.'[16]

Nevertheless, the monopoly media go on posing as a well of 'pluralism, choice and diversity' from which you are supposed to be able to draw any ideas and opinions. This 'illusion,' writes Professor Herbert Schiller of the University of California, is kept up by the 'abundance' of mass media in the United States.[17] Indeed, roughly 1,500 dailies, hundreds of periodicals, about 7,000 radio stations and over 1,000 TV stations contribute their share to an avalanche of information. It is not so easy, therefore, to disbelieve those who say this is a source of diversity. 'The fact of the matter,' Schiller writes, 'is that ... most Americans are basically, though unconsciously, trapped in what amounts to a no-choice information bind. Variety of opinion on foreign and domestic news or, for that matter, local community business, hardly exists in the media. This results essentially from the inherent identity of interests, material and ideological, of property-holders (in this case, the private owners of the communications media), and from the monopolistic character of the communications industry in general.'[18] The communications monopolies, the professor continues, 'offer one version of reality — their own ... the images and messages they purvey, are, with few exceptions, constructed to achieve similar objectives, which are, simply put, profitability and the affirmation and maintenance of the private-ownership consumer society.'[19]

In camouflaging this scheme, a special role is assigned to what Prof. Schiller calls the 'myth of neutrality.' The media are described — along with Federal legislative, executive and judicial authorities, universities and schools — as impartial, deideologized 'neutral agents' 'serving everyone impartially and disinterestedly.' Corruption among the authorities, misinformation by officials, bias and preconception in

the press, as well as other 'deviations' are said to be products of human errors and weaknesses. It follows that the country was dragged into the disgraceful Vietnam war owing to the 'errors' of President Johnson and his advisers while the 'human weaknesses' of certain Republican Party leaders resulted in the Watergate scandal. To be sure, servants of the system who have discredited themselves are criticized and even made to resign but the system itself with its institutions and values is exempt from criticism.

Life shows, however, that manipulation, however skillful, does not achieve the purposes of imperialist propaganda. In fact, there is a 'credibility gap' between the 'free press' and a large body of public opinion in the capitalist countries, as many bourgeois authors admit. In these circumstances, Prof. Schiller writes in his latest book, 'imperialism has been developing complementary, if not alternate, strategies and instrumentation for safeguarding its unstable and increasingly menaced global positions. The ideological sphere receives ever more attention.'[20]

'Freedom of information,' or 'management of news'

Government agencies of the capitalist countries give increasing attention to the ideological sphere. True, many bourgeois apologists contend that the government control mechanism only involves the economy, finance and trade, leaving the spiritual sphere, the 'dissemination of ideas,' intact. But they no longer sound as confident as in the past.

After holding several editorial jobs in London and being appointed chairman of the board of the *Evening Standard,* Charles Wintour wrote a book entitled *Pressures on the Press*. Who exerts these pressures? 'The most difficult of all pressures for an editor to withstand,' Wintour complains, 'is that of news management by practised hands who understand the media and want the paper to give a favorable slant to their activities.'[21] Wintour classes ruling parties, governments and armed forces commands as wizards of 'news management.'

'Management of news' is a term coined by James Reston, the American columnist, to describe the U.S. government's system of manipulating the media. By the early 70s, the propaganda staff of the federal executive authority exceeded 10,000 public relations experts (the figure does not encompass the USIA or the Voice of America).

The Pentagon has over 3,000 such experts. Millions of dollars are allocated for justifying in the eyes of Americans and of the world at large the enormous military budgets of the United States and the arms race backed by the military-industrial complex. In collaboration with the CIA, the Pentagon's propaganda machine invents myths about the

'Soviet military threat' and the 'aggressiveness' of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Arthur Sylvester, a former assistant U.S. secretary of defense for public relations, said in an attempt to justify the practices of his department that the government had an 'inherent right . . . to lie.'[22] His successor, Phil Goulding, admitted on resigning that for four years, he had 'misled and misinformed the American people a good many times.'[23] 'Lying,' commented Marvin Calb, a diplomatic correspondent of the CBS, 'is a legitimate part of the defense mechanism of the administration, and the reporter goes along with it when in his opinion it is in the national interest.'[24] As if to sum up all the various opinions, David Wise, an American commentator, said during a Congress hearing on 'freedom of information': 'The American people have not been told the truth . . . We now have a system of institutionalized lying.'[25]

The CIA is the greatest abuser of the media. It virtually controls all 'black' and 'grey' propaganda. 'Black propaganda, writes Victor Marchetti, a former CIA official, and John Marks, formerly of the State Department, in their much-discussed book, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence,* is identical with disinformation and the dissemination of frank lies. 'Grey' propaganda, they note, is 'a mixture of truths, half-truths, and slight distortions . . . to slant the views of the audience.'[26]

The CIA's best-known grey propaganda operations against the socialist countries are, according to Philip Agee, a former CIA official, the broadcasts of Raido Free Europe and Radio Liberty Munich.[27]

Public opinion in the capitalist countries has lately protested more and more emphatically against the continued operation of the two stations, which former U.S. Senator William Fulbright called 'relics of the cold war.'

Progressive opinion demands that, as well as removing these 'relics,' an end be put to all the methods of psychological warfare and ideological subversion used by 'black' and 'grey' propaganda experts in blatant violation of the Helsinki Final Act. There are quite a few experts of this sort on the CIA payroll. Several hundred American journalists and editors are secret agents of the CIA, wrote John Marks in *Columbia Journalism Review*.[28] Many of these agents, David Rosenbaum of the *New York Times* reported, are 'in executive positions for U.S. news outlets.'[29]

The U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities (chairman, Senator Frank Church) published in the spring of 1976 a report disclosing that the CIA does not confine itself to using American journalists. The report speaks of several hundred foreign individuals scattered all over the world who supply the CIA with intel-

ligence data and try to influence public opinion abroad through secret propaganda.[30]

The information business, wrote Stuart Loory, professor of public affairs at Ohio State University, needs to and must cooperate with the CIA and other intelligence services. Ethical considerations ... are secondary in these relations.[31]

Loory and other authors of articles on cooperation and interaction between the bourgeois mass media and the American CIA, British SIS and West German BND do not deny that this 'need' rises primarily from the overall strategy used by imperialism against the socialist countries, communist and workers' parties, trade unions, international democratic organizations and all progressive forces.

This strategy was conceived as a direct answer to the rise of the world's first socialist state. It was intended to neutralize the revolutionary impact which the ideas of socialism, being embodied in the new society under construction in Soviet Russia, had on the peoples of all countries and to withhold the truth about the young worker-peasant republic, a truth gaining ground on all continents. These factors compelled the bourgeoisie of all countries to step up greatly their propaganda in close collaboration with the governments concerned. Since the end of World War II, the increased might and influence of the world socialist system, the weakening of imperialist positions and the deterioration of the general crisis of capitalism have forced bourgeois governments and mass media to coordinate their activities ever more carefully and to carry on joint campaigns prompted by anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

But the past 60 years have shown that no amount of propaganda campaigning can stop the victorious advance of Marxist-Leninist ideas, conceal the truth about existing socialism or reduce the impact of its inspiring example on the whole of mankind.

James Peterson

1. Lord Thomson of Fleet, *After I Was Sixty*. London, 1975, pp. 6, 175.
2. Ibid., p. 111.
3. Ibid., p. 38.
4. Ibid., p. 6.
5. Ibid., p. 192.
6. *The Guardian*, July 4, 1975.
7. *Fact*, July-August, 1967.
8. B. Bagdikian, *The Information Machines*. New York, 1971, p. 133.
9. *Time*, July 27, 1962.
10. Thomas Griffith, *How True*. Boston, 1974, pp. 133-134.
11. *After I Was Sixty*, p. 132.
12. Theodore White, *The Making of the President — 1964*. New York, 1965, pp. 86-87.
13. John Sandford, *The Mass Media of the German-Speaking Countries*. London, 1976, p. 37.

14. Antony Smith, *The Shadow in the Cave*. London, 1973, p. 64.

15. 'The Media Under Pressure,' an article by Andreas Bartsch and Reinhard Bispinck, FRG, gives revealing examples of the employers' arbitrary methods in broadcasting. Television had to renounce 13 serials on factory councils because the 'employers' associations' saw them as threatening to undermine 'trustful cooperation' between worker and employers. Under the notorious *Berufsverbot* law, Peter Kleinert was discharged from his TV job because he had told in a telecast about industrial accidents, including fatal ones, at an enterprise of Dynamit-Nobel-AG *(Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik,* December 1976, pp. 1378, 1382, 1383).

16. *Columbia Journalism Review*, March/April 1972.

17. Herbert I. Schiller, *The Mind Managers*. Boston, 1973, p. 19.

18. Ibid. 'The enormous and diverse system of American television,' writes Antony Smith, the producer mentioned earlier, ' . . . provides for the overwhelming mass of American viewers and listeners a stultifying sameness . . . the end-product betrays the signs of an appalling cultural tyranny.'

19. Ibid., pp. 20, 22.

20. Herbert I. Schiller, *Communications and Cultural Domination*. White Plains, N.Y., 1976, p. 3.

21. Charles Wintour, *Pressures on the Press,* London, 1972, p. 44.

22. B. Ladd, *Crisis in Credibility*. New York, 1968, p. 3.

23. *Newsweek,* March 23, 1970.

24. *The Press in Washington*. Ed. Ray Elden Hilbert. New York, 1967, p. 162.

25. *U.S. Government Information Policies and Practices — the Pentagon Papers* (Part 2). Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. House of Representatives, 92nd Congress, First Session (Washington, D.C., 1971), pp. 329-330.

26. Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*. New York, 1974, p. 165.

27. Philip Agee, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*. Harmondsworth, England, 1975, p. 72.

28. *Columbia Journalism Review*, July/August, 1976.

29. *The New York Times*, April 27, 1976.

30. *Columbia Journalism Review*, July/August, 1976.

31. Ibid., September/October 1974.

---

facts and figures

The strike movement in the developed capitalist countries

1976 TO BEGINNING OF 1977*

As the strike record all over the non-socialist world, and particularly in the developed capitalist countries, shows, the class confrontation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is gaining momentum. Admittedly, bourgeois sociologists try to prove from time to time that the class struggle is on the wane, but the facts prove that the proletariat's class opposition to capital is as vigorous as ever and has a tendency to grow. This is confirmed by the dynamics of the strike movement over the past two decades.

Number of participants in the strike movement in the capitalist countries (in millions)*

1956	1960	1965	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
7.7	44	19	45	48	43	45	48	50

*Totals include participants in national protest days.

As the table shows, the number of people taking part in strikes in the developed capitalist countries has almost tripled in two decades and has remained high in recent years. The scale differs, of course, in various countries. According to official but incomplete data published at the beginning of 1977, during the period 1972-75 the figures for work losses per hundred of the work force in the EEC member countries were Italy 190 days, Britain 164, Denmark 125, Ireland 77, Belgium 35, France 32, Holland 10 and the FRG 5.5. In Japan and Canada losses were repectively 33 and 213 days.

*Survey compiled by *WMR* Research Unit.

But important though they are as an illustration of the tension between labor and capital, overall totals do not tell the whole story.

In recent years the strikers' demands for employment, increased wages, pensions and various allowances have arisen from the enormous growth of inflation caused by the economic crisis, the soaring cost of living, the attacks on the workers' living standards, and the policy of state-monopoly regulation of the economy in the interests of big business and the financial oligarchy.

The biggest strike actions in the developed capitalist countries in the period under review indicate that the temperature of class conflict in these countries has remained high.

Even the capitalist press admits this. In an article headed 'Labor's Growing Anger' *Time* magazine wrote in mid-March 1977: 'All across Western Europe the mood of organized labor has turned ominously sullen . . . Strikes, or threat of them, are on the increase.'

The strike movement in the period under review displayed a number of characteristic features that have been seen more and more often in the actions by working people of the developed capitalist countries in recent years.

One of these features is the unitary character of their actions.

In Italy, 1976 opened with a massive strike throughout industry. Twenty million industrial workers, technicians and office employees responded to strike calls from the three leading trade union centers — the General Confederation of Labor, the Confederation of Workers' Trade Unions and the Union of Labor. They protested against the spread of unemployment and the crisis-ridden state of the economy and demanded that in seeking a way out of the crisis the government should not allow closures and new layoffs. Similar demands were made by seven million working people in the course of a general strike in November 1976.

In France, the working people responded to the call of the leading trade union groups — the General Confederation of Labor and the Democratic Federation of Labor and also the National Education Federation and on October 7 launched a 24-hour strike and mass demonstrations of protest against the government's economic plan for getting out of the crisis at the expense of the working people. France's Communist Party, Socialist Party and the Movement of Left Radicals that make up the alliance of left-wing forces supported the strike, in which six million people participated. Another two million showed their solidarity by joining in the demonstrations. All these examples are evidence of the increased strength of the working class and its class organizations.

Another feature is the growing variety of forms of strike action. There are now 'stop-go,' 'staggered' and 'pin-point' strikes. These

forms are often used, particularly during mass action, in combination with other kinds of protest. For example, during the strike battles in France, Italy, Spain and Canada mass work stoppages were accompanied by demonstrations, street meetings and marches.

Not only the strike but the threat of a strike is becoming an effective weapon in the hands of the working class of the capitalist countries. For example, the decision of the Executive Committee of the National Union of Seamen in Britain to call a nationwide strike on September 11 caused confusion in government circles. Panic on the West European monetary market led to a fall in the exchange rate of the pound, and the result was that the shipowners had to yield to the seamen's demands.

Yet another feature of strike action was its unusual duration. Last October in the U.S., for instance, a strike by electrical workers in Minneapolis ended in victory for the workers after they had been out for over two months, and 17,000 United Parcel Service drivers stayed on strike for several months to win satisfaction of their claims. More than 30,000 construction workers in the Biscay Province of Spain kept up their fight for nearly a month. An outstanding example of prolonged campaigning by the working people is the strike by staff of the Paris newspaper *Parisien libéré* against arbitrary action by the owners who refused to reinstate 600 illegally dismissed compositors and linotype operators. The strike has been going on for more than two years now. The strikers have been helped on several occasions by the solidarity of the French working people, who came out in support of their class brothers.

Proletarian solidarity has always been a characteristic feature of strike actions in the capitalist countries. 1976 and the opening months of 1977 have yielded a good many examples of such solidarity. Over the past year British workers have quite frequently staged strikes and demonstrations in support of the victims of racism in their country. In London, on November 21, 1976, where only four days before nearly 100,000 working people had demonstrated against the government's economic policy, a new protest march against racism and in support of the Black workers living in Britain took place. In 1976-77 demonstrations and marches in support of the patriots of Chile, Uruguay and South Africa were held in many West European countries. The participants in Holland's biggest postwar strikes, which took place at the beginning of 1977, demanded that jobs should be found for the 229,000 Dutch people thrown out of work by the economic crisis.

An important feature of the strike actions in this period was the resolute protests against mass dismissals and mounting unemploy-

ment. Such protests were characteristic of the great majority of actions by working people in the developed capitalist countries.

Of considerable significance is the fact that these demands often extend beyond the bounds of the factory or company in question and tend more and more to be aimed at the state-monopoly system. This feature was particularly in evidence during strike actions in 1976 and early 1977 in France, Italy, Canada, Sweden, Australia and Belgium. The communist parties of these countries gave full backing to such mass actions.

A key event in the postwar history of Canada's working class movement took place on October 14, 1976, when the whole country held a National Day of Protest against the government's anti-inflation policy and the continuing rise of prices. Over a million people responded to the call of the Canadian Labor Congress and took part in meetings, demonstrations and marches. Many factories and government institutions across the country stopped work. On the eve of the national protest day in Canada the 23rd Convention of the CP of Canada called on all communists and the working class to participate actively in this demonstration. On February 12, 1977, on the initiative of the French CP, mass action against the deteriorating economic situation was taken in more than a hundred French cities. Britain's CP came out firmly in support of the activities of November 17, 1976, which was declared a day of protest against unemployment and the economic crisis. In connection with the nationwide strike of the Belgian railwaymen the CP of Belgium demanded guarantees of employment for the country's workers, abolition of unemployment and the introduction of state control in the main industries and big banks.

This issue of the journal will reach readers when working people all over the world will be celebrating May Day — the festival of international proletarian solidarity. This is a day when the workers of the capitalist countries sum up the results of the struggle for their rights, for democracy and socialism. One of the notable features of the struggle is the mass militancy and effectiveness of the strike actions, which have brought the working class many successes in its clashes with capital.

NEW BOOKS FROM THE USSR

Ernesto Che Guevara.
I. Lavretsky
Cloth, 312 pages, $3.95

The Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Revolution of Education. V. Turchenko
Cloth, 199 pages, $3.50

Mankind and the Year 2000.
V. Kosolapov
Cloth, 236 pages, $2.95

Science in its Youth. A. Anikin
Pre-Marxian political economy
Cloth, 389 pages, $5.25

Soviet-American Relations.
E. Baskakov, Y. Kornilov
Paper, 95 pages $.75

Neo-Freudians in Search of "Truth".
V.I. Dobrenkov
Paper, 162 pages, $1.50

The Working Class — the Leading Force of the World Revolutionary Process.
Ed. V. Zagladin
Critique of bourgeois and reformist conceptions
Paper, 190 pages, $1.75

PROGRESS BOOKS
487 Adelaide Street West
Toronto Ontario M5V 1T4

THE FOUNDING OF CANADA

Beginnings to 1815

Stanley B. Ryerson
Paper $6.95

UNEQUAL UNION

Roots of the crisis in the Canadas 1815-1873

Stanley B. Ryerson
Paper $6.95

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

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 Aussenhandelsbetrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

'Globus', Vertrieb ausländischer Zeitschriften 1200 Wien, Hochstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papajanis Stephanos, Emanuil Benaki 25-6⁰ 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, Caracas, 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.