WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

August 1979, Volume 22, Number 8



Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

August 1979, Vol. 22, No. 8

Features

3 Social reformism and the national-liberation movement
K. Bagdash

8 Raising economic efficiency: a fundamental task
I. Verdet

13 Election lessons and the outlook for the British labor movement
G. McLennan

17 SALT-II: the treaty is signed
J. Pittman

The party

20 SUPG's integrated economic and social policy
G. Mittag

24 New experience

Exchange of views

29 Revolution and democracy
International scientific conference

42 Mankind's prospects and science

43 International cooperation in tackling global problems
J.F. da Costa

45 The social and humanist orientation of scientific and technological progress
G. Kröber

47 The monopolies and the power structure of Latin America
H. Fazio, A. Hernandez Fortuna

51 Deepening of social antagonisms
T. Timofeyev

Viewpoints

56 Reform policy in crisis
K. Schacht

61 Alternative to the oligarchy
P. Ortega Diaz

63 In struggle for progress
S. Vieira

The press

66 Developed socialism inexorably moves forward
N. Kuzmin

68 In the name of France's future
P. Hentges

69 Origins of the Palestinian movement
Z. Karkabi

71 Topical problems
R. Severtyan

71 A stirring chapter of friendship
B. Lhamsuren

72 The party press

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Canada and U.S., $7.50 a year. Other countries, $11.50. Institutions, double rate.

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

Subscriptions may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE, 71 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6.

In the USA from IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, 320 West Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published by PROGRESS BOOKS, 71 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6.

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

feature

Social reformism and the national-liberation movement

Khaled Bagdash
General Secretary, CC Syrian Communist Party

The national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has lately begun to receive heightened attention from West European social-democratic parties forming the backbone of the Socialist International and mostly representing the reformist trend in the international working-class movement.

It would be wrong to say that previously the Socialist International, reconstituted in 1951 (its predecessor between the two world wars was the Labor Socialist International), had entirely ignored the struggle for national liberation. In its first program, the Frankfurt Declaration, and in many subsequent documents it declared itself a champion of the oppressed peoples. But a curious evolution has taken place since then. Originally the statements of the international social-democratic movement were fairly radical and included the postulate that capitalism was unacceptable to the backward regions of the world (Milan Declaration, 1952). But as the liberation struggle, which culminated in the political break-up of the colonial system, gained momentum and its socio-economic aspects came to the fore the social democrats' radicalism evaporated, giving way to far more moderate formulations without any hint of the 'anti-capitalism' of the past.

This noteworthy metamorphosis must have been due to both historical factors and changes in the alignment of centers of influence within the Socialist International. Be this as it may, the slogans and objectives proclaimed today suggest reluctance to take an explicit stand on the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of liberated countries or on the development paths chosen by them. However, these slogans, which are as lavish as they are demagogical, serve as a means of winning mass support for the social democrats and giving them more political leverage in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Socialist International combines ever more moderate and less and less specific guidelines on the present liberation movement with persevering attempts to overcome the 'Eurocentrism' of the movement and win solid positions on other continents.[1] This line was particularly evident at the two latest Socialist International congresses: the 13th (Geneva, November 1976) and the 14th, which met at Vancouver, Canada, two years later. This was seen in the agendas, the admission of parties of some developing countries to Socialist International membership (the social-democratic parties of the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Barbados, El Salvador and India, the ruling Socialist Party of Senegal, and the People's Republican Party of Turkey), and a number of organizational measures.[2] We are thus witnessing an escalated social-democratic effort to win new spheres of influence.

This is happening at a time when the accentuation of the anti-imperialist character of the liberation movement is accompanied by a deepening of its social content. This trend is most noticeable in Africa and Asia. The past five years alone have seen revolutionary political changes in Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Benin, Laos, Afghanistan, South Yemen and Kampuchea. All these countries are set on effecting fundamental structural changes in the interest of the people. A socialist orientation has been adopted by a sizable group of developing nations that are in the van of the struggle against imperialism and old and new forms of colonialism. Their very existence is giving the struggle an additional boost.

The dominant development trends in the one-time hinterland of world capitalism are alarming the imperialists. The process of history is going on at so fast a pace that the system of neo-colonial exploitation of vast areas of the globe, a system based on their social and economic backwardness, is under a mounting threat from the liberation movement of their peoples. This explains imperialism's sustained attempts to reverse the course of events, as well as its full support for local reactionaries to the point of armed intervention, as in Zaire in the spring of 1978. It also accounts for Israel's policy of permanent aggression against Arab countries with the backing and abetment of U.S. imperialism and world Zionism. It pursues two basic interconnected aims. One is to assist Israeli expansion and the imposition of U.S. military, economic and political influence on the region. The other is not only to prevent progressive Arab countries, primarily Syria, from pursuing and stepping up independent economic development and social progress but to make them more dependent than ever on the capitalist world market and the imperialist monopolies.

To achieve its political objectives, imperialism uses economic pressure, encourages the Peking leaders' hegemonist ambitions and acts of aggression, constantly brainwashes public opinion and leading political groups in developing countries, resorts to ideological subversion against the socialist orientation and to vicious anti-communist propaganda, defames life in the countries of exist-

ing socialism and so forth. In short, it uses every imaginable means to ensure that Asian, African and Latin American countries remain in the capitalist world system.

In view of the deadly conflict between the national-liberation movement and imperialism, the social democrats' extra-European activity should obviously be estimated according to how the following questions are answered: Whose interests does this activity objectively meet? Is the Socialist International seriously concerned with the welfare of the peoples of developing countries, as its leaders claim, or is its intensified activity one of the means used by imperialism to deradicalize and 'pacify' progressive forces? To answer these questions, it would be useful to begin by recalling the social democrats' political role in Western Europe, where their positions are stronger than anywhere else.

This role has always consisted in preventing the working class from accomplishing its historic mission, which is to do away with the exploiting capitalist system and transform society on socialist lines. History has made it possible to test the reformist concepts of socialism in practice. And what is the result? The fact that the social democrats have for years been in power in a number of West European countries (in coalition with bourgeois parties or on their own) has not altered the nature of these countries' economic basis. The rightist top leadership of the social democrats has virtually renounced the socialist perspective and has become an undisguised backer and executive agency of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Nor would it be an exaggeration to say that the bourgeoisie owes the preservation of the capitalist order in Western Europe largely if not entirely to social reformism.

To be sure, social-democratic leaders do say officially that their ideological positions are 'incompatible' with bourgeois concepts. But this 'incompatibility' is fictitious. Along with social-reformist postulates which insist that the parliamentary road to socialism is indispensable, advocate 'universal welfare,' and consider that socialism and democracy are inseparable, there is something else that the bourgeoisie sees very well, namely: 'social partnership,' or 'class collaboration,' renunciation of the principle of public property in the basic means of production, and the contention that the wealth produced by society can be 'equitably' distributed given state control of enterprises and planning. Virtually recognizing freedom of private capitalist property, and hence freedom (somewhat limited at best) for man to exploit man, the social reformists pretend that the change of economic basis needed for socialism boils down to social regulation of distribution. Yet this 'regulation,' which is illusory without public property in the basic means of production, does not imperil capitalism in the least, as the activity of the ruling social-democratic leadership itself has shown.

Having begun a vigorous thrust toward the developing countries, the leaders of the Socialist International try, of course, to introduce the main tenets of their ideology there, adapting them to local conditions where necessary. But what are the results of transplanting the principles of social reformism from their native, European capitalist soil to the social, economic and political reality of developing countries?

I have said that the social democrats' virtual denial of the necessity for public property in the basic means of production, whatever the reservations about 'control' and 'regulation,' is tantamount to recognizing freedom of private capitalist property and private capitalist enterprise. For our countries, this freedom is entirely negative today. Local private capital, which is rather weak and generally intent on making speedy and high speculative profit, is plainly unable to assure either the growth of the productive forces, or the optimization of national economic structures. Without a powerful public sector, without the state playing an active role as employer, regulator and organizer, production and the market in a country whose economy is lagging inevitably fall easy prey to the imperialist monopolies, with all the ensuing consequences.

In most of the developing countries it would, of course, be a mistake to raise insurmountable barriers to private capital; besides, this would be unrealistic, for it is vital to use every opportunity to foster independent economic growth. But these opportunities can be widely used in the national interest only if the decisive economic positions are held by a state opposed to imperialism.

Another major principle of social reformism is 'class collaboration,' or 'social partnership.' The main criterion in regard to collaboration among definite classes in any situation is why, to what end and against whom they are collaborating. The main historical task of the peoples of the developing countries is to end their social and economic backwardness and their dependence on imperialism. In carrying out progressive changes in the national interest, the different classes can and must mobilize and act together against imperialism. But this conception has nothing in common with the social democrats' idea of 'conciliation' and 'partnership' between antagonistic classes of capitalist society, primarily to the advantage of the big national and international monopoly bourgeoisie.

Transplanting 'class collaboration' of the social-democratic type to Asia, Africa and Latin America by no means eliminates its reactionary, anti-democratic essence. It must be admitted, however, that this approach occasionally surfaces even in the policy of the leadership of some socialist-oriented countries.

We communists consider that since 'social partnership' in the capitalist world serves chiefly the interests of monopoly capital, it can be nothing but a means of strengthening the exploiting classes' economic and political positions in the developing countries, to the detriment of the working people. At the level of relations between industrial capitalist countries and developing nations, it means perpetuating the neo-colonial exploitation of the latter, abandoning the struggle against imperialist monopoly, winding up the liberation fight, and

fatalistically resigning oneself to the 'destiny' ordained for our peoples in imperialist world centers.

We do not have to go far to find instances of this policy. In our own region the Sadat regime, which has repudiated all that was progressive in the Egyptian revolution in Nasser's day, represents a most instructive specimen of 'social partnership' even though the Cairo leadership rarely uses the phrase. This policy virtually denies the priority of the public sector in the economy and encourages private capitalist enterprise, especially on the part of the compradore and other parasitical sections of the bourgeoisie, which take no part in industrial or agricultural production. Its consequences at national and international levels alike are well known. Going one way, that is, against the working class, in the sphere of social relations is a logical result of the present Egyptian regime's economic policy, which implies the gradual erosion of the public sector, compensation (with interest) for the losses incurred by the Egyptian big bourgeoisie and feudal lords in the 1960s, the restoration and augmentation of their economic and political leverage, giving the 'green light' not only to domestic private capital, especially the parasitical bourgeoisie, but to foreign monopolies and non-Egyptian Arab business and so on. Equally logical was, therefore, Cairo's volte-face from cooperation and interaction with the socialist community, primarily the Soviet Union, to a disgraceful alignment with U.S. imperialism, from the struggle to eliminate the effects of the Israeli aggression to a capitulationist 'peace' with the aggressor, betraying the national interests of the Egyptian people, the fraternal Arab people of Palestine and other Arab peoples.

Lastly, let us consider a theme of the Socialist International's high-key propaganda campaign such as democratic freedoms and human rights.

The communists are determined and consistent supporters of democracy and have repeatedly proved their allegiance to its ideals by giving their blood and their very lives. We regard democracy as a most important condition for progress in any sphere of the life of developing countries, irrespective of the orientation chosen by them.

History has furnished sufficient proof that any measure curtailing the democratic rights of progressive forces, let alone repression against them, greatly injures the cause of national liberation and anti-imperialist unity. Everyone knows of the great difficulties encountered by these forces and of the extent to which social progress is hampered where openly despotic regimes or military-fascist dictatorships — generally allies or watchdogs of imperialism — have been established. What is particularly outrageous is the persecution of communists where the leading circles follow an essentially anti-imperialist policy and even call themselves partisans of a progressive orientation, as in the case of some Arab countries. I wish to stress in this connection that solidarity with the heroic Iraqi Communist Party is now, as in the past, of paramount importance to us Arab communists and our fellow-communists the world over.

We do not forget that by extolling the ideas of 'democratic socialism' and describing them as the only ones meeting the interests of mankind, the peoples of the developing countries included, the social reformists pursue mainly anti-communist objectives. In Europe social-democratic leaders, far from concealing this spearhead of their policy, actually advertise it.[3] There is no doubt that in the developing countries, as elsewhere, one of the main objectives of the propaganda of 'democratic socialism' is to 'end' the growing influence of Marxism-Leninism. For the social-democratic leaders anything is good that serves this purpose, and it is indicative that they threw the doors of the Socialist International wide open to the Turkish People's Republican Party, which is in power and obstinately refuses to legalize the Communist Party of Turkey.

Apparently realizing that the character of the Socialist International postulates, which objectively hampers revolutionary processes, will not escape the attention of progressives in our countries, the social-democratic leaders widely use more 'effective' methods that can, in their view, have the desired effect on Afro-Asian and Latin American opinion. First among these methods is talk about increasing aid to the developing countries, changing the nature of relations between them and the industrialized capitalist world, and the establishment of a 'new economic world order.'

A resolution of the 13th Socialist International Congress stated that the capitalist system had led to a tremendous discrepancy between development levels and created 'anarchy and injustice' in the world economy. Hence the need for an 'entirely new approach to international economic problems' and a 'large-scale redistribution of wealth and income.' At the 14th Socialist International Congress, the SI President Willy Brandt urged 'demonstrating still more forcefully the common interests linking the developed and developing countries.' He spoke of the determination to help 'defeat hunger all over the world by the end of this century,' 'speed progress in relations between North and South, and reshape world economic relations in this way,' and 'examine properly the interconnection of armaments and development.' The programs of various social-democratic parties abound in similar appeals and declarations.

Economic relations between the developing nations and industrial capitalist states are really one of the most important problems of mankind. There is an unbridgeable gulf between them and it tends to widen. Many millions suffer from hunger and poverty. According to data released by the IBRD, the average per capita GNP in economically backward areas of the world (excepting the sparsely populated oil-producing countries of the Middle East) in 1976 was 2.4 per cent that of the group of industrial capitalist countries. To remove this discrepancy, the developing countries will require roughly 750 years if they are to advance at the same rate of economic growth as in the first half of the 1970s. Yet in recent years this rate has slackened further due to

economic and monetary convulsions in the capitalist world.

Against this grim background, the SI's declarations sound very noble indeed. But even where the social democrats are at the helm of state, monopoly capital always retains enough economic and political power to further solely its own interests, which are contrary to those of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Erhard Eppler, former West German Minister for Economic Cooperation (with developing countries), one of the SPD leaders, wrote as an informed man that 'it would never occur to our private economy to make its investments dependent on the decisions of government agencies.'[4] Nor does this apply to Federal Germany alone.

The long-term program of the British Labour Party published in 1976 contained many attractive provisions concerning the developing countries, those of Africa included. Did that alter the neocolonial nature of economic relations between Britain, which was governed by a Labour cabinet, and new African states? Not at all. According to press reports, 13 big British companies in 1977 'earned' £280 million in profits there, or more than what Britain's economic aid to all African countries amounted to in the same year. Similar examples could be given in regard to other West European countries, where social reformists are or were in power.

While the SI President states principles and tasks that are commendable in themselves, his fellow social democrat, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, pursues in relations with the developing countries a policy that draws no criticisms whatever from the West German monopolies and does not really differ from the corresponding policy of U.S. imperialism.[5] It is also revealing that SD participation in protracted negotiations on restructuring international economic relations (the so-called North-South dialogue) has not softened the ruling circles of the North (i.e., the capitalist West), which refuse to meet the South half-way.

The social democrats do not mind anathematizing the multinational corporations on occasion. The issue of these corporations was on the agenda of the 14th SI Congress. The Congress approved the report of a research team containing abundant evidence of the predatory, reactionary activities of these gigantic monopoly octopuses and drawing the conclusion that they must be curbed. However, no specific measures to this end were proposed, and all that the Congress did was to recommend setting up an 'observation' body which, needless to say, cannot change anything.

In the light of these facts, neither the SI leaders' assurances of being sincere champions of reshaping international economic relations on the principles of justice and equality, nor their attempts to identify the very idea of a new economic world order with 'democratic socialism' can be taken seriously, to say the least.

It is not only on the issue of international economic relations that the position of the SI and many of its members organizations is inconsistent and contradictory. The social democrats have been equally inconsistent in regard to acute political problems of the struggle against colonialism and imperialism.

It is a fact that in the tensest periods of the national-liberation movement the SD parties of metropolitan states acted in the interest of the ruling classes of their countries. The British and French governments headed by member parties of the SI[6] put down by force of arms the struggle for freedom that had broken out in the colonies. A shift from direct support to verbal condemnation of colonialism did not come until the late 1960s, when the SD leaders realized at long last that the process of disintegration of the colonial system was irreversible.

There are still major strongholds of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. One of the key tasks facing African countries is to eliminate them. The problems involved have held the attention of world opinion for years. They are also prominent in the activity of the international SD movement. After the 13th SI Congress, a delegation led by an SI Vice-President, former Swedish prime minister Olaf Palme, went to southern Africa's 'frontline states.' The 14th SI Congress invited delegations of the MPLA-Party of Labor, FRELIMO and SWAPO as observers.[7] All this was accompanied by suitable gestures and declarations in support of the liberation movements.

How sincere are those declarations? The patriots of Zimbabwe and Namibia are compelled to wage an armed struggle for liberation. But it is precisely this fundamental form of struggle that the social democrats fail to 'appreciate.' Even when the SD governments of Europe back up their anti-racist declarations with financial and material aid to the liberation movements and the 'frontline states' of the region (as the Palme government did), they invariably make a reservation, saying that that aid may not be used by the patriots for combat action. Truly, they put 'democracy' above everything else.

Very often there are no deeds to support words. The British Labour Party program I have mentioned contained a number of measures whose implementation would really have contributed to the struggle for the liberation of southern Africa. They included a ban on all new investments in South Africa by British companies, the withdrawal of all British banks from that country, an embargo on trade with the apartheid regime, aid to the Security Council in enforcing proper sanctions to compel South Africa to carry out the UN resolutions on Namibia, and settlement of the Rhodesian problem on the principle of 'one man, one vote.' But the activity of the Labour government pointed in the opposite direction on most of the above provisions.

The hypocrisy shown by the Socialist International on the Middle East question verges on alignment with U.S. imperialism and international Zionism.

It is true that the time has gone when the majority of SD parties backed Israel without qualification

and blamed the Arab countries for the conflict. The 13th SI Congress even declared for a settlement within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference, on the basis of the Security Council resolutions 242 and 338. However, two years later this position, which was in keeping with the realities in the region, was forgotten; the SI gave its approval to the separate deal made by Egypt and Israel at Camp David under the auspices of the United States, and called for continuing on the same course.

Indeed, many SI parties described the Washington treaty between Egypt and Israel as a victory for peace in the Middle East. Yet the treaty is intended to legalize the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories seized in 1967, and as for the virtual military alliance concluded by Begin, Sadat and Carter, it is directed against the Arab and African liberation movements, particularly against the Arab people of Palestine, their struggle for their legitimate rights, and their heroic resistance. All this has added to tension in our region and increased the danger of another armed conflict. An indication of this is the aggression against Lebanon, which Israel is carrying on with U.S. approval. Its main purpose is to exert political pressure on Syria, which at the moment plays the leading role in building up the Arab solidarity needed to counter the intrigues of U.S. imperialism, Zionism and the Sadat regime in the Middle East.

It follows that the SD 'friends' and 'defenders' of the peoples upholding their national dignity have ended up for the umpteenth time in the camp of imperialism and its allies. On this issue, the SD center has unquestionably 'adjusted' to the will of Zionist quarters, whose spokesman, ex-premier Rabin of Israel, is a Vice-President of the SI.

SI documents admit that to settle the Middle East crisis 'a just solution of the Palestine problem in its every aspect' is needed. But it is not clear what is meant by 'just,' and what the international SD movement thinks of the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their national rights. However, some clarity may be derived from the fact that in spite of the SI policy of 'seducing' developing countries and liberation movements, and in spite of international recognition of the PLO as the sole lawful spokesman of the Palestinian people, this organization was not among those invited to the Vancouver congress.

In examining the extra-European activity of the SI, one must not forget that its inconsistency and contradictions are due in part to differences between various SD parties. These differences, in turn, are caused by non-coincidence of the approach to this or that problem, by the position of this or that party (by its being in opposition or in power), the fact that the given country is or is not a NATO member, and so on. Nevertheless, the nature of the general ideological premises of social reformism as well as of SD activity intended for the national-liberation zone warrant the affirmation that both run counter to the vital interests of the masses in Asian, African and Latin American countries and the needed further expansion of the anti-imperialist struggle. Ever more readily, the social-reformist parties of the SI assume the role of chief agent of the flexible, 'sweetened' neo-colonialist policy of imperialism. The progressive forces of the developing countries are equal to and are now drawing the appropriate conclusions.

1. *Geographical distribution of Socialist International member parties.*

	1952	1975	1976	1978
Europe	19	20	22	22
North America	3	2	2	3
Latin America	2	3	5	7
Asia	3	7	6	7
Africa		1	2	2
Australia and Oceania		1	2	2
	27	34	39	43

2. Notably, the effort to form rather motley political alignments around parties close to or affiliated to the Socialist International. The Socialist party of Senegal and the Destour Socialist Party of Tunisia have taken steps to found a so-called Interafricaine Socialiste.

3. 'We have been fighting the communists for 50 years . . . to us, they are still political opponents,' says the European Program which the Social-Democratic Party of Germany drew up in preparing for the elections to the European Parliament (*L'Humanité*, February 15, 1979).

4. E. Eppler, *Wenig Zeit für die Dritte Welt*. Fourth edition (Stuttgard e.a.: Kohlhammer, 1971). p. 128.

5. 'Carter is in the lead and we are the runners-up,' wrote *Wirtschaftswoche*, the West German business weekly (49/1978), spelling out, as it were, the formula being followed by the Schmidt government in this respect.

6. In Algeria by the Guy Mollet government and in South Yemen by the government under Harold Wilson.

7. MPLA, People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola: FRELIMO, Front for the Liberation of Mozambique. The MPLA-Party of Labour and FRELIMO are in power and have proclaimed Marxism-Leninism their ideology. SWAPO (South-West Africa People's Organization) is leading the national-liberation struggle in Namibia.

Raising economic efficiency: a fundamental task

Ilie Verdet
Member, Political Executive Committee of the CC RCP,
Prime Minister of the SRR

On August 23, 1979, the Rumanian people will celebrate the 35th anniversary of the national armed anti-fascist and anti-imperialist rising, one of the most important events in their history. This rising was planned and accomplished mainly under the leadership of the Rumanian Communist Party. It organized the anti-fascist resistance movement, a struggle against nazi domination, for the liberation of Rumania from the fascist tyranny. Backed by a powerful upsurge in the people's anti-fascist resistance and taking advantage of the favorable conditions created by the victories of the Red Army and the anti-Hitlerite coalition as a whole, the RCP united all of the country's democratic, patriotic forces and mobilized them to fight, thereby guaranteeing the victory of the rising. As a result of the overthrow of the military-fascist dictatorship on August 23, 1944, Rumania withdrew from the war against the Soviet Union and joined with all its material and manpower resources, shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and other forces of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, in the struggle for the complete defeat of Hitler Germany. The victory of the rising marked the beginning of a people's revolution in Rumania and paved the way for a deep-going transformation of society, for socialism.

In assessing the Rumanian people's achievements over the past three and a half decades, we have every reason to say that we owe our successes in socialist construction to the leadership of the RCP, which shapes and implements a socio-economic policy based on knowledge and conscious application of the objective laws of social development. At every stage of socialist construction, this policy took account of the conditions prevailing in Rumania and expressed the aspiration of our whole nation for progress. The party's scientifically valid, realistic solution of pivotal problems of economic growth, and its constant effort to raise the standard of living give the people a clear revolutionary perspective of activity.

Practice has confirmed the correctness of our party's socio-economic policy and our people's ability to use the advantages of socialism for economic and social development. In the years of socialist construction, over five million new jobs have been created, mostly in industry and non-agricultural spheres. In 1977 there were five times more fixed assets per person employed in the economy than in 1950; the country's industries produced nearly 50 times as much as in 1948, when the means of production passed into the people's hands. From 1966 to 1975, fixed assets in industry grew by roughly 240 per cent while in the 1956-65 period the increase had only been 130 per cent. Between 1948 and 1977, steel output went up from 353,000 to 11,500,000 tons and output of electrical energy, from 1,500 million to nearly 60,000 million kwh. In 1977 two days' output in mechanical engineering was equal to that industry's entire product in 1948, and in the chemical industry the 1948 output was equalled in 1.2 days.

We have been steadily expanding and modernizing the material and technical basis of agriculture. In 1977, we had 25 tractors (in terms of 15 hp units) per 100 hectares of arable land against 13 in 1965. The amount of fertilizer used in the same period increased by more than 270 per cent. The irrigated land area grew from 230,000 to 1,900,000 hectares.

Our foreign trade in the period of 1948-1977 grew more than 42-fold. Real wages were roughly 260 per cent higher than in 1950. The rising standard of living has had its effect on life expectancy, which averages 70 years against 42 before the war. Rumania, once underdeveloped, has become an industrial-agrarian country rapidly developing its industry and employing industrial methods in agriculture.

These achievements spring from the tremendous effort by the people and the utilization of the country's resources for the solution of substantive problems on which the all-round progress of our society hinges.

Rumania has registered impressive progress since the Ninth Party Congress (1965). Much has been done during these years to ensure more effective use of economic growth factors and speeding the formation of a sophisticated, highly productive comprehensive economic structure equal to assuring a steadily rising standard of living and the gradual attainment of the level of highly developed industrial countries.

In the early 1970s Rumania entered a new stage of social development, the stage of building a comprehensively developed socialist society. It was faced with the task of bringing about a further significant expansion of the productive forces by using scientific and technological achievements and carrying out far-reaching quantitative and qualitative changes in every social and economic

sphere. From 1971 to 1975, the national income went up by 71 per cent, while employment in material production increased by only 2.3 per cent, which means that the national income grew chiefly through greater productivity of social labor. The growing efficiency of the economy is seen in the rising accumulation fund's elasticity coefficient (of the national income)[1] from 0.267 per cent in 1966-70 to 0.331 per cent in 1971-75. It is also indicative that the national income rose faster than material expenditures (by an annual 11.3 and 10 per cent, respectively), which is indicative of an ever greater saving of material resources.

In accordance with decisions of the 11th Congress (1974) and the 1977 National Conference of the RCP we have concentrated on raising economic efficiency and on achieving a higher level of socio-economic activity generally. This is decisive in building a comprehensively developed socialist society and advancing to communism in Rumania.

New world developments have given a key role to qualitative socio-economic indices. These are uncommonly rapid progress in science and technology that is strongly affecting all economic and social spheres, the considerable effort needed to use the results of scientific research in production, the irreplaceability of resources of many types involved in economic activity, and the necessity for more active participation in world exchanges of material and cultural values. In these circumstances, the only way to achieve rapid economic growth and meet the population's requirements on the level of the opportunities offered by civilization is to improve the quality of output and raise economic efficiency generally.

Reporting to the RCP National Conference in December 1977, Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary of the RCP and President of the SRR, made an in-depth analysis of the factors contributing to the continued rapid growth of our economy and the development trends of the world economy, and stressed the need to improve qualitative indices in every sphere of activity in the current and subsequent five-year periods. He called for a transition from quantitative growth to a new stage, to a drive for quality. '... Qualitative indices of economic activity will be important in our subsequent development ... The time has come to transform quantity into a new quality. This is a priority on which the future of Rumanian industry and the whole national economy will depend.'[2]

Our strategic concept urges wider application of qualitative indices in every public sphere: the economy, production management and organization, science, culture, ideological work, political education and the social mechanism as a whole. The economy is ultimately the decisive sphere as far as building a comprehensively developed socialist society is concerned. We must give closer attention to the qualitative aspects of economic activity if we are to achieve a high economic growth rate in the period ahead and to keep it up for a relatively long time. This is a condition for steadily raising the working people's living and cultural standards and of gradually bringing these standards closer to those of highly industrialized countries.

The Program of Additional Measures for the Socio-Economic Development of Rumania up to 1980 and the Main Lines of Drafting the Five-Year Socio-Economic Development Plan of Rumania for the 1981-85 Period, approved by the National Conference of the RCP, provide for a per capita increase in the national income from roughly $1,000 in 1975 to $1,600 in 1980 and to between $2,400 and $2,500 in 1985. This means that Rumania must catch up with economically medium-developed countries by the middle of the next decade. We are bending every effort to reach this target. In the current five-year period, the accumulation fund will amount to 33 or 34 per cent of the national income and in the next, to between 30 and 33 per cent. At the same time, we do our best to use our production potentialities as effectively as possible, to spend resources more judiciously, and put out high-quality products meeting the requirements of the economy to a growing extent.

The economic level reached by our country makes it possible to fulfill the tasks we have set ourselves. At the same time, we are working to supply the economy with up-to-date facilities and trained personnel. Under the previous five-year plan, we invested 110 per cent more than in 1966-70 in research and designing facilities. In the current five-year period, we plan to spend twice as much for these purposes. Between 1976 and 1980, about 1.9 million people will receive vocational training, which means that 80 per cent of all industrial workers will be skilled.

To boost the role of qualitative factors of economic growth, we must make a special effort to improve production management, planning and organization with due regard to the tasks arising at this stage of development. In the past decade our party has evolved a broad, integral and dynamic concept and carried out a series of important and well-considered measures in this field.

We hold that production intensification objectively necessitates meaningful utilization of all the material and manpower resources of society, and requires a great deal of initiative and creative effort on the part of the masses. This is why the measures for improved management adopted by our party are aimed at combining overall guidance of the country's development according to plan with the economic and financial autonomy of economic and administrative territorial units, worker self-management, and active participation of the masses in the framing and implementation of party policy.

To raise economic efficiency, we have taken steps to strengthen overall leadership and steadily enhance the role of the party as society's leading political force. At the same time, the organizational activity of the socialist state is being improved and the public organizations are playing a growing role.

It is of special importance to continue perfecting planning and the organizational structure of production. While promoting integrated economic

management, the RCP encourages factories and other production units to show more initiative and approach their tasks with a greater sense of responsibility. This helps to give them more autonomy in drafting the national plan and carrying it out with maximum effectiveness.

The leadership of society and the measures to improve it that have been taken in recent years are characterized by deepening socialist democracy and direct involvement of the masses in decision-making and in the work of central and local government bodies. The principle of collective leadership operates in every echelon of economic management, and collective bodies have been set up at all levels of management. Direct participation of the workers and of members of public organizations in the work of the various collective leading bodies has been formalized by law. We have set up new central bodies in charge of collective decision-making. The presence of working people's representatives in every leading body gives all socio-economic activity a new character; it makes everyone more aware of his responsibility for the proper utilization of the production potential and assures a continuous uptrend of economic efficiency.

The new measures to perfect management and planning, worked out on the initiative and under the leadership of Nicolae Ceausescu and approved by our party in March 1978, are going a long way in improving qualitative production indices. Their purpose is to link the economic mechanism closely with the new institutions of production democracy brought into being in recent years, promote worker self-management and perfect economic and financial accounting at the enterprises. Enterprises now draft plans with an increasing sense of responsiblity. They must take into account both available resources and the party's general guidelines for the advancement of the economy. The role of contractual relations in drafting and fulfilling plans is growing. We are improving the index system, placing the accent on indices of the end results and efficiency of production to the fore. We are extending the rights and duties of enterprises in financial matters so as to induce them to expand production, cover costs and set up material incentive funds out of their own profits, repay loans granted by society as quickly as possible and contribute to the establishment of state funds financing the solution of general socio-economic problems. We are taking steps to promote foreign trade activity and international cooperation in production, and to foster foreign-exchange and financial relations. We are introducing a system of profit-sharing for the working people. All this is helping to achieve an all-round improvement of economic management and enhance its efficiency.

One of the main lines of work in improving management in every economic field is to rapidly modernize economic structures and raise the technical and qualitative standards of material production as a whole. The task of creating a highly efficient economy is served by general guidelines for the optimization of economic balances, by decisions at enterprise level to perfect production, by the lines of research and designing, and by personnel training. Through this policy we intend to achieve a marked increase in labor productivity, a decrease in production costs, and an improvement of the technological and economic indices of our goods relative to world standards within a relatively short period.

The tasks set by our party until 1985 are to maintain a high rate of industrialization with priority for metallurgy, engineering, and the chemical industry, or the industries that play a decisive role in the advancement of the material and technical basis of the economy. Under the Program of Additional Measures industry is to put out goods worth from 100,000m. to 130,000m. lei more than planned originally for the 1976-80 period. In the first two and a half years of the five-year plan, we have produced an additional quantity of goods worth roughly 40,000m. lei — mostly machines, chemical products and consumer goods.

In the power engineering industry, the consumption pattern of energy sources is changing, with the share of coal, particularly lignite, in power production going up. Metallurgy, which is to increase steel output in 1975-80 from 9.5. to 17.3 million tons, is increasing output of items conforming to a high standard of processing: cold-rolled sheet and tape steel, galvanized and tinned sheet iron, sheet steel, high-grade stainless and electrical steel, and stainless pipes.

We attach special importance to continuing the modernization of production structures, improving the quality of critical engineering and chemical products, expanding our own raw material base, increasing exports and making them more attractive. By 1985, the share of these industries in the industrial product should be up from 40 to 50 per cent.

Our plans gear engineering to the production of articles meeting high technical and economic standards and to intensive use of up-to-date metal processing methods. They give priority to electronics, electrical equipment, precision instruments, optical products, machine-tools, sophisticated equipment and high-capacity production lines. The Additional Program has increased plan assignments for the manufacture of such technologically progressive articles as industrial electronics, automation facilities and computers, power transformers and autotransformers, metal-cutting machines, hydraulic and pneumatic equipment for metallurgy, the chemical industry and oil refining, and the production of building and heat-insulating materials. All this is evidence of the efforts being made to enhance economic efficiency.

Our developing chemical industry is an important factor for raising economic efficiency and improving the people's standard of living. The visible results that we have achieved have taken much effort. The chemical industry was built anew in the years of socialist construction. Thanks to the rapid modernization of its structures in the current

five-year period, it will achieve a greater increase in output than in the 1966-75 period. Higher development targets have been set for such production fields as comprehensive utilization of oil and gas by improving their processing. In this way we expect to enlarge the country's raw material base and increase the export of articles meeting a higher standard of processing. Our priorities include mastering the manufacture of higher-grade synthetic rubber, synthetic thread and fibre with physical and mechanical properties close to the natural, improving the quality of plastics and diversifying the production of fine synthetic items and small-batch chemical products. To further the use of chemicals in agriculture, we plan to extend the variety and production of fertilizers and pesticides.

Light industry will expand production primarily by increasing the manufacture of high-quality fabrics, knitted goods and footwear. The food industry will increase output of more nutritious products. We are mastering a new technology making it possible to vary the range of articles and use various subproducts and food wastes.

The following plan targets give an idea of the scale on which we are modernizing production and renewing output: in 1980 the proportion of items which we have begun to produce in the current five-year period should amount to 43 per cent of the total output of the manufacturing industry; by 1985, the same index should go up to 45 per cent. In engineering, new items will account for approximately 70 per cent of the entire output in 1980-85.

The present stage of Rumania's industrial development is marked by the growing contribution science is making to technological progress. We steadfastly follow this line, with the result that the targets of the first two years of the current five-year plan were exceeded. In 1977, the share of new and improved items, whose production was begun in this five-year period, came to more than 20 per cent of the total output of the manufacturing industry (against 18.4 per cent under the plan).

As the plan envisages faster modernization, the rate of mastering the manufacture of new articles and new technology will increase by the end of the five-year period. According to preliminary estimates, between 55 and 60 per cent of higher productivity and lower expenditures in 1979-80 will be achieved by using the latest technological advances.

In this context, particularly important tasks confront research, which must make a great contribution to the fulfillment of a fundamental task set by the 11th Party Congress, namely transforming the current five-year period into a period of widespread use of scientific and technological achievements in every economic field.

Developing research and bringing the rate of technological progress into line with present-day requirements are difficult tasks necessitating the application of the nation's entire creative potential. Our science, planning, designing and education must help improve the qualitative indices of economic management and supply industry with new and better materials and highly efficient plants. New technologies should reduce the expenditure of fuels, raw and other materials, and speed the growth of productivity.

We now regard reduction of the science-technology-production cycle and fulfillment of the plan for research and development, and the utilization of technological progress as a most important every-day activity of all leading bodies

The steps to intensify social production now being carried out are aimed at making better use of the work force, materials, plant and production space. Rapid growth of the national wealth, the production of material benefits, and a swiftly improving standard of living are inseparable from rising productivity. To move up to the level of economically developed countries, we must, first of all, achieve the same productivity as they have. This is why a high growth rate of productivity is not merely one of the many areas of economic development but the fundamental task of the overall strategy of raising economic efficiency.

Productivity in industry has more than doubled in the past decade. We try to use working time more effectively and to speed the growth of productivity in all economic fields. We see the basis for this in adopting up-to-date methods of production and labor organization, mechanization and automation, improving skills, continuously perfecting the training of personnel, improving output-rate setting, and bringing about proper order and labor discipline. The average annual growth rate of productivity in industry envisaged by the Additional Program (9.2 per cent) is higher than the corresponding index of the five-year plan (8.4 to 9 per cent) and the index actually achieved in 1971-75 (6.6 per cent). That this target can be reached is seen in the fact that in 1976-77 productivity in industry went up by an annual average of 9.3 per cent. It follows that more than 80 per cent of the increase in industrial output will be achieved by raising productivity.

One of the important measures to intensify production is continuous reduction of the expenditure of materials, and more effective utilization of raw materials and energy. Our party leadership foresaw the trends that emerged in the fuel, raw material and energy sphere of the world economy, with the result that as far back as the early 1970s important steps were taken to improve judicious use of materials and energy, 'An important target of the Additional Plan,' Ceausescu said, 'is to make more efficient use of raw and other materials and master the manufacture of articles of a higher technological standard and better quality. In our country, which imports the bulk of its industrial raw materials, this is essential if we are to modernize the economy and improve the people's standard of living.'[3]

The steps taken on the party leadership's initiative to reduce per unit inputs of raw materials,[4] apply technological achievement, employ new technologies on a larger scale in every field and use new and better materials and substitutes should lead to a reduction of the per unit input of materials in the aggregate social product from 59.5 per cent in

1975 to 56.9 in 1980 and 53 or 54 per cent in 1985. We make a special effort to utilize by-products and waste, which should satisfy much of the economy's requirements in raw and other materials (by 30 to 40 per cent in some cases).

We are doing much to ensure efficient use of both prime energy carrying materials and electric power. Plans provide for a reduction of per unit input of prime energy from 84.4 to 64.7 tons of conventional fuel[5] and from 68,200 to 56,200 kwh of electricity (in terms of industrial output worth one million lei). Steps will be taken to achieve a marked improvement of technological and economic indices of the exploitation of power stations, modernize the machine fleet, improve production technology, and cut technological expenditures at power stations and losses in the transmission and distribution of power.

An important line of raising the quality of social production is to use fixed assets with growing effect. At the end of the current five-year plan, their total worth throughout the economy will be 2,000,000 million lei (against approximately 1,200,000 million in 1975). To use this great production potential most effectively is an important requirement of rapid economic development and modernization.

A key condition for economic growth is to carry out the capital investment program and make investments more effective. Under the current five-year plan, capital investments will total 1,000,000 million lei (against 550,000 million under the previous plan). In regard to capital investments, the Additional Program sets more difficult qualitative tasks than the previous plan. A persevering effort is required in all investment spheres — research, designing, construction and the building materials industry — to cut expenditures and achieve high technological and economic parameters shortly after a project has gone into operation. Our aim is to ensure that each invested lei makes a maximum contribution in terms of greater output, higher productivity, lower production costs and better quality.

A special effort is being made to reduce the share of building and assembly in the overall volume of investments. We combat attempts to exceed the amount of construction work, and strive to introduce simple and light structures, have plants installed in the open wherever possible, and make the maximum use of roofed space for installing machinery and plant. One of the tasks is to increase the contribution of research to the devising and application of new progressive and constructive solutions and economical building materials, speed the industrialization of construction, and improve labor organization on building sites and the utilization of materials and plants.

The RCP works for Rumania's more effective involvement in international economic exchanges and for our country's active cooperation with the CMEA nations, and other socialist countries and developing countries, with all states irrespective of their social systems. We consider this an objective necessity and an important factor for our country's development in general and, at the same time, a means of increasing our contribution to fruitful cooperation throughout the world.

Improvement of the qualitative aspects of our economic activity goes hand in hand with a substantial improvement of the pattern of our exports. We attach great importance to securing foreign markets for our machines and chemicals. The share of the output of these two industries in exports is to increase from 36 per cent in 1975 to approximately 45 in 1980, and more than 55 per cent at the end of the next five-year period. We expect to achieve this primarily by exporting more high technology machine-tools, power equipment, electronics, electrical equipment, precision instruments and petrochemicals.

Accordingly, we press for the increased production of items of a higher technological and economic standard and hence more competitive. Enterprises must adapt promptly to the requirements of foreign clients, deliver goods of appropriate quality within the time limits set by contracts, and make exports highly profitable. In addition to traditional forms of international cooperation, we are promoting new forms that make it possible to use the advantages of the international division of labor to a larger extent.

The work to raise efficiency in every economic field begun under the leadership of the RCP is proof that our economy can achieve rapid, balanced, and effective growth and steadily raise the standard of living. It is indicative of the energy which our party and all working people show at every stage as they carry out the current tasks in the building of a comprehensively developed socialist society and advance to communism.

1. It shows how far the national income grows (in per cent) when the accumulation fund increases by one per cent. — *Ed.*

2. Nicolae Ceausescu, *Raport la Conferinta Nationala a Partidului Comunist Roman, 7-9 decembrie 1977* (Bucharest: Editura politica, 1977), pp. 16-17.

3. Op. cit., p. 20.

4. Per unit cost of expended raw materials. — *Ed.*

5. Fuel whose thermal power is assumed to be equal to 7,000 kcal/kg. — *Ed.*

Election lessons and the outlook for the British labor movement

Gordon McLennan
General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain

The British General Election held May 3 ended five years of Labour government.

In the new Parliament the Conservatives have 339 seats compared with 268 for the Labour Party. When the 28 seats held by the smaller parties are taken into account the Conservatives have an overall parliamentary majority of 43 seats.

There was, for British parliamentary elections, a relatively high turn-out of voters in this election, with 76 per cent of the electorate casting their votes. The Conservatives received approximately 13,700,000 votes, Labour 11,500,000 and the Liberals 4,300,000. The fiercely undemocratic nature of the British electoral system is demonstrated in the fact that while the Liberals got more than one-eighth of the total votes cast they only have 11 seats in Parliament, out of a total of 635 seats — about one-sixtieth!

The Conservatives got 43.9 per cent of all votes cast, compared with 35.7 per cent of the last General Election in October 1974. Labour's share of the poll fell from 39.1 per cent in 1974 to 36.9 per cent in this election — the lowest Labour percentage of the poll in any General Election since 1931. The Liberals also dropped — from 18.3 per cent to 13.8 per cent.

The outcome of the General Election is a major setback for all of us in Britain's labor movement and a serious blow to the interests of the British people.

Margaret Thatcher, leader of the Conservative Party since February 1975 and the new Prime Minister, marks a decisive shift to the right in her party — the party of big business. She leads the most reactionary British government in decades. It has already launched an offensive to weaken the trade unions, attack wages and living standards, cutting spending on the social services while increasing military expenditure, reduce democratic rights, encourage racism and continue with repression in Northern Ireland. In pursuit of its foreign policy the government will bind Britain still closer to NATO and the EEC, endanger the process of peace and détente, strengthen collaboration with the apartheid regime in South Africa and aim to thwart national liberation in southern Africa and elsewhere.

The big question that must be posed and answered in the British labor movement is — why after five years of Labour government, a government that was elected in 1974 on the basis of great mass struggle against the Conservative government, led by Edward Heath, are we now faced with an even more reactionary government with a decisive parliamentary majority? The Communist Party is of the view that the responsibility for this heavy defeat for all progressive forces in Britain and the victory for reaction that the General Election result represents, must be placed squarely at the door of right-wing Labour policies and leadership.

In the early days of the Labour government Prime Minister Wilson and Foreign Secretary Callaghan recommended a yes vote in Britain's referendum on membership in the European Economic Community. Their promise to defend Britain's interests in a 'renegotiation of entry terms' proved to be a farce. Market membership has cost Britain's taxpayers vast amounts of money, forced up prices, led to closures and sackings by the multinational corporations and undermined Britain's independence and sovereignty. All of Callaghan's speeches (having replaced Wilson as Prime Minister in 1976) during the election in which he posed as the opponent of EEC policies, particularly in relation to agriculture and food prices, could not obscure the fact that Labour was in large measure responsible for the disastrous effect of EEC membership on Britain.

In Ireland the Labour government carried out through its five years in power the long-standing bipartisan policies of repression. In foreign affairs it refused to side actively with national-liberation movements, was lukewarm on détente in Europe and acted as willing partner when NATO raised military expenditures to over £7,000 million a year.

The linchpin of both Wilson's and Callaghan's economic policies was the Social Contract, described as early as the winter of 1975 by the Communist Party as a 'Social Con-Trick,' not a 'Social Contract.' This central pillar of the government's economic strategy was based on an agreement with the trade unions. The theory was that if they, the unions, would hold back wage demands in line with government dictated norms for wage increases the government would respond with a series of social and economic policies in the interests of the workers.

The Communist Party was proved right. It was a con-trick. The Social Contract policies of 1975-1978 led to cuts in real wages, attacks on social and public services, created mass unemployment and deepened Britain's crisis.

Although it was at first opposed only by the Communist Party and a small section of the left, opposition within the labor movement grew until in September 1978, despite an appeal from Prime

Minister Callaghan, the Trades Union Congress, representing 12 million workers, threw out government proposals for a 5 per cent wages norm and declared against any continuation of the Social Contract. The Labour Party Conference in October took a similar stand. What followed is the essential background to this year's General Election.

Although he was rejected at the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference, Prime Minister Callaghan and his government decided to continue with their 5 per cent wages policy. They forced a confrontation with the trade union movement, and like Conservative Prime Minister Heath in 1974, in different circumstances, they were defeated.

During the winter months of this year there was a tremendous upswing of militant struggle involving a million and a half trade unionists, including Ford motor workers, road haulage workers and workers in the health and other public services. The government had to give way. The 5 per cent policy was smashed and hundreds of thousands of workers gained justified wage increases and improved working conditions. It was again a graphic description of the force of the organized working class in Great Britain.

But in the process two things took place that played a vital part in the outcome of the General Election.

Firstly, thousands of the most active trade unionists in Britain were angered and disgusted by the attitude of the Labour leaders and hundreds of thousands of potential Labour voters were alienated by the government's actions.

Secondly, the mass media mounted a frenzied campaign of abuse against the unions, blaming the workers, who were in militant action for modest demands, for Britain's chaos and crisis. In conditions of monopoly control of the mass media this propaganda made a big impact on millions of working people, especially those not directly affected by the government's wages policy. Prime Minister Callaghan, instead of rebutting the poison of the class enemy and placing the responsibility where it belonged, on the employers and wrong government policies, joined in the anti-trade union campaign, speaking in parliament of 'free collective vandalism' — a parody on the demands of the trade unions for the restoration of free collective bargaining — and calling on workers to 'cross picket lines.' It was one of the most shameful episodes in the history of the labor movement of Britain and severely damaged Labour's election prospects in the General Election that followed soon after.

Callaghan's post-election statement that 'the events of last winter' were a major reason for Labour's defeat was not an expression of self-criticism but a clear indication that he holds the trade unions, not those who abused and misrepresented them, responsible for Labour's defeat.

The Communist Party's view is quite different and we are confident it is already shared and will be shared by many others on the left. Once again it was the policies of the right-wing Labour leaders — policies of propping up capitalism — which have proved disastrous for the labor movement and opened the way up for a Conservative comeback. In this regard it is of the greatest significance to note that in acting as they did the right-wing Labour leaders were on major issues of policy acting in defiance of decisions of the labor and trade union movement.

The right-wing Labour leaders approach to the movement's decisions was carried right into the heart of the election campaign. Labour's Manifesto ignored key decisions of the Labour Party Conference and was described by some commentators as having the least socialist content of any Labour Manifesto of post-war years. The campaign that Callaghan and the right-wing leaders conducted was gutted of all class and progressive policies as a result of which the political initiative in the election was handed to the Conservatives.

A big lesson from all this is clear. To win support for left policies in the labor movement is not in itself enough. The movement must have the democratic possibilities and the determination to ensure that the Labour Party in parliament and in government carries out the policies the movement has decided upon.

The strong demands now being made in the Labour Party and trade union movement for greater democracy in the Labour Party and for the primacy of Labour Party Conference decisions indicates that this lesson of Labour's election defeat is already being learned. This could be further sharply reflected in the Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference in the autumn of this year.

General Election activity of British communists was conducted in the 38 constituencies where the party had candidates. But in line with the party's general approach of calling for the defeat of the Conservatives and the return of a Labour government, Communist Party members also assisted Labour candidates wherever possible and participated in activities promoted by the Committee 'Trade Unionists for a Labour Victory.'

Our Election Manifesto, 'People Before Profits,' declared that Britain was not doomed to inevitable decline, located Britain's crisis in the crisis affecting the whole capitalist world, set out the policies that were necessary to make drastic changes in the way Britain is run and open up advance to the establishment of a socialist society. That is, we presented in the election the comprehensive alternative strategy advocated by communists through the years of Labour government, a strategy for tackling Britain's crisis in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people. Many points of this strategy are in line with the policies of the labor movement.

It was a vital contribution to the election. But primarily because of the conditions in which communists have to fight elections in Britain the communist candidates received very low votes — a total of just under 17,000 votes in the 38 constituencies contested.

We were unable to convince many of the electors

to vote for our candidates, even where they agreed with our policies, mainly for the reasons that have applied in all recent General Elections in Britain: the polarization of voting between the major parties; the increasing domination of elections by TV and the mass media from which we are virtually excluded; the undemocratic electoral system and the wide ranging and consistent anti-communist propaganda.

The wider support for the party and its policies was shown in the local elections which were held simultaneously with the General Election. An example of this can be said to be the Rhondda parliamentary constituency in Wales. The communist parliamentary candidates received 1,819 votes. But in local election contests covering just over one-third of the parliamentary constituency communist candidates polled 7,368 votes and one of them is now the first communist mayor ever elected in Wales.

Unfortunately Rhondda is not typical of other parts of Britain where our votes were much lower in both local and parliamentary elections. But there was in general a much higher vote for communist candidates in the local elections, where different conditions apply to those of a General Election.

Despite the great obstacles that face communists in conducting electoral activity in Britain and the low votes we generally receive there was an excellent spirit among the communists in the constituencies where we contested, among whom there were many young comrades.

This combative spirit and élan flowed from the clear political understanding of how vital for the left and the whole labor movement was the political battle being waged by the Communist candidates.

The battle for left policies that they conducted in the election must be carried forward in the post-election period. With a Conservative government in power the struggle for left policies is now more vital than ever. Millions will need to be brought into action for higher wages and pensions, the 35-hour week, extension of trade union and democratic rights and defense of the social and public services.

This can be done.

The government's social and economic policies will fall heavily on the overwhelming majority of the people for they are essentially policies in the interests of the great monopolies and multinational corporations, policies in the interests of the tiny minority who own the overwhelming proportion of Britain's wealth and control the levers of power.

The anti-democratic and anti-working class nature of government policies will become increasingly clear in the months ahead and millions of people inside and outside the labor movement, including many who voted for the Conservatives, can be brought into action, not only on social and economic questions but also on a number of other vital issues.

One of these on which there were important developments in the General Election is the struggle to defeat the fascist organization, the National Front, and to root out racism in our society. The National Front had 303 candidates in the election and polled 191,000 votes. This was much less than many expected them to poll. It was a product of countrywide action by anti-racist forces in the months prior to the election, including the activities of the Anti-Nazi League, and the militant opposition to the Front and to racism by thousands of young people and by immigrant communities in Britain during the election.

But the new government with its racist policies on immigration and its pandering to racism in other fields, as well as its policies which will make social conditions worse, particularly in the big cities of Britain, creates new dangers which will need an ever greater widening of the anti-racist struggle. The mass organizations of the working class will need to bring to this struggle their incomparable power and strength so that the road to racism and fascism is effectively barred.

That power must also be exercised to win a political and democratic solution in Northern Ireland. The long-standing policies of repression and direct rule from Britain have exacerbated every aspect of the crisis in the artificial statelet created more than half a century ago by British imperialism. Ever heavier burdens and loss of life are imposed upon its people.

The Communist Party campaigns for a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland establishing full democratic and civil rights to all citizens and creation of conditions for the complete withdrawal of the British armed forces.

We condemn the terrorist acts of the British army and its associates and those of the loyalist paramilitary groups. We also condemn the bombing campaign of the Provisional section of the Irish Republican Army which kills and injures innocent people and plays into the hands of reaction. With reaction more firmly in the political saddle in Britain it is clear that a priority of the democratic forces in Britain and in Ireland is to work out new political initiatives around which campaigns can be conducted in both countries so that the present intolerable situation, which is a menace to the working people of both our countries, is speedily resolved.

The great issues of peace, disarmament and détente are now also sharply confronting democratic forces in Britain. The new Prime Minister's bellicose and cold-war type statements made when she was leader of the opposition in parliament were not an aberration. Her basic political outlook is one of deep hostility to socialism and national liberation. It is an outlook shared by the members of her government and was expressed in their almost immediate decision following the election to step up Britain's military expenditure, including expenditure on nuclear weapons. This was, of course, the carrying into practice of promises made in the election campaign, for the new breed of reactionary Conservatives in Thatcher's government have never hidden their hatred of socialism, and particularly of the Soviet Union, and their views that Britain must spend more of its already over-stretched resources on weapons of mass destruction. But this

is an outlook and belief that is against all the interests of the British people; it threatens present living standards and menaces life itself. It can and must be challenged by all those in Britain who want peace and disarmament and pursuit of the policies of détente in Europe and the world.

The post-General Election situation in Britain represents a great challenge to the British labor movement and to the left in our country. On the day immediately after the election the Political Committee of the Communist Party expressed its confidence that the movement would take up the challenge. 'The election result is a serious setback,' it declared, 'but not a reason for defeatism. The forces exist which can throw back the Tory onslaught.'

These forces are much wider than the labor movement. They comprise all those in Britain who can be won to struggle in defense of living standards, extension of democratic rights, in opposition to EEC domination of Britain, for national liberation and peace.

Glimpses of their potential strength have already been seen in the mass struggles of past years. The great need now is to unite them in a broad democratic alliance of action under the leadership of the working class and its mass organizations. This is what is needed not only to throw back the Tory onslaught but to open up a new course for Britain.

The concept of such a broad democratic alliance acting as the force for deep-going political change in Britain was creatively elaborated in the program of the Communist Party, *The British Road to Socialism*, where it says, 'This (the broad democratic alliance — *G. McL.*) would embrace the great majority of the people; and be overwhelmingly superior in numbers and strength to the forces which want to maintain the status quo. The objective basis for this is that those who own and control the monopolies which dominate the economic and political system in Britain are only a tiny minority of the people, pursuing policies which conflict with the interests of the great majority.'*

The labor movement must be seen, as Conservative government policies unfold, to be acting in 'the interests of the great majority.' This is only possible of realization if the grip of right-wing leaders and right-wing ideas is weakened in the labor movement and the left increasingly influences not only the policies of the movement but is able to bring about mass action for these policies. How to achieve this is a vital issue requiring urgent and maximum discussion on the left and at all levels in the labor and democratic movement.

This is why the Communist Party's Executive Committee meeting on May 12 called on all Communist Party organizations to seek discussions with others on the left — in the Labour Party, the trade unions and the democratic movement — so as to make possible in the months ahead a new development of left unity in political action and struggle.

It will be the purpose and aim of Communist Party activity to help make that action and struggle so wide-ranging and powerful that 'the conditions for a new election are created long before 1984 and the Conservatives defeated in that election' (Report to Communist Party Executive Committee, May 12).

We are confident that this approach of creating conditions for a General Election before 1984 will be shared increasingly by others in the labor and democratic movement. But it will only be an 'approach,' a 'declaration of intent' and not a political possibility realized in life unless one of the great challenges of the Tory victory is faced up to by the labor movement.

That great challenge is the degree to which many working people have been influenced by Conservative ideas. Communist Party and Labour Party activists came up against this problem during the election.

To a much greater extent than previously experienced, workers in the factories and working people in their homes made points in discussion that echoed the Conservatives' reactionary philosophy and policies on taxation, public ownership, welfare services, law and order, race and the unions. It was clear from such discussions that the mass media's ceaseless propaganda on these and other questions had undermined progressive attitudes and class and socialist understanding in the minds of millions of workers.

How will this trend be reversed? This is a critical question for the left and the labor movement.

It is the view of the Communist Party that it can only be reversed through a great battle among working people for progressive and socialist ideas, a battle conducted at the same time and seen as inseparable from the development of action against every new threat posed by the Conservative government's policies.

This requires going to the mass of working people day after day, helping them to organize in defense of their interests, explaining and educating, answering the capitalist mass media, inspiring class solidarity and sharing the vision of what Britain could be like given the tackling of the capitalist crisis and ending the domination of the giant monopolies.

And that on an all-British scale demands what *The British Road to Socialism* calls *the vital need*, '... an organization of socialists, guided by the principles of scientific socialism, active everywhere among the people, in all the struggles, in all the unions, in all the progressive movements ..., an organized party, distinct from the left groups in the Labour Party, the separate unions and the other social forces and movements.'*

In other words, it requires as part of an ever more effective left, a bigger Communist Party, with campaigning branches in factories, work places, universities, colleges and residential areas throughout the country. Active every day among the people and selling in greater numbers the daily paper of the left, the *Morning Star*.

---

*The British Road to Socialism, London, 1978, p. 17.

*Ibid., p. 25.

Commentary

John Pittman
CC Political Bureau member, CPUSA, member of
WMR Editorial Board

SALT-II: THE TREATY IS SIGNED

The signing of the second strategic arms limitation agreement (SALT-II) has opened a new phase of the continuing struggle to underpin political détente with détente in the military sphere.

Strategic arms represent the most advanced products of the economic, technological and military capabilities of states. The achievement of agreement regarding their quantitative and qualitative limitation by the two economically and militarily most powerful states of the world, each representing one of the two opposing systems, was a task of extraordinary complexity. It is also not insignificant that the negotiations preceding the Vienna meeting proceeded in an atmosphere in which, on the one hand, the socialist-community states, the international communist and working-class movement, the non-aligned nations, the peace movement and all progressives pressed for the treaty's earliest conclusion, and, on the other, the U.S. negotiators encountered politically powerful opposition in the USA and some other North Atlantic Treaty Organization states from beneficiaries of vested interests in the maintenance of international tensions and the arms race. These circles sought to block agreement altogether, or, if not successful in this, to link its acceptance with unacceptable conditions, namely, unilateral concessions by the Soviet Union that would have violated the underlying principle of the treaty — equality, equal security, and an equitable balance of Soviet and U.S. interests. This adverse condition was further aggravated by the Carter administration's disposition to play the China card vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and other countries of existing socialism.

Small wonder, then, that progressives the world over hailed the announcement of the completion of the agreement with relief and satisfaction. Its enforcement would mark a new stage in curbing the nuclear arms race and pave the way to a substantive reduction of armaments and the attainment of the highest aim, that of entirely halting the production of nuclear weapons and destroying the stockpiles of these weapons.

What are the main provisions of SALT-II which runs to December 31, 1985?

First, the treaty sets new quantitative and qualitative limits on the development of strategic offensive arms. The USA and the USSR will, when the treaty comes into force, each limit their total number of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and heavy bombers, and also air-to-surface ballistic missiles (ASBMs) to not more than 2,400.[1] Beginning with January 1, 1981, this amount should be cut to 2,250 by each side.

Within these limits a ceiling is set for the number of ICBMs, SLBMs, and ASBMs, armed with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs), and heavy bombers equipped with clusters of cruise missiles with a range in excess of 600 kilometers.

Second, taking into account the probable qualitative improvements in weaponry resulting from scientific and technical advances in both countries, the negotiators have agreed to accept obligatory limitations and restrictions to contain that process.

As for the problem of verifying compliance with national technical means, the treaty prohibits either side from interfering with the other side's monitoring system.

The Joint Statement of Principles and Basic Guidelines for Subsequent Negotiations on Limitation of Strategic Arms is designed to expedite and lay a framework for negotiations on SALT-III. It establishes strategic arms limitation negotiations as a continuous and ongoing process.

From the foregoing it may be seen that SALT-II, while not directly ending the arms race, does apply controls that tend to slow it down. The treaty and the Joint Soviet-American Communiqué conform to the basic principles underlying USA-USSR relations which were set forth in May 1972 at the Moscow summit and in November 1974 at the Vladivostok summit. The Basic Principles of Mutual Relations between the two countries negotiated in Moscow commit them to 'proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence.'

The meeting at Vienna reaffirmed the need to strengthen the constructive basis of Soviet-American relations and for that purpose to expand the areas of cooperation between the USSR and the USA. The Joint Soviet-American Communiqué stresses that 'such cooperation should be based on the principles of complete equality, equal security, respect for sovereignty and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs, and should facilitate the relaxation of international tension and the peaceful conduct of mutually beneficial relations between states, and thereby enhance international

stability and world peace.' SALT-II confirms this proposition. The principle of equal security on which it is based is today the cornerstone of détente and peaceful coexistence and meets the interests of the USA and the USSR, and also of all other nations.

Therefore, SALT-II can be said to merit the positive appraisal it is receiving among the peoples, their mass organizations, and their governments. By conspicuously curbing the arms race in the area of its most serious threat to peace, the treaty could lessen the danger of a nuclear confrontation. It stabilizes the strategic situation between the two militarily most powerful states, which would positively affect relations between all other states. It could improve the international political atmosphere and promote mutual confidence among the powers.

Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee and President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the most experienced and indefatigable of the world's statesmen in the struggle for peace, said at the signing of the Vienna documents: 'To act in such a way as to prevent an outbreak of nuclear war is an obligation that the Soviet Union and the U.S. have jointly assumed. The treaty that has been signed today reaffirms our desire to fulfill that obligation. In terms of both quantitative and qualitative limitations on strategic arms it goes far beyond the SALT-I agreement. The entry into force of this treaty opens up the possibility to begin elaborating subsequent measures not only to limit but also to reduce strategic arms.

'By concluding the SALT-II treaty we are making a major step forward along the road of an overall improvement of Soviet-American relations and, consequently, of the entire international climate.'

U.S. President James Carter stressed in his speech that, 'like SALT-I, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is based on the real security needs of our two nations. It will not end the continuing need for military strength and readiness on both sides. But SALT-II does place important new limits on both the number and quality of nuclear arms. And it allows us to continue on course toward a safer world with even more substantial limitations and reductions in SALT-III. We cannot interrupt or endanger this process.'

Before the Treaty was signed, Carter addressed his remarks to critics and opponents of the treaty. Its rejection by a minority[2] of the U.S. Senate, he said, would be a 'massive, destructive blow to world peace,' which would cause the U.S. government to be 'looked upon as the war-monger.'

The U.S. President's warnings were re-iterated by members of his Cabinet. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, replying to threats of certain Senators to amend the treaty, said on a nationwide television program, that to amend any part of the treaty runs a grave risk of killing it completely. He added that if ratification were defeated, he did not believe it would be possible to renegotiate the treaty with the Soviet Union.[3] And in Brussels, U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown said that failure to ratify the treaty would make U.S. relations with its NATO allies more difficult, inasmuch as in their communiqué the NATO Defense Ministers had said that all governments in the alliance 'welcomed the agreement in principle.'[4]

These statements of government leaders brought into focus several conspicuous features of the situation over SALT-II. The point is that, first, the signing ceremony at Vienna was but the first step toward practical implementation of the accord, and that the next step of ratification may not be taken by the U.S. Senate. Second, they served to remind the peoples that in the USA and other capitalist countries there are politically powerful forces with vested interests in maintaining international tension and the arms race, whereas in the Soviet Union such forces do not exist. Third, they confirmed that the main national arena of the global battle to consolidate political détente with détente in the military sphere is the United States of America.

This latter reality presently takes the form of a polarization of American society on the issue of war or peace. For the last seven years, that is, during the talks on SALT-II, public opinion polls and other surveys of popular attitudes in the USA have consistently recorded the existence of a steadily growing pro-peace majority, estimated to number from 75 to 81 per cent of the population. The years of senseless and brutal U.S. imperialist aggression against the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos left a deep imprint in the minds and hearts of the people. The gluttony of the Pentagon and its financial-industrial accomplices, which together consume ever-increasing amounts of the people's produce, becomes daily more intolerable. Permanent mass unemployment, chronic price inflation, decaying cities, back-to-back economic crises and slumps — in short, mounting material and psychological insecurity — is the lot of an ever-growing mass of the U.S. working people. The peace issue has become all-pervasive and all-encompassing, intertwined with economic issues of everday living and political issues of defending human and democratic rights.

The U.S. pro-peace majority has time and again proved its ability to influence political developments in the nation. It forced one President to withdraw his candidacy for re-election and another to speed the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. It is now reconstituting its organizations and mobilizing its forces for the battles around SALT-II. Old peace organizations have revived and new ones have emerged.

A comparatively new feature of this process has also made its appearance — the growing participation of the U.S. working class. Even before the May 9 announcement of the completion of SALT-II, the country's three largest industrial unions — the United Steelworkers of America (960,000 members), United Auto Workers (1,394,000), and International Association of Machinists (630,000) — endorsed SALT-II and launched campaigns to win support for it. Their action sharply rebuffed anti-SALT-II forces in the executive council of the

American Federation of Labor — President George Meany, Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland, and President Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers, all of whom now find themselves in company with the country's most ultra-reactionary, anti-labor, anti-communist and anti-Soviet cabal.

'Americans For SALT,' one of the pro-peace majority's new organizations, is headed by six prominent personalities: Marjorie Benton, U.S. delegate to the UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament; Clark Clifford, former U.S. Secretary of Defense; the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University; Townsend Hoopes, former U.S. Under Secretary of the Air Force; Henry Cabot Lodge, former U.S. Senator and Ambassador to the UN; and Charles Yost, former U.S. Ambassador to the UN. This organization, as well as others such as the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, the U.S. Peace Council, and the National Centre to Slash Military Spending, unite an all-class all-strata majority of multi-millions of the U.S. population.

Another distinctive feature of the polarization process around the peace issue confirms the folk saying that 'birds of a feather flock together.' The foes of SALT-II are now allied with ultra-right-wing and even pro-fascist forces, such as the John Birch Society, American Nazi Party, the anti-union misnamed 'Right-to-Work' organization, the Ku Klux Klan, and other similarly mindless elements of the lumpen strata and the paid agents and stool-pigeons of the federal and local police. This motley array of assorted scum is decorated here and there by the presence of a member of the 'respectable' right and the pedigreed pseudo-intelligentsia. But all receive ideological direction from such offshoots of the finance-industrial-military complex as the notorious 'American Security Council,' the 'Coalition of Peace Through Strength,' and the 'Committee on the Present Danger' headed by Paul Nitze, an inveterate and incorrigible anti-Soviet hard-liner. Moreover, the monopoly-controlled mass information media, with their paranoic anti-communist, anti-Soviet bias, routinely give more space and time to the ideas of these groups.

The anti-SALT ideas feed on falsehoods and vary from the crude alarmism for the brain-washed gullible — 'The Russians are coming!' — to sophisticated variations on the old theme of 'the Soviet threat,' and its converse — 'America's growing inferiority and vulnerability.' This is coupled with speculation concerning the probability of a Soviet 'pre-emptive first strike' (this in a country whose top military leaders are striving day and night to develop a first-strike capability vis-à-vis the Soviet Union!). Much is made of the alleged certainty of Soviet 'cheating' and the impossibility of verifying Soviet compliance with the treaty. Opponents of SALT-II are vocal about their 'concern' for 'national security,' but what they cannot in fact stomach is the balance of strategic strength between the USA and the USSR and the obligation, recorded in the Soviet-American Communiqué, to refrain from seeking military superiority.

On sober examination, all these arguments collapse like straw huts in a windstorm. SALT-II is a reasonable compromise. It strictly observes the principle of the impermissibility of seeking unilateral advantage, the principle of equal and undiminished security for both negotiating partners. The alarmists charging SALT-II with inequalities favoring the Soviet Union remain silent about the actual situation imposed by geography and history. They say nothing about the nuclear capabilities of three other powers, two of which are allied with the USA, in contrast to the USSR's solitary nuclear umbrella for the community of existing socialist countries; or about the existence of scores of U.S. military bases on the soil of countries neighboring on the Soviet Union, in contrast to the absence of Soviet military bases in proximity to the USA. Moreover, the record of Soviet performance under SALT-I completely exposes the fraud of pretended concern over Soviet 'cheating,' or that that U.S. verification facilities are inadequate to monitor Soviet compliance under SALT-II.

Exemplary answers to the falsehoods of the hard-liners come from the working people. The United Auto Workers, for example, has issued a position paper for SALT-II which denounced traditional cold-war opposition to Senate ratication. The statement pointed out that U.S. taxpayers 'have forfeited huge sums of money — $2 trillion over the past 30 years — that could have gone toward national health insurance, full employment and rebuilding our cities.' It declared that Pentagon spending 'has decreased rather than increased our security. This is the time to freeze the nuclear arms race.'[5] This is confirmed also by the study published on May 15 by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. It said that up to 165 million of the 220 million people in the USA could die and the survivors would live under conditions of 'the economic equivalent of the Middle Ages' in an all-out war using strategic nuclear weapons.[6]

With committee hearings on SALT-II scheduled to last several weeks and floor debate after the summer recess, all organized forces of the pro-peace majority should move to bring pressure on the Senate. Among these forces the Communist Party of the United States of America has taken a full share of the effort to have SALT-II ratified. As other organizations, the CPUSA has mobilized the entire party membership for the crucial struggle which is to begin in the near future. The party leadership has toured districts to spur this campaign, participating in the door-to-door solicitation of votes for pro-SALT Senatorial candidates [7] and against anti-SALT candidates. CPUSA General Secretary Gus Hall has toured the country to assist in the campaign. 'On the scales of history,' Gus Hall wrote in his *Daily World* column of last March 22, 'SALT-II can make the difference between life and death on our planet.' The CPUSA is resolved that the decision shall be life.

1. ICBMs have a range of more than 5,500 km; SLBMs — submarine launched ballistic missiles; ASBMs are launched from flying vehicles with a range exceeding 600 km. The aggregate number includes not the heavy bomber proper but the maximum number of air-to-surface ballistic missiles for which such a bomber is equipped for one operational mission.

2. Ratification of SALT-II requires a two-thirds majority of vote in the U.S. Senate. This means that 34 of the 100 members of the Senate, who may vote against the treaty, would be enough to kill it. It poses an important question for the entire U.S. electorate: whether or not constitutional reform and democratic renovation have become urgently necessary when the life or death of the world's peoples can be decided by a minority of the Senate members? — *Author.*

3. *International Herald Tribune,* May 15, 1979.

4. Ibid., May 17, 1979.

5. *Daily World,* May 10, 1979.

6: *International Herald Tribune,* May 16, 1979.

7. 1980 is a national election year, when executive officials on all levels of government, as well as 435 representatives of the lower house of Congress and one-third of the Senate members, will be elected. — *Author.*

SUPG's integrated economic and social policy

Günter Mittag
SUPG CC Political Bureau member and Secretary

The integration of economic and social policy consists in dialectically linking economic achievements and improvements in the people's material and cultural conditions. This is determined by the tasks of building a developed socialist society in the GDR. The SUPG's Program, adopted at the Ninth Party Congress in 1976 says: 'A developed socialist society means conducting economic policy in close unity with social policy. The struggle for a high growth of production and of its efficiency serves systematically to improve the people's working and living conditions. Consistent realization of the principle of "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work" releases fresh motive forces for economic and social progress.'[1]

The possibility of integrating economic and social policy lies in the social relations of socialism, in socialist property, and the exercise of political power by the working class under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist party. The actual producers are simultaneously the owners of the socialized means of production and collectively appropriate the social product. Thus, in 1978, the entire GDR industrial product came from socialist enterprises, including 95 per cent from people's enterprises (VEB) and 5 per cent from cooperatives. There are no other forms of property in the GDR. Agricultural production is also almost entirely turned out by socialist farms, which cultivate 94.8 per cent of the farmland. The SUPG's constant concern for further developing the socialist relations of production and steadily consolidating the political power of the workers and peasants has been, is and will be the main political condition for the integration of economic and social policy.

In accordance with the basic economic law of socialism, social production is developed for the purpose of providing ever fuller satisfaction of the people's material and cultural requirements. Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, emphasized at the Ninth Congress: 'When taking steps to increase the volume and improve the efficiency and quality of production, and consolidate the material and technical basis of our economy, we are constantly guided by this principle: the people's requirements, the people's well-being, and their vital stake in further strengthening the socialist German Democratic Republic are the prime and highest criterion of our activity.'[2] Close connection between economic achievements and the efforts to raise the people's material and cultural standards is of invaluable importance in the economic and political strengthening of socialism, because the people come to feel from their own experience that under socialism the results of their work go to benefit society as a whole and every working person individually.

Since the Eighth Congress in 1971, our party has been putting through socio-political measures purposefully and on a large scale. Central among them is the housing program, which is designed to solve the housing problem as a social problem by 1990. In this way we seek to help the family as a key unit of socialist society. In 1970, over 76,000 flats were built or modernized in the GDR, and in 1978, nearly 168,000, so that the number of flats built or modernized since 1970 has more than doubled. In the eight years from 1971 to 1978, a total of 1,090,000 flats has been built. This means that we have met the planned targets ahead of schedule. Simultaneously with the building of dwelling houses we have been tackling other important social matters, like enlarging the network of creches and nursery schools, building schools and facilities for rest and recreation, public health and sports. In this way, important material prerequisites are created for shaping the socialist way of life.

One fact which testifies to the broad scope of social measures in the GDR is that in 1970, 291 children per 1,000 under the age of three attended crèches; in 1978, the figure was 605. In 1907, 645 children per 1,000 of the relevant age attended nur-

sery schools, and in 1978, 900 children. Besides, the state has put through extensive measures to stimulate the birth-rate: the working day has been shortened for mothers with two or more children (those who work in shifts have additional benefits), paid one-year leave for mothers who give birth to a second child has been introduced, and much more has been done.

The SUPG's socio-political program serves the interests of the vast majority of citizens in our country. The condition of the lower-paid groups of working people is being improved most tangibly: minimum wages and pensions have been raised. More favorable conditions have been created for citizens requiring special medical care. In 1965, 24.9 per cent of all industrial- and office-worker families had an average income of under 600 marks a month. In 1970, the percentage went down to 14.9 and in 1978 to 3.9. On the other hand, the proportion of families with a net average monthly income of over 1,200 marks went up from 11.9 to 29.8 per cent in 1965-1970, and to 69.4 per cent in 1978.[3] Thus, the income structure has been radically changed in favor of a majority of the people. Retail trade, which in 1970 came to over 64 billion marks, went up to more than 92 billion marks in 1978, an increase of over 44 per cent in eight years. This figure is especially impressive in the light of the fact that prices have remained stable. The range of consumer goods available has been extended with the addition of high-quality and more attractive products.

The SUPG's social policy also includes extensive measures to develop education, culture, public health, etc. The state's extensive activity in this field is expressed in the growth of services and subsidies from social funds (from 1970 to 1978, these went up from 25.6 billion marks to 46.2 billion marks, or more than 80 per cent). The biggest items were appropriations for education and public health, subsidies for retail prices, rents and other social measures.

Of tremendous importance for the GDR's political stability, the growing attractiveness of socialism at home and the country's prestige abroad now and in the future is the fact that by the end of last year we have fulfilled the joint decisions taken in 1972 and 1976 by the SUPG Central Committee, the Central Board of the Association of Free German Trade Unions and the GDR Council of Ministers. The policy of the SUPG's Ninth Congress, which is aimed at fulfilling the main task and conducting economic policy in close connection with social policy, has been fully justified.

Our growing economic achievements are the basis for improving the people's well-being. Our line of integrating economic and social policy has largely helped to develop new initiatives among the working class aimed further to mobilize our reserves. In the past eight years, labor productivity in industry of central subordination increased by 53.3 per cent. In 1970, it took 23 work hours to turn out 1,000 marks' worth of products, and in 1978, only 15 hours. One of the reasons for this growth of labor productivity is the availability of more and more modern technology: from 1970 to 1978, the value of equipment per person employed in the central-subordination industry went up from 37,000 to 54,000 marks. One should also bear in mind that from 1971 to 1978, a total of 43.3 billion marks went into the development of science and technology. In that same period 4.1 million innovations were implemented in the state sector of our economy, and these yielded an economic effect of nearly 29 billion marks. In that period, nearly 339 billion marks (including investments in other CMEA countries) went into the economy. All of this created the crucial prerequisites for our economic successes and, accordingly, for raising the people's material and cultural standards.

The indisputable successes in pursuing the integrated economic and social policy have further strengthened the ties between the SUPG and the worker-peasant government with the masses, and this is expressed in the working people's growing political activity in connection with the 30th anniversary of our Republic. The returns in the local elections on May 29, 1979, showed that the overwhelming majority of GDR citizens have confidence in their state. At a national festival in early June of this year, the young people of the GDR displayed their devotion to the socialist German Democratic Republic and loyalty to the unbreakable alliance with the USSR and the other socialist-community countries.

In its economic policy, which it ties in closely with its social policy, the party takes into account the fact that there is not automatic awareness of the objective relationship between economic successes and social measures. This requires constant political and ideological work by the party. What we must also reckon with is that our class enemy makes use of every possible means, including lies and slanders, to minimize the GDR's economic and social achievements. That is why the political influence of the gains of existing socialism is an object of fierce ideological struggle.

Central issue

A broad social policy can be pursued only if there is successful economic development, because one can consume only that which has been produced. At the 10th Plenary Meeting of the SUPG Central Committee Erich Honecker emphasized: 'The central issue in the further building of a developed socialist society in the German Democratic Republic is to increase our country's economic potential.'[4] Our party has always frankly told the working class and the rest of the people that the Republic's economic achievements constitute the material basis of the socio-political program.

The strenthening of our economy's material and technical basis has become a task of primary importance. The ways of fulfilling it are indicated in the documents of the party's Ninth Congress: development of our own energy and raw-material basis, expansion of production of modern machinery and equipment with the use of the latest achievements

in electronics, increase in capacities for the production of modern consumer goods, and development of building. We regard this broad range of tasks also from the standpoint of creating the premises for a further build-up of the GDR's defense capability.

We have constantly studied the possibilities for making better use of our own raw materials, and have taken the relevant measures, being mindful of the fact that our further economic growth needs to be backed up chiefly with our own raw-material and energy resources. Their use entails large-scale economic outlays because the deposits are being worked at every greater depths, and because use has to be made of deposits which require especially large investments because they are relatively short and have a low mineral content. At the same time, we have set ourselves the task of making much broader use of recycled raw materials. Plans for the development of science and technology and the people's initiatives in production in the course of socialist emulation are aimed at the most economical use of the available raw and other materials in terms of the economy as a whole.

Accordingly, the party has urged more attention to production accumulation, that is, accumulation which has a direct impact on the expansion of production. This is necessary in order to ensure the continuity of expanded socialist reproduction and to accelerate production growth from year to year. The build-up of the material and technical basis of our economy can, in effect, be carried out only through socialist intensification, through the use of all the internal sources of growth and resources, through better quality and greater labor efficiency.

To maintain continuous expanded reproduction is the indispensable condition of strengthening socialism and bringing out its further advantages in the class struggle. All the other tasks of raising the living standards and cultural level of the population and strengthening socialist society as a whole are linked with this goal. When we plan to ensure uninterrupted expanded reproduction, we take into account the factors brought about by the cardinal changes in foreign-economic activity. These include, above all, the swift rise in the prices of raw materials on the world market over the past several years. Since the GDR imports nearly 60 per cent of the raw materials used by its industry, its economy is greatly affected by the price rise. All this has led us to a very important conclusion: in order to provide conditions for expanded socialist reproduction, we must increase the end-product of our economy, and use energy and raw and other materials as sparingly as possible.

Our experience has shown that socialism has the ability to develop new sources of enhancing the quality and efficiency of social labor. In its political and ideological activity the SUPG sees to it that in the new conditions the party organizations and the people work with more confidence and resolve. The party, the government bodies and work collectives are taking measures to accomplish the set goals despite the changed conditions in economic activity.

We must, therefore, use thriftily and augment the resources we now have. We have already acquired a wealth of experience in this kind of activity. The consumption of critical energy resources, raw and other materials per 1,000 marks' worth of industrial commodity output has been reduced by more than 21 per cent in 1970-78, which means it has been going down by about 2.9 per cent annually. But for this reduction, we would have consumed, in 1978 alone, 8,000 million marks' worth of raw materials more than we actually did — a sum equalling the cost of goods it takes the GDR seven days to manufacture.

We need a new and higher level of economic management if we want to accomplish our current and future tasks. Although the use of critical energy sources and raw and other materials has been cut down on an average by 2.8 to 3 per cent annually, which is quite a sizable reduction, the 1979 economic plan sets the target at 4 per cent. This will require additional effort, so we must find new ways to effect not only partial but also decisive structural changes in production, thus saving a substantial amount of energy and materials. The main thing here is to speed up scientific and technical progress more consistently and use its results in the economy the best way we can.

The setting of goals and tasks in science and engineering must be preceded by a precise analysis of the objective processes going on in the development of the productive forces. Such an analysis has shown, in particular, that new reserves of economic growth on the national scale are linked with the development of micro-electronics. Speaking in economic terms, this branch is of strategic importance. In the coming years, our economic potential will largely depend on the manufacture and use of micro-electronic products, because micro-electronics ushers in a qualitatively new stage in engineering which produces a very important economic effect and enables socialism to use it for its own good.

The solution of these problems requires certain changes in economic administration and management, so in recent years nearly all enterprises in central-subordination industry and construction were grouped into combines. These combines consist of relevant enterprises, research establishments, facilities to produce rationalization means, and marketing agencies and form a relatively closed reproduction process covering every stage in manufacturing the end-products in which they specialize. They normally incorporate 30 to 40 factories and are subordinate to industrial ministries.

The combines have great economic and political responsibility in ensuring dynamic growth of production. They are expected, above all, to make prompt use of major scientific and technical achievements in the economy and to introduce up-to-date technological processes, thereby rationalizing production. And last but not least, they are expected to show better results in saving energy and raw and other materials. What we have already done shows that the great responsibility placed on

the combines opens up new possibilities for enhancing the quality and efficiency of labor. The combines have proved highly instrumental in building up the material and technical basis of our economy and extending the output of raw and other materials and modern equipment. They have speeded up the output of consumer goods and are showing good results in export. The combines are making an important contribution to the growth of the national income and its use for the benefit of the whole of society.

The formation of the combines necessitated further improvement in management and planning. Proceeding from the fundamental instructions of Erich Honecker, our party's General Secretary, measures have been drawn up to improve the work of the ministries and the State Planning Commission and to create big modern combines. Thus, important preconditions are now available in management and planning for a restructuring of the economic reproduction process in keeping with the new situation.

A factor of cultural development

The SUPG, convinced that labor is the most important sphere of social life, works for all-round development of its socialist character. We are creating all the necessary conditions for man to be satisfied with his work and be willing to work, so that the people would strive to maintain order and discipline, and abide by the rules of safety engineering. Our economic and social policy is aimed at developing the socialist individual. It is in the production sphere that various tasks are set to improve human welfare. In this sphere, basic preconditions are provided for citizens in socialist society to be able to attain a high degree of self-expression, work creatively and take part in management and planning. A fine example of this is the participation of more than 8,000,000 trade union members in the large-scale socialist emulation drive to mark the GDR's 30th anniversary.

An active and creative attitude to the development of socialist production, and the search for ways to raise labor productivity and make more effective use of energy, materials and basic assets give rise to a constructive and politically motivated approach to life, when instead of being enslaved by things man is their master and becomes free in the true sense of the word. The practice of building a new society has shown that in the GDR as in other socialist countries socialist relations of production deliver the working people from exploitation and create the basis for developing a new, socialist world view. Our society holds out the prospect of full employment, growing well-being and social confidence. The party's constant concern for improving material production includes the improvement of working conditions. We have formulated a principle, according to which rationalization of production must be followed by an improvement in living and working conditions. A big role is played here by scientific organization of labor.

The integration of economic and socialist policy thus means creating the conditions for man's development in the process of production and consumption. The SUPG Program says that the way of life and the character of people's behavior in work and leisure, in the work collective, in the family and in every-day life typical of developed socialism manifest themselves ever more fully in every sphere of our society. The socialist way of life is based on the socialist mode of production and spells out a steady rise of the well-being and cultural level of the people. In this context, a major task is to develop moral and spiritual qualities among workers, cooperative farmers and intellectuals, in all sections and classes of our society, that would meet the demands of developed socialist society. We are solving this big and long-term problem in the conditions of confrontation with imperialism. Our party is making the most of the vast opportunities offered by socialist society for the individual's spiritual development.

Of primary importance here is the development of the education system at the basis of which is the ten-year general education school, where young people acquire extensive knowledge and are educated in the spirit of communist ideas. Polytechnical education serves as a direct link between the school and material production, which makes it easier to go over to vocational training. School-leavers who decide not to go to a technical college or a higher school receive vocational training. In 1974-78 alone about 700 schools and 727 gymnasiums were built for 420,000 children. As many as 50,000 teachers have been trained over that period.

Works of socialist culture and art profoundly influence intellectual life. In keeping with the decisions of the Party's Ninth Congress, we concentrate more on developing lofty humanist traditions, propagating anti-fascist art and new works of literature, cinema, TV and fine arts reflecting socialist reality.

The SUPG thus pays special attention to combining the rise in the living standards with the development of cultural life. We associate every step on the way of social development with our citizens' ideological and moral education. The entire cultural life of our society is imbued with the lofty ideas of Marxism-Leninism, whose influence will continue to grow. Our republic lies along the borderline between the socialist world and the world of capitalism confronting us in the form of the FRG. Working in such difficult conditions, our party has never lost sight of questions related to the ideological tempering of the working people and educates them so that they can better strengthen socialism and defend its gains.

1. *Programm der SED.* Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1976, p. 20.
2. *Bericht des ZK der SED an der IX. Parteitag der SED.* Dietz Verlag, Berlin, p. 43.
3. *Statistisches Taschenbuch der Deutschen Demokratischen Republic, 1979,* Berlin, 1979, p. 106.
4. E. Honecker. *Schlusswort auf der 10. Tagung des ZK der SED.* Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1979, p. 190.

New experience

In this section we report on the methods and forms of the communists' work. Our interviews, extracts from party documents and reports in the press, letters from readers and short items reflect the experience of every-day party work.

INTERVIEWS

MEETING THE DEMANDS OF PRACTICE

Jannis Imvriotis
Chairman, Center of Marxist Studies (Greece)

Your center was set up a relatively short while ago. How is its work organized and how are the main lines and subject-matter of its studies determined? Who is involved in these studies?

A. When setting up our center, we assumed two main tasks: first, to disseminate the Marxist-Leninist doctrine among the masses, and second, to carry out research, above all into topics directly connected with the present situation in Greece. At the same time, it also operates as a study center, offering courses on philosophy and political economy for students and some workers. We also seek to provide special courses for workers in a more popular form. This was first done last year, but I must say that we do not yet have enough experience in this respect.

Our center is an independent public organization with more than 600 members, and branches in the big cities: Salonika, Patras and Iraklion in Crete. Our work is financed from membership dues and donations by those who share our outlook. We all work voluntarily and without pay, combining our lectures and research with our occupational duties. That does not mean that all the activists are Communist Party members. The main thing is that they accept the Marxist world view and the rules of our center.

Among our activists are specialists in various fields of knowledge: philosophers, economists, historians, teachers, doctors and lawyers. In accordance with their professional interests they are grouped in sections. Thus, the philosophy section consists of those who have graduated from the philosophy department of the university and who have scientific degrees. But there also are students and young scientists who have just graduated from the university.

Our main sections are philosophy (which also carries on sociological research), economics, agriculture, history, international affairs, education and public health. A culture, literature and aesthetics section is now taking shape. Groups doing research into individual problems are set up by these sections. These are not standing but *ad hoc* groups. Now and again, we engage in complex research involving three, four or five groups simultaneously.

What are the problems tackled by these groups? Well, in philosophy, for instance, we are trying to produce a fundamental work on 'Bourgeois Philosophical Thinking in Modern Greece.' This is, of course, a serious undertaking and it is being carried out in stages. For the time being, we have been holding seminars and lectures, and the material will be subsequently summed up and prepared for the printers.

In economics, one of the main questions today is the impact of foreign capital on Greece, and the consequences of its entry into the Common Market. We have already carried out a number of studies bearing on the problem, because it has been central to the political and theoretical struggle in the country.

We intend to concentrate special attention on the anti-fascist resistance movement, a key question in our history. We seek to show who organized it, which social and political forces led the movement, and the elements of the new power which then emerged (on the liberated territory there were people's councils, people's courts and other forms of self-administration). We want to present this in a visual way, because of the growing number of attempts to distort our history, and to minimize the role of the communists, for the people — the young people, in the first place — must know the truth.

I will not list all the other questions on which we are working, but let me say that the subject-matter of our studies in the field of theory, the history of the working-class movement, education, culture and public health bears directly on our people's present-day interests and starts from the existing situation in the country.

You will realize, therefore, that we have to divide our attention and to deal with many problems at once, involving many people. As I have said, the specialists working at the center elaborate the problems connected with their professional activity. But it is important that specific research should also be carried on in the light of the Marxist theory. We have to say that even our activists do not always display Marxist maturity, and this is a weakness of our center. That is why members of our center also attend courses, lectures and classes in philosophy and political economy, so that it is simultaneously a research center and a school.

We have gained much from developing relations with similar institutions and establishments in other countries, both socialist and capitalist. Exchanges of delegations and literature, meetings at conferences and symposia help us to make fuller use of the available experience, to deepen our own view of many things and to use much more extensive material in our research.

For the time being, we cannot be quite satisfied

with what we have done, but the willingness of men and women, especially the young, to gain a better knowledge of Marxist ideas encourages us and creates good conditions for extending our activity. This will be seen from the fact that our publications are popular, running to two or three printings. We hope that once the teething period is over we will be able more fully to meet the demands of practice.

DEVELOPING MASS CONSCIOUSNESS

Walgama Hewamaluwage Piyadasa
General Secretary, Sri Lanka Federation of Public Service Trade Unions

What are the problems now facing the communists of Sri Lanka in involving the working people in the struggle for political demands?

A. We communists are working hard to develop a true class consciousness among the working people, but for the time being the prevailing trend among our industrial workers and employees is to follow the parties which are in power or which can expect to be in power. Thus, during the United Front government the strongest trade unions followed the Sri Lanka Freedom Party. Now many trade unions follow the United National Party.

Many working people are simultaneously members of several trade unions, and this tends to breed opportunism. Out of political sympathy they may support the left-wing trade unions, but in order to obtain the benefits and secure additional protection they also join trade unions led by the ruling or the other bourgeois party with a considerable number of seats in parliament. This is all the more understandable because, in accordance with existing practice, the granting of jobs in each electoral district depends on the local deputy. That is why it is especially hard to rouse the working people to political struggle. For the time being many fail to realize that economic problems can be actually solved only through radical social change.

Our experience shows that in order to involve broad masses of working people it is important to rely on concrete economic demands characteristic of the given sector, gradually adding political demands to them. Here is an example of successful action of this kind in our recent history.

The Joint Committee of Trade Union Organizations decided to stage a one-day general strike on January 31, 1975, to back up very important political demands: nationalization of foreign plantations, foreign banks and a number of big foreign and local industrial companies, notably those turning out synthetic fabrics. But in order to ensure massive participation by the working people in the campaign, we also put forward a demand for higher wages, so emphasizing the interdependence of the demands.

In that period, the right wing which headed the Sri Lanka Freedom Party abandoned the anti-imperialist policy which the Sri Lanka Freedom Party government had earlier followed. It proclaimed the following slogans: 'End Nationalization,' 'Privileges for Foreign Capital,' etc. However, it was hard for the working people to understand the danger of this swing in a 'pure form.' That is why it was important to couple the struggle against the swing to the right with the struggle to realize the above-mentioned demands for higher wages, so as to show the connection between nationalization and the possibilities for improving the working people's condition. As a result, our call met with a response that forced the government secret service to predict that the strike would indeed be a general one. The government then had to announce that it was prepared to negotiate with the Joint Committee of Trade Union Organizations and made concessions in the course of these talks. It agreed to nationalize the plantations, which was one of the most important gains of the United Front period. Besides, wages were raised for all the working people. A promise was made subsequently to nationalize the banks, and it was declared that the question of nationalizing the textile industry would be seriously considered. That was a great success, which was achieved, in particular, thanks to the tactics adopted in the struggle.

Subsequently, the situation changed, and when the United National Party came to power in 1977, it became harder to carry on the struggle. Thus, in early 1978, the government issued a White Paper on the trade unions, whose purpose was to check and sharply limit their activity and to wipe out the rights which the trade union movement in Sri Lanka had won. We tried to explain this to the working people, but we did not obtain any immediate response or resolute action on their part. We did not retreat, we carried placards to the workers' canteens during lunch breaks and talked with them. Eventually, this painstaking work began to yield fruit.

The ultra-leftists accused us of failing to call a general strike right away, but having been among the working people we knew that they were not yet prepared or aware of the imperative need for such action.* A long and hard struggle lies ahead of us and the yardstick of success in it will be the growth of the political consciousness of the working people. In accordance with the situation in the country and the mood of the masses, we try consistently to carry on our work.

DOCUMENTS

Vietnam

CONCERN FOR THE QUALITY OF PARTY RANKS

A directive of the Secretariat of the CP Vietnam Central Committee, 'On Intensifying Work in Party Construction, Improvement and Strengthening of Party Organizations,' has been made public. It says

*Making use of this immaturity of the masses, the government managed to inflict a heavy blow on the trade union movement, completely banning strikes in the public sector and political strikes in the private sector in October 1978 — *Ed.*

that the past period has been marked by a steady advance of the Vietnamese revolution. This is evidenced by the militancy of the Party ranks. At the same time, in the process of the party's growth, some negative aspects were to be seen alongside positive and progressive phenomena. In many local organizations, due attention has not been given to strengthening and raising the quality of the membership, selection and education of active participants in the revolutionary movement for their admission to the party. There are still many villages, enterprises, armed forces units, schools, etc., especially in the South of Vietnam and the mountain areas which have no party cells; close contact between party members and the masses has not been established everywhere.

The Secretariat of the CP Vietnam Central Committee believes that it is necessary to set up strong and reliable party cells everywhere by the end of 1980.

Special attention is to be given to the qualitative growth of the membership, and admission to the CP Vietnam of the best men and women of the working class, the cooperative peasants, members of the armed forces and the security forces, and the socialist intelligentsia. What is especially important, the document stresses, is to extend the party ranks in the production collectives and also in the military units in the field. In the communities and villages of South Vietnam and in the mountain areas work is to be invigorated in selecting the best representatives of the Youth League, and activists of mass organizations to prepare them for party membership.

Work in party construction is described in the document as the prime duty of the party committees.

The need is emphasized scrupulously to abide by the principle of mass participation in party construction, more regular meetings with the people, to hear their views about the activity of party organizations and members, and pay attention to their critical remarks.

Once in six months, the directive says, every party bureau of each party cell must hear reports by Communists, encouraging their positive aspects and criticizing and applying disciplinary measures whenever their work is bad. The work of admission to the party must be carried on systematically and closely tied in with the communists' every-day activity.

The department of cadre training of the CP Vietnam CC, in close cooperation with the organization department, the document says, is working on a supplement on party construction to the program for training leaders and party members, including senior echelon functionaries.

A number of conditions for party membership are to be revised. Thus, primary organizations with more than 300 members and probation-members are to set up their own committees with the right to decide on admission to the party and on disciplinary measures on a par with the district committees.

Spain

ATTENTION TO ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain was held at Cordoba to consider ways of invigorating the party's political activity, helping communists elected to organs of power, and enhancing the role of the CP Parliamentary group. It adopted the relevant decisions.

Much attention was given to a discussion of matters relating to inner-party activity. It was said that in the recent period, especially since the parliamentary and municipal elections, a situation has arisen in the party in which some communists have two or three party and trade-union and public or parliamentary posts. It was decided, accordingly, to draw up special instructions limiting the number of posts which a party member may hold, or determining the incompatibility of some posts held by one member.

Mongolia

MASSIVE SPREAD OF ADVANCED EXPERIENCE

A Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party adopted a decision to improve work in applying advanced experience and organizing socialist emulation.

Having analyzed and summed up the results of the party's activity in this field, the Plenary Meeting set the task of studying and applying in practice advanced experience gained by advanced workers and the best collectives as the chief duty of party, government, economic, cultural, trade-union, Young Communist and other public organizations. In formulating this task as a key one, the party believes that its fulfillment is one of the main means for boosting the productivity of social labor.

Its decisions urge the need to improve the organization of socialist emulation, above all developing active participation by the masses at every stage — preparation, adoption of socialist commitments, control of the process of emulation — which is the best guarantee against formalism in this matter.

It emphasized the need to restructure work in applying advanced experience in practice in such a way as to enable all organizations and establishments from top to bottom to do this in a concrete and planned manner, always combining moral and material incentives. It defined concrete measures to increase assistance to innovators and production collectives on the part of the country's scientific institutions, and to enhance the role of the mass media in spreading advanced experience. Special attention is to be given to the question of studying and applying the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist-community countries. Among the measures ensuring systematic and effective activity in this field, it recommended broader use of the experience of specialists from the fraternal countries working in Mongolia and advising the communists to set up at enterprises small centers equipped with the necessary pamphlets, visual and other study aids.

The application of advanced experience and the spread of socialist emulation, the document says, should be aimed at developing and consolidating the socialist way of life and establishing true collectivism, comradeship and cohesion in work collectives. This work is to be organized under the following motto: 'Let us support and multiply all that is best; let us root out and remove all that is bad.'

IN THE MIRROR OF THE PRESS

Avante!

IN MEMORY OF A HEROINE

The rural proletariat of Portugal has marked the 25th anniversary of the death of Catarina Eufemia, a farm laborer in Alentejo who led the struggle of the peasants and was killed by a fascist officer. *Avante*, newspaper of the Portuguese communists, reports that thousands of people gathered at Catarina's grave to pay homage to the memory of those who fought for the realization of the age-old dream of peasants to own the land they had always tilled. A meeting was organized at the graveside by communists who come from the same province as Catarina and are continuing her fight.

The gallant young communist, speakers at the meeting declared, did not sacrifice her life in vain. Today Alentejo is free of landowner and capitalist oppression. Hundreds of thousands of hectares of land, formerly used by landowners as game preserves, have passed to the hands of the peasants under the land reform. Most of these peasants have united in cooperatives.

Addressing the meeting dedicated to the memory of Catarina Eufemia, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist party Alvaro Cunhal said that her example of devoted service to the people was inspiring the working people in their heroic and selfless struggle. He emphatically denounced the assault of the rightists on the gains of the Portuguese peasants. The Communist Party, he said, would do all in its power to prevent the land from being returned to its former owners and would continue the struggle for the transfer to working people of uncultivated land still in the hands of the landowners.

All the speakers, the newspapers reported, said that they were firmly determined to uphold the agrarian reform and distinguished two directions in which it had to be safeguarded: by stepping up the mass struggle and increasing output. Here, the newspaper noted, a key role belonged to women, as the example set by the glorious Catarina had demonstrated.

QUESTION-ANSWER

IN THE FOREFRONT OF THE STRIKE STRUGGLE

Dear Comrades.

From the press we know of the great tidal wave of strikes that recently swept across Britain. Could you tell us how the communists acted during that period, particularly at the factories? Perhaps you could illustrate this with a specific example.

Javier Camargo,
Member, People's Party of Panama

The signal that set the working people in motion throughout the country was the great strike at the multinational Ford corporation in October and November last year. It was the automobile workers' response to the continuously intensifying exploitation that was bringing enormous profits to the corporations and a fall in living standards to the working people. Compared with 1974, real wages at the corporation's factories dropped by an average of £17 a week. The unrelenting struggle during the strike brought the working people a 15 per cent rise in wages and some other concessions from the management.

The role played by the Communist Party organizations in the struggle for the just demands of the working people was seen most strikingly in key disputes such as at the Ford corporation. During the strike many communists came forward as the acknowledged leaders of the masses. This is true of Sid Harraway, Chairman of the Shop Stewards Committee at the factory in Dagenham, London, whom this author interviewed.

Everybody at the factory knows Sid Harraway. He has been working there for 38 years. In 1952, during a three-week strike, he joined the Communist Party. Why had he joined at that time? 'I saw the huge part that the communists played in that strike,' he said. 'Each of them devoted all his time and energy, dedicated his entire self, to forming a united front of struggle of the workers against the capitalists. I was greatly impressed and decided that I should be with the communists.'

The Shop Stewards Committee headed by Harraway knew of the fabulous profits the corporation was making and refused out of hand to accept the handout of a 5 per cent wage rise. It called upon the workers to go on strike. The communists consulted with the workers, studied and generalized their wishes and demands, brought them up for discussion at meetings of the factory's shop stewards, and passed them on to the trade union leadership.

The trade union committee usually draws up a comprehensive document, specifies the details, and then presents the demands to the company. 'This time we took democracy into our own hands,' Sid said with a smile. 'We decided to stop work without waiting for the termination of the trade union's negotiations with the company, but after the recommendations of the shop stewards have been unanimously passed by a mass meeting of workers. Faced with an accomplished fact the leadership of the Union of Engineering Workers has no alternative but antedatedly to give the strike its official blessing.'

The success of the Ford strike gave a powerful impetus to the strike movement throughout Britain. An idea of its scale is given by the fact that nearly a million and a half people took part in the one-day

strike on January 22 organized by the municipal workers' union. The motor workers' strike was followed by strikes by millers, bakers, teachers, plumbers, railway workers, printers, lorry drivers and many other contingents of the British working class. This was the largest action since the general strike of 1926.

The communists were in the forefront of the strike struggle. One of the key figures in organizing the lorry drivers strike was the communist Erik Rechnitz, member of the Executive Committee of the Transport and General Workers' Union. What made this an important strike was that it involved in action a contingent of working people that had hitherto held aloof from active struggle. Its passivity was due to the fact that three-fourths of road haulage in Britain is carried by small firms operating ten or fewer lorries, and under these conditions it was no easy task to coordinate the demands of the drivers and unite their efforts and will. This time this aim was achieved.

I met with Erik Rechnitz at a party district committee in London three weeks or so after the successful strike. Erik told us of the tasks that communist trade union officials have set themselves.

'Our immediate aim,' he said, 'is to coordinate the actions of the trade unions. This may be judged from the demands put forward by us during the strike, specifically, a shorter working week, sick pay, pension insurance, paid holidays and others. But we do not lose sight of the political aim of strengthening the unity of the workers and of explaining to them that their economic gains are only the first result of their organization, that within the framework of capitalism their victory today may be nullified tomorrow.'

The growth of the number of communists among trade union organizers and shop stewards, the British comrades said, has made its imprint on the class consciousness of rank-and-file trade union members and has prompted them to be more active and to show more initiative. At factories and offices the communists are helping the people to acquire confidence in themselves and a greater sense of dignity. They show not only that it is possible to wring important socio-economic concessions from the capitalists and the bourgeois government, but that the working people have the strength, initiative, and experience to build and administer a new society. The workers are beginning to appreciate this. They have learned much in recent years. At the factories the communists are closely linked with their fellow workers and this enables them to understand, enlarge upon, and firmly uphold their demands, conduct explanatory work successfully, and map out effective tactics for the leadership of the practical struggle of the workers.

As Bill Dunn, head of the working-class movement section at the London district committee of the CPGB, noted, the communists working at engineering factories, printshops and other enterprises in the British capital, and also in transport are united and organized. For many years they have been exercising considerable influence in the city's docks. They play a prominent role in the building industry: despite the difficulties due to the temporary character of the work at building projects and to the denial of rights to builders, whom employers can discharge in total disregard of the trade union, the communists are effectively upholding the rights of the workers.

Communist influence is felt not only in the factories in London. In Liverpool the movement against unemployment, against the continued closure of factories, for a higher living standard of the people is headed by the strike committee of the CPGB city committee. The strike committee has nearly 50 members. Many of them are shop stewards. Members of the strike committee take part in meetings at factories, organize demonstrations and rallies, collect voluntary donations and circulate party literature, including the newspaper *Morning Star* and leaflets. At the Dunlop factory, where a Communist Party organization has been functioning for many years, the shop stewards and other party activists have succeeded in creating a climate in which only 83 of the 2,500 workers agreed to receive compensation and leave their jobs. The rest are resolutely opposed to the factory's closure, understanding that this would be a misfortune not only for themselves but also for the city's entire population.

Most of the Liverpool communists work in the shipbuilding, ship repair and automobile industries. Although there are still few communists in municipal institutions and in the health services, their influence has been visibly growing. For instance they have succeeded in getting the Liverpool schoolteachers to strike against the decision of the reactionary city education council to cut the number of local secondary schools by one-third and thereby diminish the opportunities of children of working people for getting an educaiton. Almost 90 per cent of the teachers in the city participated in the strike.

We have already noted the role of communists acting as shop and factory stewards and trade union organizers. They have won perceptibly stronger positions in the trade union centers of basic industries, particularly in the National Union of Mineworkers, of which Mick MacGehey, Chairman of the CPGB, is vice-chairman, and also in two civil servants' unions. For the first time in the history of the British trade unions, two communists, Ken Hill and George Guy, have become members of the TUC General Council, while as a whole, although the left forces are still in no position to define the General Council's policies, they have won greater influence in it.

Of course, the communists do not close their eyes to difficulties and do not conceal the weaknesses in the party's work. They are aware of how much remains to be done to consolidate their influence among the working sections of British society. But their efforts are yielding results. At the Ford factory in Dagenham, the factory steward Dan Connor, a communist respected by all the workers, remarked:

'When we communists recommended beginning

a strike, the workers, and there are thousands at the factory, agreed with us to a man despite all the hullabaloo in the press, radio and television. The workers supported us also when we called for an end to the strike, because more could not be achieved at the time and a continuation of the strike would only have helped the employees to destroy the unity of our work collective. After the strike, morale was very high among the workers. This militant spirit, this unity moulded in struggle, is exactly what we want to sustain. We hope that by giving day-to-day leadership to the struggle of the workers for an improvement of their material condition we shall be able to strengthen our role as political leader of the masses.'

The Conservative victory in the parliamentary elections has confronted the working-class movement with new and formidable problems.* Still, the communists have no doubt that these difficulties will also be overcome. An earnest of this, they believe, is the growth of the class consciousness of the British working people, their activity and militancy.

Vladlen Kachanov
London—Liverpool—Prague

*See Gordon MacLennan's article in this issue.

---

exchange of views

Revolution and democracy

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

We continue publication of the proceedings of a scientific conference on 'Revolution and Democracy' sponsored at Tihany, Hungary, in late April by the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and *World Marxist Review.** All the papers are presented in abridged form. These have been grouped by the key problems which the participants in the conference considered: the socialist perspective and democratic transformations, the hegemony of the working class and the diversity of social interests, democracy and the international factors of the revolutionary process.

We present here the views expressed on the first question in the papers, speeches and rejoinders of the participants. Among those who took part in the exchange on the first question were: *Luciano Antonetti,* Deputy Director, Italian journal *Nuova rivista internazionale; Oiva Björkbacka,* member of the CC Political Bureau and Secretary of the Department of Agitation and Propaganda, CP Finland; *Peter Boychuck,* alternate member, CC Central Executive Committee, CP Canada; *Robert Francis,* representative of the CP Belgium on the Journal; *Ivan Frolov,* corresponding-member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, *WMR* Executive Secretary; *Bruno Furch,* CC member, CP Austria; *Girgin Girginov,* D.Sc. (Philos.), CC member, Bulgarian CP; *Emile Habibi,* CC Political Bureau member, CP Israel; Professor *Antonio Jannazzo* of Rome University; *Monty Johnstone,* member of the Theoretical-Ideological Committee, CP Great Britain; *Kemal Kervan,* representative of the CP Turkey on the Journal; Professor *Yuri Krasin,* Pro-Rector, Academy of Social Sciences, CC CPSU; *Sandor Lakos,* CC member, HSWP, Director, Institute of Social Sciences, CC HSWP; *Jose Lava,* CC member, CP Philippines; *Jose Luis Malo de Molina,* Professor of Madrid University; historian *Claude Mazauric,* CC member, French CP; *Sarada Mitra,* National Council member, CP India; *Ion Mitran,* Deputy Editor-in-Chief, Rumanian journal *Era Socialista; Essop Pahad,* Ph.D., South African journalist; *Bert Ramelson,* representative of the CP Great Britain on the Journal; *Magsarzhavin Sanzhdorzh,* D.Sc. (Hist.), Sector head, Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Mongolian People's Republic; *Alexander Sobolev,* D.Sc. (Philos.), Department head, Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC CPSU; *Boris Spasov,* Chairman, Bulgarian Union of Jurists, consultant at the Council of State of the Bulgarian People's Republic; *Dimitris Tsaras,* CC member, CP Greece; *Eduardo Viera,* member of the CC Executive Committee, CP Uruguay; *Horst Wilhelms* of the Board of the German Communist Party; and *Konstantin Zarodov,* D.Sc. (Hist.), Editor-in-Chief of *WMR.*

*Continued from *WMR,* July 1979.

I. THE SOCIALIST PERSPECTIVE AND DEMOCRATIC TRANSFORMATIONS

Line of quest

Prominent among the methodological questions in the theory of revolution was a definition of the lines of creative quest in solving the problems of transition to socialism in present-day conditions, an

analysis of the dialectics of the revolutionary process in its organic connection with the struggle for democracy, the importance of the class approach in assessing its new potentialities and perspectives, and a consideration of the general uniformities and concrete specifics of each country.

Now that the working people in a number of capitalist countries have won important democratic gains, we are witnessing a quest for new ways to socialism, *Eduardo Viera* said. We do not regard these as being something antithetical to existing socialism. This quest is determined by the diversity and depth of the revolutionary process, new potentialities whose advances have been produced by the triumph of socialism in a sizable part of the world. First the October Revolution, and then the victory of the Soviet and other peoples over fascism, and the formation of the system of socialist states helped to enhance the democratic aspirations of the masses, awakened an awareness among many once-oppressed peoples, and stimulated the struggle for democratic rights in the capitalist countries.

The question of power — economic and political power — is the main question of democracy. The winning of genuine democracy, in effect, means that power passes into the hands of the working people, of the working class. This idea was developed in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the breakup of the bourgeois state apparatus and on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The possibility of putting through democratic changes does not rule out serious upheavals which could start the advance to even deeper transformations. The success of democratic and socialist transformations depends on whether the working class plays its role of leader, and on whether the embryos of the new power have emerged in the course of the revolutionary process. In Russia, for instance, the emergence of the Soviets was followed by the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus and the establishment of a new, socialist state in the form of a republic of Soviets. After the victory over fascism, people's democracy was established in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe. In the future, Viera said, new forms of power could emerge. Only very deep democratic gains, he emphasized, could ensure the transition to socialism without civil war. Chile is not the only example in our day, when the revolution, having put through a number of important transformations, was forced to retreat because the issue of power was not finally decided.

He characterized the present period as one of broad alliance and popular action for democracy. But now and again, the question of democracy is regarded only from the standpoint of the developed capitalist countries, when sight is lost of the fact that peoples oppressed for thousands of years are entering upon a new life with forms of power that are far from being perfect. For Latin America, above all for countries like Uruguay, where there is one political prisoner for every 400 inhabitants, the main issue on the agenda is the question of democracy, the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and the subsequent extension of democratic gains. The extirpation of fascism will have an effect on the situation in the whole of Latin America. Regrettably, Viera said, some scientists suggest that we are wrong in defining the dictatorial regimes in Latin America as fascist. They fail to take into account that most of these dictatorships are the product of a counter-offensive by imperialism against the development of the revolutionary process.

Democracy, *Alexander Sobolev* said, has now become the main form of struggle against state-monopoly capitalism, and for a solution of the anti-monopoly and other tasks of social progress which develop into socialist tasks as they are fulfilled. The emergence of a new historical phenomenon, namely, the independent democratic stage of struggle under developed capitalism is connected with the fact that in virtue of the intricate and zigzag nature of the process of development the volume of democratic tasks under state-monopoly capitalism tends to increase, instead of diminishing. The importance of the socialist aspects of democratic tasks has been growing. The substantiation of this thesis by Marxist scientists helps to enrich the socio-economic analysis of capitalism, correcting the notions about capitalism's capability for solving democratic problems.

The emergence of these problems in the theory of revolution, the speaker said, is determined by the following factor of world development. First, the socio-historical maturing of socialism, the consolidation of its economic strength, and rise of its international prestige and the spread of the new social system to various countries — all of this goes to create new and favorable potentialities for the interaction of revolution and democracy. The second factor is the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. We now witness an exceptionally peculiar phenomenon, as capitalism creates a gigantic apparatus for self-preservation and strengthening of its power, although historically it is worked out. The whole of this apparatus is anti-popular in substance, and that is why it induces in the working class and all the other working people exploited by the monopolies a great urge for democracy, for bridling the monopolies, without as yet solving the problems connected with socialism. At the same time, many new democratic tasks have arisen. The action against the arms race and the threat of war has now acquired a qualitatively new character, and this also applies to the struggle on the ecological front.

That is how the democratic, anti-monopoly phase of the class struggle has taken shape, producing new contradictions for whose solution the way is paved by the working people's democratic movement, which, however, contains socialist aspects — and therein lies the dialectics of its development.

That is the general aspect which is, perhaps, not new in every respect, Sobolev concluded. But the problems arising in the intricate interaction of the struggle for democracy and the struggle for transition to socialism can be objectively solved only through an enhancement of the socialist elements

within the framework of democratic transformations.

Our revolutionary task, *Claude Mazauric* said, is to give the people an awareness of the fact that the democratic transformation of the class nature of the state and society through a socialist revolution is now a necessary, feasible and historically proximate endeavor. Communists and revolutionaries cannot evade the necessity of carrying on a principled struggle against reactionary and reformist ideas, because these ideas are aimed at obscuring the class nature of the state. The existence of the socialist countries in all their diversity and with all their contradictions invests this struggle of ideas with the form of an intense political contest between the revolutionary forces, on the one hand, and the reactionary and social-democratic trends, on the other. This struggle needs to be carried on, giving a just evaluation of the considerable contribution made by existing socialism to the history of the social emancipation of man.

The statement of the antithesis between socialist and bourgeois democracy, the speaker went on, does not yet provide an answer to the question either of the transition from bourgeois to socialist democracy or of the concrete modes for effecting the latter, or of its possible transformation, or even of the principles which help critically to comprehend the mechanisms of socialist society and the meaning of the new contradictions. What is more, unless we go beyond this statement, the speaker said, negative consequences may arise: for instance, a shortsighted view of the need to elaborate concretely the theory of the diversity of the ways of socialism, and justification — for the sake of the overall result, which has a progressive content — in the life of the socialist countries of that which now and again we do not very much like, and the obscuring of the concrete differences and difficulties. That is why, apart from standing up for the already established truths in the ideological struggle, the speaker stressed, one should also work for progress in the sphere of theory to enable us to act as a revolutionary force and operate in the light of the requirement of scientific socialism.

Our revolutionary strategy, Mazauric said, may be formulated as follows: realization of socialism in France in the democratic way. Describing the process of its elaboration, the speaker singled out two of its stages: first, recognition of the need for a multi-faceted alliance of the anti-monopoly social forces and other political entities both at the transitional revolutionary stage and in the period of building a socialist society; then, in 1976, abandonment of the idea of the proletarian dictatorship, of the plan for establishing it. This change could have been brought about, first, owing to the changing balance of forces in the world against imperialism and the existence of the socialist countries. Their successes, the speaker said, have transformed the perspective of socialism into an actual possibility shaping the consciousness of millions of men and exerting an influence even on those who now and again thoughtlessly succumb to the most humdrum anti-Sovietism. Second, the tremendous need for democracy that has arisen from the contradictions of the struggle against monopoly oppression and capitalist exploitation, ensuring an identity of the perspective of socialism and a considerable extension of the most diverse democratic rights. Third, the advance of the productive forces generated by the scientific and technological revolution, which requires the participation of producers in adopting and realizing decisions, even in conditions when the drive for profit by the new multinational capital developing on a national basis leads to the down-grading of the skills of the working people, migration and unemployment.

In our day, all of this culminates in a powerful movement for new democratic rights, which goes well beyond here-and-now concessions that the ruling class can afford, the speaker went on. The struggle to extend democracy, going beyond the classical demands for representation in parliament and local organs of administration, ultimately tends to mitigate class oppression.

Our democratic strategy, Mazauric said, covers every sector of the struggle and puts forward new tasks, especially in every-day life in conditions of the crisis. This means winning real rights and freedoms; this means directing the broadest struggle for a democratic transition to socialism, making use of all the possible means, with the exception of 'civil war'; this means preservation — after the completion of the transition period — of democratic rights won earlier.

Such is our strategy, Mazauric said. The FCP does not set it up as a 'model' because it respects the experience of other parties, or as an 'anti-model,' especially in contrast to the existing socialist states. The party proposes its own way for France, its own original plan.

We have chosen a difficult road, the speaker continued. It is difficult because the struggle for democracy must be put at the service of socialist transformations in social and state relations, enhancing the political consciousness of the working class and other sections, while effecting a broad policy of alliance; but here, however, the leading role of the working class must not be obscured. The main thing is for the Communist Party to exert the decisive influence in the struggle for satisfying the priority demands of the working people and for building a new society. We reject any bureaucratic or 'cartelized' forms of 'unity,' rehabilitating social-democracy, which in France is now a force uniting all the reformist trends, and vindicating any possible measures to salvage crisis-ridden capitalism. This road is difficult also because we have to work, as Lenin said, to make the masses realize that democracy, however broad it may be, continues to be a means of exercising social power, whose actual historical significance is determined by its class content.

In conclusion, Mazauric said: Our strategy largely coincides with some political steps and practical actions taken by a number of communist parties of Europe and other continents. Some

analysts have given their own name to this interlacing of identities, namely, 'Eurocommunism.' We do not question this term, which is convenient and correct as a definition, but we request that it should not be enshrined as a 'model,' or a conception, or yet as a category of scientific socialism. 'Eurocommunism' embraces diverse but also proximate modes of linking the promise of socialism with the use by the masses of all the potentialities of democracy and struggle. In part, we regard its content in the identity of views on many problems with other European communist parties.

The urge to express the specifics of the class struggle in this or that country, or even region, in definite terms is understandable, *Emile Habibi* said. Some of these have been established, like the 'British road' and so on. However, regional concepts like 'Eurocommunism,' I think, are unacceptable from the standpoint of assessing the cultural heritage and historical traditions of other peoples. This, I believe, does not rule out some other designation of the specifics of the movement in some countries.

While supporting the idea of the importance of a creative quest on a principled basis for new and original forms of transition to socialism, some participants in the discussion drew attention to the fact that the 'democratic way to socialism' was a term that clashed with revolutionary experience. This term, *Girgin Girginov* and *Yuri Krasin* said, contains a hint — even if not a direct one — that other ways to socialism are undemocratic. It would be more correct here to speak of a specific road, considering the conditions in each West European country.

The intricate process of working out a strategic line in the light of the new conditions was also analyzed by *Bruno Furch*. Since World War II, he said, the Austrian version of state-monopoly capitalism has taken shape with its system of 'social partnership' and 'class cooperation' through the medium of social-democracy and its bourgeois partners. This has gone hand in hand with a favorable economic outlook. This gave rise to a new situation in which our party turned out to be inadequately prepared in ideological and theoretical terms, something that was, of course, not brought out at once, but gradually. Many communists continued to think in categories which did not help to find answers to the new questions or suggested incorrect solutions. Some, having lost faith in the working class as the leading force of society, began to 'enrich' Marxism-Leninism with fads of bourgeois liberalism or even to question the validity of revolutionary theory. Others, by contrast, entrenched themselves in positions of dogmatism and sectarianism.

The struggle to overcome these trends was hard and long, Furch went on. It cost the party losses, above all in terms of its social influence and trust of the working class. The starting points in this struggle were a thorough analysis of the new socio-economic conditions and elaboration on that basis of general concepts of the road along which Austria could advance to a socialist transformation of society. This is a road of struggle for anti-monopoly democracy without civil war, for a limitation and eventually elimination of the power of local and foreign monopolies. The struggle against the power of the monopolies is profoundly democratic: it is being carried on in defense of democratic gains and for an extension of the people's rights, for invigorating the democratic traditions of the working class and improving democratic institutions.

The party's conception, Furch said, is in sharp contrast to the program of the Socialist Party of Austria adopted in 1978, which speaks of filling 'ever new spheres with the ideas of democracy' and effecting 'social democracy.' That is the SPA's substitute for 'socialism,' a word still to be found in its first postwar program, in which it said that it intended to take a 'third road,' something that it now prefers to say nothing about.

Concerning the methodological problems of analyzing the revolutionary process, Furch emphasized the futility of structuring any 'models of socialism,' including an Austrian 'model.' We have abandoned what could be an arm-chair elaboration of some qualitatively specific 'model of socialism' for Austria. The socialist social system is created in accordance with general uniformities, which must be applied creatively, in the light of the country's national specifics, and which can be effected only in national form. Among these uniformities, in particular, is the establishment of the state power of the working class exercising a function which in the Marxist theory of the state is called the dictatorship of the proletariat, so realizing the broadest democratic rights and freedoms for all the working people, for every individual.

The interconnection between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism, *Konstantin Zarodov* said, expresses the dialectical unity of the two key lines in the communists' revolutionary strategy. Now and again, democracy is declared to be the leading aspect of this unity. Its preservation and consistent development are brought out as a necessary and adequate condition for the triumph of socialism. Is such an approach justified? In Marxist theory, democracy is regarded as an important form of class struggle which gives the proletariat considerable advantages and potentialities, and which is always preferable for it, but still only as a form. In any case, the contradictory class interests, their clash and contest continue to be its content. That is why, Zarodov stressed, we feel that in assessing the role of democracy in revolution it is not right to transcend the line beyond which the form is set up as some kind of absolute, while the content is in a sense made subordinate to it.

This is closely connected with yet another question. In our day, more favorable conditions arise for transition to socialism with the use of institutions and norms of bourgeois democracy. This road is frequently designated as a peaceful, constitutional, democratic road. It is, of course, not terms that matter, although these, too, could well be the subject of discussion.

The substance of the problem here is to gain a clear view not only of the potentialities opening up for a socialist reconstruction of society within the democratic constitutional framework of bourgeois states, but also of the limits within which these potentialities lend themselves for use by the revolutionary forces. Even the most developed bourgeois democracy and the most democratic constitution in a society ruled by capital are still ultimately adapted to the protection and service of the vital interests of the bourgeoisie. Nearly a century and a half ago, Marxism dispelled the utopian illusions that there could be some kind of extra-class or supra-class democracy. What is more, Marx and Engels regarded the advocates of 'pure democracy' as potential support for reaction. Why? Because to regard the political institutions and norms of democracy as being free of class content, to stand up for them as a value in itself, without taking into account their actual social function, is tantamount, wittingly or unwittingly, to exonerating the class whose interests they chiefly defend, namely, the bourgeoisie.

One could say: but what if the key instruments of state power turn out to be in the hands of the revolutionary forces, what if it is they and not the bourgeoisie that will use for their own interests the existing democratic legality, the constitutional norms, the representative institutions and so on? Well, that is quite possible. But that would mean nothing but a change in the class content of democracy. Indeed, the power taken by the working people within the framework and on the basis of democratic legality will inevitably have to face this dilemma: either to abandon, for the sake of observing this legality, any encroachments on the vital class interests of the exploiters, or to ignore its norms, which hamper the consistent transformation of the socio-economic foundations of society in the interests of labor and against capital. The exploiting minority will also have to face the same dilemma: either to submit to legality and the revolutionary power resting on it, which means losing its wealth, profits and privileges, or to defend its class interests, disregarding all the limiting norms of democracy. That is a situation which must inevitably arise. And this is no mere hypothesis. It is a picture which has been repeatedly observed in life.

The whole of the world revolutionary experience, Zarodov said, shows very well that forgetfulness of the class content of every democracy and legality is the first step toward costly illusions.

He then drew attention to an important aspect in the analysis of the socialist revolution — its connection with the democratic trasitions which in each country naturally have their specifics determined by its history, national peculiarities and the concrete course of the the class struggle. There is a relatively widespread view, he said, according to which socialist revolutions seem to be divided in this respect into two types: revolutions growing out of democratic traditions, and revolutions taking place in conditions where such traditions do not exist or hardly exist at all. Our ideological adversaries frequently attribute the October Socialist Revolution to the latter type. But how justified are such evaluations, or the typology itself?

It would be wrong, he stressed, to reduce democratic traditions to the existence of parliamentary forms of government, legal activity of political parties, etc., in a country. Of course, the prolonged existence of such institutions in a bourgeois society, and the struggle for these against reaction is a very important tradition. In Russia, such a tradition was, indeed, a weak one.

But the strength, depth and sweep of the democratic traditions of our country and their role in the socialist revolution were determined by the fact that for almost a century, beginning with the uprising of the Decembrists in 1825, they were shaped and developed under the impact of revolutionary ideas. Then these traditions were heralded by Alexander Herzen's *Kolokol* (The Bell), followed by the intellectuals of non-aristocratic origin, and Nikolai Chernyshevsky. What is also important is that the democratic traditions in Russia had deep roots in the consciousness and way of life of the bulk of the population, the peasantry. The Bolsheviks' consideration of these traditions and, in particular, the democratic traditions of the peasant commune, became one of the foundations for the democratic solution of the agrarian question in Russia as proclaimed in the 1917 Decree on Land and the subsequent enactments of Soviet power.

The proletarian movement in Russia, according to Lenin, adopted the best democratic traditions of the country. These traditions, he said, are an object of its national pride. They were enriched in the first revolution in Russia of 1905-1907, and the February 1917 revolution, in the course of which the creative activity of the masses produced a form of democracy in the shape of the Soviets. This enrichment of the traditions of democracy in the revolutions in Russia did not take place under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, but of the working class. The organic connection with these traditions of the world's first triumphant socialist revolution was manifested in its genuine democracy.

Like other areas of Marxist thinking, *Ion Mitran* said, the theory of socialist revolution could not remain stagnant or isolated from experience. At one time, the idea prevailed that the socialist revolution would occur at the moment of some economic catastrophe in capitalist society. Subsequently, Lenin considered the problems of revolution in a broader, global context connected, in particular, with the socio-political upheavals caused by imperialist wars. Let us recall that his conceptions were borne out by the revolutionary processes which led to the formation of the world's first socialist state and the revolutions which have triumphed in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, including Rumania, since the Second World War.

One could, he said, speak of new elements in the theory of socialist revolution in the context of the present conditions of the developed capitalist countries. In our day, thanks to the changing balance of

strength in the international arena and the growing influence of existing socialism and other anti-imperialist forces, and also as a result of the technological revolution in the military field, aggressive bourgeois circles cannot use world war as a policy instrument without posing a real threat to civilization. At the same time, favorable conditions were created for the scientific and technological revolution, and for an increase in the volume of production and higher labor productivity. Although the contradiction and structural defects of the capitalist economy remain and are becoming more pronounced, they do not necessarily result in a stagnation of production. Capitalism has learned to avoid such a situation which is highly dangerous to its very existence. But it is not capable of overcoming the antagonistic character of the functioning of its economy, which reproduces the phenomena of instability. The high concentration of the numerous clashes and social conflicts produces a critical situation for the hegemony of the bourgeoisie in a number of capitalist countries. Today, the struggle for a revolutionary alternative may prevent a slide into economic or military-political disaster. The revolutionary process in the developed capitalist countries tends to become a relatively longer and gradual process of transformation of structures changing the balance of forces.

The further elaboration of the theory of revolution frequently bears on the question of the interrelation between the general goals of socialist transformation of society and the specifics of the various countries, the speaker went on. The community of the goals of the socialist revolution constantly leaves an imprint on the real embodiment, without signifying its uniform realization. The diversity of social transformations implies, on the one hand, a constant definition of the specifics within the framework of the operation of general laws, and on the other, selection by the revolutionary forces of the possibilities existing in each society.

From the fact that there is an indissoluble link between revolution and democracy, Mitran held, follows not only the need to enrich the theory of revolution but also the historical importance of deepening democracy, including socialist democracy.

Democracy is one of those political categories which are the subject of constant ideological disputes. They show that one and the same word is used to designate totally different realities; some reach the pessimistic conclusion that democracy in the modern world is a 'statue built of sand on a beach.'* Everything depends, however, on the kind of democracy that one has in mind, the democracy of which social class. The revolution, the brilliant collective sculptor, 'shapes' democracy.

The mechanism of transformations in the system of power

One of the key lines of the discussion was consideration of the mechanism of transformations of the bourgeois-democratic system of power of present-day capitalism. In this context, there was a discussion of the possibilities of using its institutions for the benefit of the working people, the role and place of the democratization of capitalist society's political superstructures in the class struggle, and the problem of the qualitative change in the whole structure of power to effect the transition to socialism.

The advance toward socialism, *Jose Luis Malo de Molina* said, does not entail an elimination but defense of the institutions of representative democracy, whose renewal and development constitute a key feature in the strategy of class struggle in Spain. The idea is to make effective the power of parliament and the other elective organs not only in face of the concentration of power at monopoly centers, which take the economic decisions, but also in consequence of the growing influence of bureaucratic organs of the state seeking to extend and diversify their functions and spheres of competence. It is necessary to prevent the mechanism of representative democracy from being limited to a mere delegation of powers, when the masses only have the right to elect after a definite interval of time those who are to realize the interests of the monopolies.

We, Malo de Molina stressed, want the establishment of a political democracy capable not only of intervening in economic life to ensure justice, but also of promoting the development of the relations of production and bringing about a change of ruling classes. This means creating a democracy which, he believed, will help to advance to socialist transformations based on consensus and hegemony, instead of coercion, and which is capable of planning economic development and reorganizing all the state organs and counteracting the authoritarian and anti-democratic trends of monopoly capitalism.

The developed system of democracy will be headed by a parliament representing the will of the whole people. At the same time, this system will be based on a ramified network of institutions deeply rooted in the masses. Such a structure will strengthen the power of parliament, without in any way weakening the role of political parties, elections and parliament itself. Representative democracy, for its part, will enhance the role of every form of self-administration and direct democracy in every sphere of political, social and cultural activity.

Such an alternative to the present society, based on a deepening of democracy, he went on, is exactly what can carry Spain in the future to socialism in conditions of freedom. The forces of labor and culture, with the aid of political and social democracy, will win ever stronger positions of political power from day to day, and will be able to become the leader. This process will result in the emergence of a new civilization based on a development of the productive forces and science aimed at achieving greater equality in the distribution of material and

**L'avenir de la democratie,* Debats, Paris, 1978, p. 11.

cultural values, and so also more effective democracy.

I find, *E. Viera* said by way of a rejoinder, that the idea of advancing toward socialism in conditions of freedom is internally contradictory. That statement implies that there can be socialism without freedom. But the point is that one cannot imagine any transition to socialism without deep-going political and socio-economic transformations constituting the foundation of genuine freedom for the broadest masses of working people.

The victory over Italian fascism by the working class, the communists and kindred forces, and the winning of a democratic republican constitution in Italy, *L. Antonetti* said, bore out the idea that 'democracy kills the bourgeoisie.' In the new constitution, the following are proclaimed: an Italian Republic based on labor, a new foreign policy of the state, a reform of agrarian relations with the abolition of the landed estates in the first place; this constitution restricts the rights of proprietors and extends the rights of the working people, and lays the foundations for a reform to democratize the state. Of course, proclamation and realization are not one and the same thing, but for all that, I think, our constitution cannot be called a bourgeois one. Today, a number of key state prerogatives have been handed over to the local authorities, a reform of state administration has been carried out, power is being decentralized, it has moved closer to the sections of the people, to the working people, who enjoy new powers. The struggle to invest our democracy with an even more advanced content goes on.

There are forces in Italy which rely on the sector of traditional capitalism that would like to curtail the functions of parliament and to make the intervention of the state in the socio-economic sphere even more technocratic against the aspirations of the people. The struggle for parliament, for enhancing its efficiency and extending its functions, the speaker said, is one of the chief elements of our strategy of advancing toward socialism.

Speakers gave various assessments of the role of parliament and its use for revolutionary purposes. We see parliament, *Monty Johnstone* said, not as an organ of bourgeois state power to be swept away. It can be made a sovereign instrument of socialist transformation. But isn't parliament, *Emile Habibi* objected, an organ of the bourgeois state, even considering the fact that it has been created as a result of historical battles for democracy? From whom will it be independent? Parliament, *Monty Johnstone* responded, can be used as an organ of capitalist power, but we do not regard it on a par with the state apparatus, because it reflects the struggle for its use for the people's benefit.

A number of democratic institutions of bourgeois society, *Boris Spasov*, said, were used in the course of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria. Thus, a considerable part of the revolutionary measures taken by the people's power (nationalization of industrial enterprises, mines, pits, large-scale real estate) was also put through on the basis of laws enacted by a bourgeois parliament before the revolution. Only the fascist laws (concerning the protection of the state, police legislative acts) were rescinded immediately after the revolution. Until the adoption of the socialist Constitution of 1947, parliamentary activity was almost entirely carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Tyrnovo bourgeois constitution. In assessing this experience, one needs to bear in mind that in Bulgaria the old institutions were used when power was taken over by the people.

Today, *Robert Francis* said, the masses, relying on their own experience, have a sense of profound mistrust for parliamentarianism, for the political games being played out beyond the control of the electorate, which allow the most diverse groups to pressure and influence the solution of fundamental matters. But it would be dangerous to deny parliamentarianism. There is a need to act from inside the crisis-ridden parliament to seek new means and opportunities for all the representative institutions and to determine their new face.

The contemporary capitalist state can hardly be schematically presented as an organ of class dictatorship which is exclusively coercive and repressive. The power of the bourgeoisie also rests on the agreement of a section of the subordinate classes, which is sometimes fairly large, aggreement that is obtained through the spread of the dominant ideology by 'state ideological organs' (schools, cultural and educational establishments, mass media). The functions of the state are not confined to the 'suppression-ideology' formula. They have been markedly extended, notably in the social sphere, where the state has a number of positive functions to perform with respect to the people. Finally, the economic functions now have a crucial role to play.

The structure of the state naturally meets the interests of the bourgeoisie, notably the monopolies. Francis described the state as a sphere of strategic struggle of classes; it is influenced by the contradictions not only between the groups in power, but also between the ruling and the oppressed classes. When the progressive forces win stronger positions in the state apparatus and the balance of forces in society changes as a result of mass action, an opportunity will arise to wrest the commanding instruments of state establishments from the rightists and gradually to transform the whole structure of the state by means of democratization. This can be achieved, provided the struggle 'from within' rests on action taken 'outside' by the mass movement, which is of crucial importance.

The democratic rights and liberties existing in Belgium, which need to be further extended, are not a gift of the bourgeoisie, but a result of the struggle of the working-class and democratic movement. The gains of the working class have invested them with new meaning and extended them to the scale of the whole of society, instead of limiting them to the framework of the élite. Thus, Francis said, the 'democracy for all' concept is becoming an abiding historical value.

The chief problem on the agenda in Belgium today, the speaker went on, is to take the democratic road to socialism in order to build democratic socialism. Elaboration of a strategy for a peaceful road to socialism does not in any sense amount to the adoption of a reformist-fatalist conception.

More attention should be given to bourgeois-democratic traditions, *Sandor Lakos* said. Parliament and the institution of elections need, of course, to be defended. But there is also a need to transform the institutions of bourgeois democracy to make them more democratic and effective from the standpoint of the people's interests. The institutions of bourgeois democracy are largely the gains of the revolutionary struggle, and an area of the working people's struggle, while being the result of bourgeois rule. The importance of these institutions should not be minimized, because to some extent they indicate the balance of class forces in a given country. But then they should not be overrated either. It would be wrong to have any illusions about them. These institutions are being increasingly manipulated by the ruling classes; they do not represent the interests of the whole population. If one were to look only to parliamentary elections, such a one-sided approach could lead to a minimization of the importance of extra-parliamentary political struggle. But the point is that it alone can help to achieve tangible results in parliament itself.

The bourgeois parliament and the electoral system, he emphasized, are increasingly becoming a means for duping the masses. It is wrong to regard parliament as the center of decision-making. In the developed capitalist countries, the truly important decisions, at least most of them, are taken outside of parliament. The centers of power — the military-industrial complex, the monopolies, the highest organs of the armed forces and the police — are not controlled by the people. In effect, even parliament does not control them.

Democracy also has a great part to play in the preparation and victory of the socialist revolution. In turn, the victory of the revolution creates qualitatively new and favorable conditions for the development and improvement of democracy. The working people seek consistently to use the institutions of bourgeois democracy for their own benefit. But the ruling classes are not idle either. There arises this question: what are the limits for transformations within the framework of bourgeois democracy? Evidently, Lakos said, there will be a need for a qualitative change in the character of power. That could well be called the critical point.

The developed bourgeois-democratic system as a form of the political power of monopoly capital, *Yuri Krasin* said, evolved under strong influence from the working-class and democratic movement, integrating within itself many of the results of this movement. Broad opportunities arise for the use of democratic institutions by the working class as bridgeheads in the struggle against the power of big capital within the system itself. However, the prospect of continuity in the development of democracy cannot obscure the task facing a socialist revolution, namely, the change in the class content of democracy, something that requires radical transformations in the system of the organs of state power.

At the present stage, broad opportunities for joining the system of bourgeois-democratic institutions — parliament, local organs of power, the municipal councils, and even the government — are opening up before the working class, the communists and the other democratic forces. The communists entering the state system of contemporary capitalist society, the speaker said, are confronted with a problem which has yet to be solved theoretically and practically: on the one hand, they express the interests of the working class and all the other working people, and on the other, they have to reckon with the 'rules of the game' of the whole political superstructure, which functions in accordance with laws determined by the logic of the development of capitalist society that tend to clash with the interests of the working class and its socialist goals. There arises the real danger that the entry into the system of bourgeois-democratic institutions could entail a loss of the revolutionary perspective and produce a trend toward integration with this system.

Reformist utopias do not consist in recognition of the need to use bridgeheads within the existing bourgeois-democratic system. What is utopian is that radical transformations in the system of power are allegedly possible only 'from within' the state system.

State-monopoly capitalism is a complex of stratified contradictions. It is hard to imagine that all these contradictions can be resolved all at once, at one blow, although such a prospect cannot be ruled out either. But it is more probable, Krasin said, that the contradictions of what might be called the upper stratum connected with the relations between the state-monopoly system of power and the various sections of the people will be resolved first. That is what opens broad opportunities for creating transitional types of power which, while not being socialist, already go beyond the framework of the traditional political system of capitalist society. This way leads to the establishment of the political power of the working class, because such profound transformations are conceivable only under its leadership.

One can hardly accept the assertion, *Bert Ramelson* said in this connection, that no theoretical solutions for the problem of the communists' participation in bourgeois-democratic institutions with a view to achieving a non-civil-war transition to socialism have yet been found. Such solutions have been proposed. One can of course, say that they should be seen as hypotheses, which life will prove whether they are theoretically justifiable or not.

Another remark concerns the observance of the 'rules of the game'. Are these rules to be accepted if they are undemocratic? Among the 'rules of the game' in Britain in the early 70s was the rule that the right of the trade unions to strike was limited. The British workers did not play according to this rule, and got it abolished. Theoretical conceptions of the

non-civil-war transition to socialism imply that this transition is to be effected as a result of a combination of extra-parliamentary struggle with the use of constitutional forms, where extra-parliamentary struggle, and not 'rules of the game,' is crucial.

Concerning the trends toward integration with the bourgeois-democratic system, the speaker said that such a danger always exists. But one can hardly achieve anything without taking risks. Being aware of this danger, one must be able to avoid it. That is the main thing.

And the final point I want to make, Ramelson said, is that elections and mass movements must not be separated from each other. The mass struggle may reach a level when elections will lead to the winning of a majority in parliament committed to socialism. But there must be no stopping at that point, for there are the socialist transformations that need to be put through. In order to carry them through there is a need for mass struggle, mass organizations, extra-parliamentary institutions, which the working class develops in the course of this struggle. There is a need for constant pressure on the government.

Revolutionary theory, *Yuri Krasin* replied to the rejoinder, always remains open to practice. Life always poses problems which theoretical thought has to solve again and again. In this case, this is a problem with respect to which Marxists have carried on a theoretical quest on the basis of Lenin's legacy, of experience summed up by revolutionary thinking.

There is nothing wrong in saying that the acceptance of continuity signifies adoption of 'the rules of the game' of bourgeois democracy. All communists, so long as they have to act within the framework of bourgeois democracy, naturally accept the 'rules of the game' of this democracy. When the Bolsheviks went into the Duma, they acted in it on the basis of its rules and procedures. The example of struggle against the limitation of the right to strike, which was given here, refers to something else. The struggle against a particular law will be accepted also by social-reformists, if this is a norm of law which does not work any fundamental change in the existing system.

But the point at issue is another one, and it is the thesis that transition to socialism can be effected under the 'rules of the game' of bourgeois democracy. That is the thesis which the speaker questioned. The problem, he said, consists in avoiding two extremes: first, complete negation of the democratic forms won under capitalism; this extreme inevitably leads to leftist, extremist and anarchist trends. But there is another extreme. It is the extreme of gradualism, of obliteration of the crucial qualitative leap in the transition to socialism which, in effect, is called revolution. The revolution tends to dissolve in this gradualness. However gradual the transformations, whatever the extent to which the old institutions are used, there is a crucial line along this way, as has already been said, at which the full plenitude of power passes into the hands of the working class and the content of the whole of democracy is changed.

When giving the example of the struggle for the workers' democratic rights, *Bert Ramelson* remarked, I merely wanted to emphasize that it is wrong to say that, in fighting for a transformation of society without civil war, we are merely engaged in a game of constitutionalism.

Capitalism, *Peter Boychuck* said, does not in any sense tie itself down by its own laws and constitutional norms when these hamper the achievement of its class goals. As soon as the masses in the capitalist countries relax their vigilance, ever so slightly, democracy tends to be whittled down and disappears, with the ruling classes trampling rights and freedoms. At the same time, at definite stages the revolutionary process leads to a sharp class struggle which is not regulated by parliamentary rules. The success of the working class and its allies in this struggle paves the way for further democratization, all the way to socialist revolution.

It is impossible to reach socialism, *Kemal Kervan* said, without going beyond the bounds of bourgeois democracy. It is apparently possible gradually to create the conditions in which it is easier to effect the transition to socialism. All the same, in an antagonistic-class society there can be no extra-class 'consensus,' no supra-class 'democracy for all.' There inevitably comes a point at which the state set up by the bourgeoisie for totally different purposes will display its anti-popular dictatorial substance. Besides, it would be a dangerous illusion to assume that the class adversary will calmly wait until the revolutionary forces carry their endeavor to the end.

The road involving the use of peaceful methods only is not guaranteed. When the ruling class still feels secure, the use of peaceful means is apparently possible. But the farther the struggle advances, the sharper will be the response of the class adversary. Totally new conditions will emerge — not of themselves, but as a result of his acts — when both the movement will be stronger and the adversary will put up a more ruthless fight.

At any rate, *Jose Luis Malo de Molina* said, there must be a qualitative leap in the democratic struggle, because the change of the class character of the state is the key issue in all revolutions. We seek to have this leap take place without the abolition of the freedoms and institutions of representative democracy. Theoretically, one could imagine a point of no return. After the takeover of power and socialist-type transformations no possibility of going back exists or will exist. Of course, the danger of counter-revolution will remain. But everything will depend on the strength of the majority, on the mobilization of the masses for effecting the socialist process.

In Western Europe, or at any rate in Spain, he went on, the substance of bourgeois democracy is expressed above all in a limitation of the people's freedoms and potentialities.

Characterizing bourgeois democracy, *Claude Mazauric* said that this concept covers not only its

connection with the class content of the state, and he defined it as an evolutionary process, as a structure existing over a long period and reflecting the dynamics of the balance of forces, of the struggle between the masses and the ruling class, which is simultaneously subordinate to the requirements of the scientific and technical revolution within the framework of class society. In other words, from the historical standpoint, the concept of bourgeois democracy is a relative one. This approach, he said, eliminates the difficulties in understanding the meaning of our political strategy.

There is much room to criticize bourgeois democracy, *Bert Ramelson* said. But it is equally wrong that democracy in the advanced capitalist countries is really non-existent, that it is all a sham and a charade. Naturally, there are vital democratic rights that are beyond the power of capitalism to grant, like the right to work or the right to develop oneself in accordance with one's capabilities. Such democratic rights are only possible under socialism. But it should not, the speaker said, be presented, as it sometimes is, as if it is choice of economic and social rights (characteristic of socialist democracy) versus political rights (identified with capitalist democracy).

Socialist democracy has no prescribed limits of development. It does not replace 'capitalist' democracy, but builds up the working-class and democratic forces' achievements within capitalism, removes the obstacles to their development, and supplements them with those economic and social rights which capitalist society is inherently incapable of providing.

The thesis about a gradual remodelling of the whole structure of the bourgeois state through democratization, *Magsarzhavin Sanzhdorzh* said, leaves open the question of remaking the bourgeois state's class nature, of rooting out that state. Structural improvements in the bourgeois state or its democratic development do not obviate the need to negate it while retaining all the positive features. The use of bourgeois-democratic institutions for winning power should apparently not be taken to mean that bourgeois democracy could be preserved, that it could serve as an instrument for attaining socialism. No matter what form it takes, the ultimate restructuring of its class content is inevitable. At any rate, the idea of using bourgeois democracy has no universal relevance in the theoretical plane and cannot be used on a global scale in practice. This particularly applies to the developing countries. Take Mongolia, where bourgeois democracy proved to be utterly alien to the requirements of social and political progress. Mongolia oriented itself toward the socialist, rather than the bourgeois type of democracy.

Specifying the idea of the communists' participation in the bourgeois-democratic system of power, *Oiva Björkbacka* said that the Finnish communists, taking part in the government, have no illusions about there being more democracy in the country now than before, when they did not take part in the government. In one way or another, in our conditions, he said, our participation in the government creates new opportunities for struggle for the interests of the working class through pressure 'from above' within the governmental spheres. However, the realization of these opportunities depend above all on the scope, strength and organization of the working-class movement, on pressure 'from below.'

In speaking of the emergence of a new superstructure, *Jose Lava* remarked, the point is not to contrast on the 'either-or' principle the democratic processes unfolding within and outside the system of state power, but to explore their interaction.

Any transition from capitalism to socialism, however gradual, *Yuri Krasin* emphasized, cannot be conceived solely within the framework of existing state institutions. Alongside these there emerged various basic organizations which influence (in the final count decisively) the whole transition to socialism. Thus, a Jacobin Club emerged even in the course of a bourgeois revolution. Such basic organizations existed in all the socialist revolutions that have been carried out.

It is another matter that these basic organizations may be incorporated in the new system of power in different forms. The Soviet power provides a classic example of one such form. The old power was swept away and replaced by the Soviets, a totally new state institution. Today — and this idea runs from Lenin through Gramsci and others — it is possible to make broader use of existing institutions, something that has already been done in practice in a number of East European countries. It is possible, he added, that no alternative system will need to be set up if, say, the preponderance of forces in favor of the working class is such that it could transform the existing system of institutions, filling it with a new class content.

SWING TO REVOLUTIONARY TRANSFORMATIONS: PREREQUISITES, STATES, PROBLEMS

Another group of questions raised at the conference concerns the ways of creating the conditions for a swing that would carry the masses to social revolution; the complexity of the revolutionary process and the fact that it could go through several stages; the new problems facing the working-class movement, notably those connected with the interaction of the social and the scientific and technological revolution; and the importance of the socialist example for winning over the masses to the side of socialism.

Considering the prospects of the struggle for democracy in the Federal Republic of Germany, where a developed system of state-monopoly capitalism has taken shape, *Horst Wilhelms* pointed to the possibility in the immediate future of creating conditions for a swing to democratic and social progress. The tasks formulated for this period, he said, are still confined to the capitalist framework, but even within that framework their fulfillment should help to curb the power of the monopolies and so strengthen the positions of the working class and other anti-monopoly forces.

Fundamental changes will occur when this struggle leads to the establishment of an anti-monopoly democracy, which we read as a process of deep-going democratic transformations in the state apparatus and the economy.

But anti-monopoly democracy does not yet represent a new social system. In the context of present-day conditions and the class struggle in the Federal Republic, we regard it as a possible form for ushering in a revolutionary transition to the new, socialist system. Anti-monopoly democracy, Wilhelms said, will cover a whole period of revolutionary struggle, when the remaining elements of capitalism will be coupled with incipient elements of socialism.

The struggle for a swing to democratic and social progress and for anti-monopoly democracy is the most acceptable form in the Federal Republic for opening up the road to socialism. We regard anti-monopoly and socialist transformations as two interrelated stages of one and the same revolutionary process of transition from capitalism to socialism.

A different stance was taken on this question by *Jose Luis Malo de Molina*. Since the struggle for socialism, he said in a rejoinder, is an uninterrupted democratic process, we regard as meaningless the traditional analysis which mechanically divides that process into different stages: the struggle for democracy and a struggle for its further strengthening, for anti-monopoly transformations.

One of the major problems of the revolutionary movement in Greece, *Dimitris Tsaras* said, is to determine the stages of the revolutionary process. We think that a coherent revolutionary process will consist of two closely interrelated stages. At the first of these an anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist democracy, a people's democracy will be attained. Its chief content will be to abolish our country's dependence on imperialism, to eliminate the power of local and foreign monopolies, and to democratize social life. At the second stage, the transition to socialism will be effected as the people's democracy develops into a socialist democracy. The latter, he said, will be a power which the classics of Marxism-Leninism called the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The power of the monopolies stands in the way of democratic reforms. The struggle for genuine democracy does not end with an extension of the democratic gains within the framework of the bourgeois state, but is bound to entail a struggle for the overthrow of the power of the monopolies, for the establishment of an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly power. Touching on the forms of revolutionary struggle, the speaker emphasized that if the monopoly oligarchy, the imperialist forces resort to violence, we should be prepared, both ideologically and politically, to follow the non-peaceful road. We, he said, reject the view that the non-peaceful road is anti-democratic. This view is based on bourgeois-democratic criteria according to which democratic methods are only those which are acceptable to the bourgeoisie.

Speaking of the ideological prerequisites for elaborating the problems of transition to socialism in this country, *Antonio Jannazzo* pointed out that Italian Marxism has in the course of history come to regard socialism as a challenge; not as a static model that has been established once and for all, but as an intensive quest aimed at creating a City of Man, where the individual would be able to develop all his abilities. This notion is closely tied in with the present historical stage, when there is a danger of the classes destroying each other in their struggle, and of socio-economic regress. This calls for great revolutionary will and induces this will to manifest itself in the intricate mechanism of civilian society, in hard day-to-day battles, which Jannazzo said, are less emotive than the storming of the Winter Palace but are equally important.

The dynamic nature of Italian socialism and its quest for a 'third road' that would bypass the negative experience of the social-democratic parties, which have been unable to transform the capitalist system on revolutionary lines, he said, are due to an awareness that one has to work in the most diverse conditions.

Socialism should not succumb to the temptation of enshrining existing realities, such as they are, but should help to generate in the most intricate labyrinths of the crisis of capitalist rationality viable forces conveying new values: to develop the personality of a new-type of socially-minded worker, whose activity is not confined to the traditional framework of an industrial enterprise, but also manifests itself in the sphere of skilled social services based on the latest technological achievements, and also to develop the democratically-minded middle classes, which under socialism will grasp the meaning of socially useful instead of parasitic labor.

A solution of these problems will make it possible to prevent the classes from destroying each other in their struggle, to avert the danger of dead-end 'passive' revolutions, against which Gramsci had warned the revolutionary forces, revolutions that fail to complete the transformations they have begun and stop half-way; this phenomenon, if I am not mistaken, Jannazzo said, is evident in the countries of existing socialism. Marxism, he went on, should take a more critical view of itself and become a science that would not claim to rationalize the whole of reality or bend the latter to its demands, but should, on the contrary, recognize and make allowances for factors of spontaneity. Gramsci said that the party uses Marxism as a faultless method, as a precision instrument for exploring the future, for prognosticating, controlling and, consequently mastering major events.

But even if this was a correct method, historical Leninism, Jannazzo said, failed to spread in the West as a mobile war. Gramsci offered the conclusion that revolution in the West was a protracted process which had to be effected by consensus, without resorting to methods of mass terrorism, but by gradually winning over the numerous bastions, institutions and social forces making up the structure of civilian society.

He went on to explain the meaning of the defense

of democracy, primarily the meaning which the battle for democracy now acquires. This needs to be specified, for the word 'defense' could create the impression that it is a matter of immutable values belonging to the past (that is, the 'bourgeois' world), whereas the task is to fight for those democratic values that could be forfeited or less than fully realized. Communism that keeps pace with the modern productive forces can develop only in the framework of a conception of democracy which can harmonize social development with economic development, the growing independence of social organizations with prompt and effective decision-making, economic efficiency with effective administration and democracy.

The scientific and technological revolution without effective democracy, Jannazzo concluded, remains an oligarchic phenomenon, which can never ensure the full development of the social productive forces and, consequently, is bound to lead in social relations to a catastrophic balance between the classes, which could easily give rise to new dictatorial regimes. Only democracy can provide the measure and quality of the new requirements and help to gear the production apparatus to these requirements.

Other views were expressed on the general theoretical questions raised by A. Jannazzo.

The 'third road', *Essop Pahad* said, is in the main projected in Western Europe. Meanwhile, the countries of that region differ markedly from one another, and this, as we know, is reflected in the conception of the diversity of the ways of transition to socialism. Of course, some features intrinsic to developed capitalism are common to all these countries. But on this basis, South Africa, to say nothing of the USA, Canada and other countries, could be ranked together with the West European countries. But in South Africa there is a different approach to the solution of the problems of the advance to socialism.

The social democrats, in speaking of the applicability of their ideas (realized in a number of European countries) to the conditions obtaining in the Third World, also recommended a 'third road' for this World. Of course, that is something different, Pahad said. But what is the point of suggesting yet another 'third road?'

It was mentioned here, *Alexander Sobolev* said, that the storming of winter palaces is a thing of the past. Perhaps, nowadays it will no longer be necessary to storm the Bourbon, the Buckingham, the Quirinal or other 'winter palaces.' But isn't it too early to regard this as a general rule applicable in any situation? How is one to parry the blows that state-monopoly capitalism is already prepared to strike and does strike at any forces that are really striving towards socialism?

In my opinion, *Girgin Girginov* said, 'Italian Marxism' is a metaphorical turn of phrase no different from, say, 'Bulgarian mathematics.' Science, including Marxism, should not be interpreted in the spirit of national pluralism. Marxism has long since become a sicence, an essentially critical and self-critical science, which does not claim to 'rationalize the whole of reality' or 'bend' that reality to its postulates, but seeks to understand social life and change it for the working people's benefit.

Marxist scientists in the socialist countries do not make a cult of the realities existing in these countries. We, he went on, do not realize or regard as complete the socialist society that our peoples have built, but formulate and tackle the tasks of its further advance toward communism. In this sense, from the standpoint of developed socialism, the ongoing transformations have naturally still to be brought to completion, and this will take time. But is it right to talk about stopping half-way solely because the whole road to communism has not yet been travelled?

Marx's teaching that revolutions have sometimes to halt in their advance, *Yuri Krasin* said, was already confirmed in his lifetime. He referred to the Paris Commune. Then came the revolution of 1905, which was defeated, but from it due lessons were learned. Present-day reality provides similar examples. Take, for instance, the experience of the revolution and counter-revolution in Chile. But this idea, if one is to follow the historical principle, does not apply to developed socialism, which is tackling the creative tasks of building a new society. It also has its own problems, but these are being solved from phase to phase. Nowhere does socialist society stop half-way, the speaker emphasized.

As for the assertion that 'historical Leninism' failed to spread the mobile war to the West, the point to note here is, first, that it is not clear what is meant by this term and, second, that Leninism has never aimed at such a goal. The speaker recalled Lenin's well-known polemic with Terracini at the Third Congress of the Comintern, where Lenin came out against such leftist attitudes advocated, in particular, by some representatives of the young Italian Communist Party, A. Bordiga above all. Lenin urged the Italian revolution to look for its own ways instead of mechanically copying Russia's experience.

In the matter of the historical relevance of Leninism in the broad sense of the word, Krasin went on, the road for which the West European communists, notably, the Italian communists, are now looking, has its own roots. I say nothing about Marx and Engels, who put forward the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the strength of the conditions in the West rather than in Russia. The origins of this road are also to be found in Lenin's legacy. In elaborating his conception Antonio Gramsci directly referred to Lenin.

One view on the socialist example in the class struggle of the working people was expressed by *Oiva Björkbacka*. There is an evident need for profound democratic changes in the production structure and the political system of capitalist society in order to open up the road to socialism he said. But here we face many problems. One of these relates to the fact that socialism not only provides a theoretical and political-program alternative to capitalism, but has for a long time now existed as a social

system, in the true sense of the word, which is necessarily an object of our critical examination.

Socialism undoubtedly represents a vast and progressive stride forward, Björkbacka emphasized. At the same time, a number of socialist countries, in spite of high development rates, have still to attain the level of the more advanced capitalist countries in per capita national income. Simultaneously, the working-class struggle in many advanced capitalist countries has made it possible markedly to improve the social-security system and raise living standards in these countries. Of course, the threat of unemployment in capitalist society constantly gives people a sense of insecurity. But we cannot hope to win over to our side the bulk of the workers solely by referring to this fact alone or, incidentally, also to the hardships borne by some sections of the working people, the speaker said. The working-class movement has now put forward broader and more fundamental demands, calling for employment guarantees, for a higher quality of life, for healthy and modern working and living conditions, protection of the environment, improvements in the education system and so on. There is a need, he believed, to show in concrete terms the answers that socialist society could provide to the new problems facing the working people in the developed capitalist countries.

The socialist countries are setting an example for the working masses in the developed capitalist countries, who are looking for answers to pressing social problems, to questions concerning the development of democracy. What, in that case, it is sometimes asked, prevents the masses in a capitalist country from going over to socialism? In Finland, at any rate, *Björkbacka* said, this could hardly be attributed solely to the bourgeoisie's complete control of the mass media and ideological influence.

The results that the workers in the capitalist countries have achieved in their struggle have a value of their own which is independent of the capitalist social system. Naturally, in going over to socialism, the workers want to maintain and extend their rights. But how is this to be done? We are expected to provide an answer to this question. And here we have to put in a great effort: to explain all the concrete manifestations of socialist democracy and the concrete historical conditions of socialist construction in each country. We have been studying the experience of the socialist countries. Björkbacka said, and on the strength of our analysis of the conditions in Finland, we have come to the conclusion that it should not be copied mechanically.

Different standpoints on the road to socialism, *Sarada Mitra* said, are only natural, for general uniformities are refracted through national specifics. And since there are different points of view, discussions and criticism are also natural. But not all criticism is constructive.

He showed the harm of criticism that goes beyond the constructive framework and coalesces with our adversaries' attempts to denigrate the experience of existing socialism. Such criticism, he said, creates serious obstacles for the struggle for socialism in non-socialist countries. After all, the example of existing socialism is a powerful instrument the communists use in the fight for the masses.

Existing socialism, Mitra went on, is sometimes criticized on the strength of notions about the kind of socialist society the critics would like to see in their own country. An 'ideal model' of 'desirable socialism' is first put forward, and this is then compared with the actually existing socialist society, but not for the purpose of taking into account the available experience. No, the demand here is that reality should correspond to the 'model,' because, the argument runs, it would then be easier to uphold and substantiate this 'model' in the fight against the opponents of socialism. Isn't that doing violence to the natural-historical process of socialist development? What then are we to do with each nation's right to choose its own way to socialism on the basis of the general uniformities of social development with scrupulous consideration of its specific features?

Another puzzling question, the speaker said, is that of justifying phenomena which someone does not like. Reality needs to be understood and explained. It needs no justification. Those who try to judge the socialist reality, he said, should be asked: what is the standpoint for your judgment, the positions of which class? Who benefits from your judgment?

An analysis of phenomena in a 'pure form,' from the standpoint of an ideal, *Ivan Frolov* said, could, of course, be a necessary component in the development of scientific thought and elaboration of some conceptions. But this should not clash with the actual processes, the actual factors and mechanisms by means of which revolution is united with democracy, notably in the economic, social and ideological sphere, which have been historically realized in the socialist countries. It is clear to everyone that the results we now have are a derivative of the interaction of theory with vibrant life. It is absurd to raise the question of a reverse movement, of re-establishing something that from someone's standpoint had been missed in our revolution. It is generally absurd to moralize over the actual historical process which has taken place. It has to be understood, and it has to be made an element of our common experience.

We in our country, Frolov emphasized, are building a communist society as a new phase in the development of socialism. By setting this goal and advancing toward it, we take a self-critical attitude to every given stage of our development, including the development of democracy. At the same time, it should be emphasized that for the time being there is no fuller democracy than socialist democracy.

Analyzing the dialectical interconnection of revolution and democracy it is worthwhile to lay greater emphasis on the fact that revolution is not a one-shot effort, but a process ranging over a whole historical epoch of development in this or that country or group of countries. That is why the con-

clusions based only on an analysis of a given segment of this lengthy process are not always well grounded. Of course, no one makes anyone travel along the way that has been paved. Everything naturally depends on the choice that is made. But all reasoning about the way of revolution in interaction with democracy should range over the broader reality, which, strictly speaking, exists in life.

The historical process, I would say, is never rigidly determined and is never reduced to any simple relationship. It exists as a multi-variant process. Viewing the problem of revolution and democracy from that angle, Frolov said, we in our analysis should also reckon with the different phenomena instead of taking only one variant. There is, for instance, the variant that occurs when the bourgeoisie tries to jettison all democracy when it feels revolution is imminent. Furthermore, we also find another attempt: to carry out a socialist revolution and socialist construction outside democracy. Another variant is the 'absolute' (in the bourgeois-democratic sense) democracy without revolution. That is what the social democrats are talking about.

Finally, the stand which was brought out here, is the unity, the identity of revolution and democracy.

The speaker then drew attention to the growing role of complex phenomena called the scientific and technological revolution in the contemporary mechanisms by means of which the social revolution is meshed with the progress of society. Without taking these fundamental processes into account it is now hard to make a political and social analysis of the development of the revolution in the conditions of democracy.

Fundamental changes are taking place in the working class in many instances under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution. The importance of intellectual elements in production tends to increase, and this is accordingly reflected in our notion of the future development of revolution and democracy. In the speaker's view, even the character of the concept of the 'possession of power' tends to change in some respects. There arises the problem of bringing together the broad participation of the masses in the running of the state and social affairs with the increasing transformation of management into a science and profession, he said. How does this relate with the ever broader mechanisms in the development of democracy? What in these conditions is the role of the working class? We know that the scope of its social action and its social importance tend to grow. What is the relation of this role and the traditional property relations generally and, accordingly, power relations with the relations of possession of knowledge as some kind of new and in many instances highly formidable material force? This question requires concrete research, and on it largely depends the answer to the more general question of revolution and democracy in a society changing under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution.

The scientific and technological revolution is already a reality even in countries where the socialist revolution remains a prospect. This also poses the social revolution with many new non-classical problems which now have a basic role to play because science and technology have made a reality of the revolution above all in the sphere of production. They also bear on the social sphere. This produces the illusion that perhaps the scientific and technological revolution obviates the need for a social revolution.

These new problems are not invented. We are perhaps more inclined to underestimate them than to include them in our analysis of the trends in the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society, Frolov emphasized. We have still done little to explain socialism under the scientific and technological revolution, the alliance of science and democracy. Marxism is open to these problems, and in many instances the traditions and also the priority in their scientific study are on its side.

(To be continued)

Mankind's prospects and science

Under this heading *WMR* will cover an important subject claiming the attention of the communists and progressive opinion generally, namely, the impact of science on contemporary history. The editors have asked eminent scientists of various countries to comment on a wide range of problems relating to the concrete historical content of the current scientific and technological revolution, the manifold aspects of its impact on people's living conditions, social processes, development trends and prospects, and international relations. Considerable space will also be given to the problem of using the achievements of science and technology for humane purposes, controlling the scientific and technological revolution in the interests of social progress, and eliminating the dangerous imbalances in scientific and technological development under capitalism. The *WMR* Commission on General Theoretical Problems, which has raised a number of questions for discussion, regards publication of the answers to them as a step toward a round-table meeting of scientists planned by it. The exchange of views on the subject is open to all, and the editors hope readers will contribute.

The following answers were sent to *WMR* by Joao F. da Costa and Günter Kröber.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN TACKLING GLOBAL PROBLEMS

Joao F. da Costa
Secretary-General, UNCSTD

Q. How would you assess the present potentialities of science and technology for solving primary materials, ecological, energy, food and other global problems?

A. Trends and perspectives in the development of science and technology and their possible impact on the solution of contemporary global issues will be very important topics of the deliberations at the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development in Vienna, August 20-31, 1979. The importance of such deliberations cannot be overestimated due to the fact that quite a number of global problems facing mankind have become so acute and pressing in the contemporary world that their solution cannot be avoided or postponed. Special attention in the debate will be paid to questions connected with the role, methods and contribution of science and technology to the solution of global problems. Science and technology have an especially great role to play in the search for ways and means of resolving global problems. An important aspect of such a search is the definition of the scientific and technological potential needed for the solution of these problems.

In attempts to evaluate the possible contribution of science and technology to the solution of global problems, it will be appropriate to start from the premise that the major impediments to development are mainly political and social rather than scientific and technological. Realistically assessing the situation shaping up in the world on the threshold of the 21st century, it is necessary to state that the solution of global problems depends not on scientists alone but on the political will of governments and countries, and their concerted actions at various forums at all levels. And more than that, the solution of global problems, or at least a reduction of their acuteness and possible negative consequences, is an essential part of any program of social and economic development in the world as a whole and the developing countries in particular. Science and technology are but tools to achieve certain objectives of socio-economic development.

At present, two distinct sets of global problems are gaining momentum. First, there is the wide range of issues related to the reshaping of international relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence, including the prevention of a nuclear war and a scaling down of the arms race, a restructuring of world economic relations on just and democratic principles, and the eradication of poverty and underdevelopment. The other is the complex set of issues concerning optimization of man-nature interaction, satisfaction of the growing demand on the part of the increasing world population in the conditions of a greater human impact on its natural habitat. The list of this second set of global issues varies according to different points of view but includes permanently: population, food, energy, natural resources, environment, health, etc. These problems are of special interest as the role of science and technology in their identification and solution is particularly important.

Science and technology have achieved a qualitatively new stage in their development. That is why there is every justification for speaking about a new phase of the scientific and technological revolution. More than that, this revolution will undoubtedly have much more impact on the destinies of mankind than earlier upheavals in science and technology. Therefore, it is feasible with the help of science and technology to resolve any of the above-mentioned problems now or in the near future. Just one example might illustrate this statement. The latest achievements in nuclear energy research (fusion) promise to supply humanity in the near future with practically unlimited energy. The solution of the energy problem will undoubtedly help to resolve many other global problems. For instance, it is well known that additional energy consumption could make less pressing, if not solve entirely, problems such as primary materials, food and water, to mention a few.

However, it is very hard to assess future trends of basic and applied sciences and their likely impact on the solution of global problems. First of all, to our regret our awareness of the nature and scale of a number of global problems is meager. Nor do we know the existing and potential capabilities of science and technology in the solution of generally acknowledged global problems. For some problems, due to the lack of requisite data and observation, we need detailed and specific analyses in order to formulate the issues correctly and find scientifically valid means of their solution.

We do not seem to realize clearly enough how much the different sciences can contribute to solving global problems; neither have we any idea of the extent to which each global problem can be solved by research in various fields conducted by different countries. In the majority of cases, the problem is not only and not so much in the technical aspects of implementation as in the complicated social and economic tasks. In order to handle key global issues, one has to take socio-economic and natural conditions into account. Global problems thus require greater efforts on the national level and a more responsible attitude on the part of governments to the need to consider these problems at an international level. Consequently, solution of global problems implies integration of national and international efforts. Global problems will urge a reconception of long-established categories and press for a sharp turn in some deep-rooted trends of socio-economic development.

Q. What new methods could the development of science and technology over the next two decades yield for the solution of global problems?

A. New technologies and processes which might be developed by science over the next two decades will undoubtedly allow making greater use of different kinds of resources and considerably reducing production waste, thus tremendously enhancing

the effectiveness of human activities. The future powerful potential of science, its capacity to elaborate new ways and means of resolving extremely complicated socio-economic problems, underscores the desirability of a comprehensive interdisciplinary system approach to the choice of options and optimal decisions. This approach requires comprehensive treatment, which takes the entire spectrum of socio-economic factors into consideration. In this connection, global modelling might be regarded as an especially important instrument of research. Global modelling now plays an increasingly positive role. The scientific and technological revolution highlights the need for a more explicit and scientifically substantiated projection of likely long-term human development trends. Global modelling even now helps to understand new processes and problems and their interrelations. In turn, it demands a new and adequate methodology for analyzing available alternatives.

Q. What is the role of international scientific and technological cooperation in solving global problems?

A. A characteristic of these problems, which are partly a product of socio-economic development and the current scientific and technological revolution, is that because they are complex and interdependent, they cannot be solved by one or a few countries. Their solution requires considerable financial, material and manpower resources and the massive application of the latest advances of science and technology. They cannot be tackled successfully without worldwide coordinated efforts of all countries at different levels. That is why it is vital to promote broad and long-term cooperation between countries with different socio-economic systems. Such cooperation on democratic and just principles as embodied in the conception of the new international economic order might be a significant lever for accelerating the socio-economic progress of all countries.

However, the global character of the problems we are discussing does not mean that their solution depends on the creation of new international bodies or agencies. The main emphasis should be placed on national activities, which have to be coordinated and geared to a common understanding and a common effort. There is an urgent need for a new concept of international cooperation in science and technology calling for close interaction between national institutions, international agencies and non-governmental organizations representing the world scientific community. Such cooperation could take the form of many-sided contacts, information exchanges, coordination of research planning and implementation, financing and so forth.

To sum up, any program of international cooperation in global problems must be based on national programs and incorporated in relevant comprehensive national programs of socio-economic development. International action should be aimed primarily at reinforcing the efforts and capacities of individual countries to resolve global problems or to contribute to their solution. But this approach requires new, more effective forms and methods of international cooperation and should take into account the need for the most efficient use of available resources and institutions, both national and international.

In this connection, it is important that there should be a dialogue between scientists working in different fields and in different countries. For this numerous forums must be organized for the discussion of global problems and there must be an international coordinating body. Special attention should also be given to applied research in this field.

It is of primary importance to define the main areas of international collaboration. Global problems should be constantly kept under close observation in order to record the emergence of new problems or of unknown aspects of old ones, and to determine their urgency and dynamics. Particular attention should be paid to the interaction of global problems and to the harmonization of the measures for their solution.

Another important area of international cooperation is the entire spectrum of methodological problems related to the analysis and elaboration of possible solutions of global problems. The fact that they are new demands a new and adequate methodology for analyzing existing alternatives and for subsequent decision-making.

Q. How would you describe the prospects and possible ways of using scientific and technological achievements for peaceful purposes?

A. It would be quite aimless to deal with man-nature issues if destructive forces were allowed to jeopardize any attempt to solve them. On the other hand, the diversion of enormous resources to the arms race and the employment of a very high proportion of scientists in research for military purposes are obstacles to any serious attempt to tackle global problems on the necessary critical scale. Moreover, international cooperation can broaden only in an atmosphere of relaxation of political tensions and introduction of more just, democratic principles in international relations.

Nowadays, when contacts between peoples and countries have assumed unprecedented scope and diversity, when between countries or groups of countries there are many points of contradiction and tension, normalization of international relations as such is the most important global problem and simultaneously an indispensable condition for solving all other global problems. In this context, it is vitally important to end the arms race and establish a stable process of disarmament. Without this the losses in terms of both manpower and resources will grow without let-up and it will become even more difficult to tackle global problems.

This restructuring of international political relations can only go hand in hand with an intensive effort to eradicate poverty and underdevelopment and to restructure international economic relations on a basis of equality and mutual benefit. The problems of mass poverty, underdevelopment and dependence are the immediate concern of three-

fourths of the world's population and are a most urgent world issue. It would be entirely unrealistic to try to harness science and technology to confront global issues while ignoring the poverty and underdevelopment existing in the world.

From the aforesaid it is quite clear that global problems demand better political and economic relations in the world and broader scientific, technical and other forms of cooperation among all countries.

Experience demonstrates that science can be used to benefit or harm humankind. Consequently, the social-humanistic orientation of science, and moral and ethical imperatives are acquiring growing significance. Scientists bear a special responsibility to make sure that the potentials of science and its achievements are used for mankind's benefit. It is, therefore, the duty of all scientists, particularly those in industrially advanced countries where the cumulative technico-scientific potential is many times higher than in the developing countries, to facilitate the use of scientific and technological achievements for the advancement of the peoples of these countries.

Science and technology can be increasingly involved in the solution of global problems only if this involvement is accompanied by radical internal reforms at national levels with the purpose of solving socio-economic problems. In this connection, I would like to emphasize that the socio-economic aspects of global problems merit a more detailed, closer study.

The last but not least condition for the successful solution of global problems with the aid of science and technology is that there must be an effective mechanism for applying their achievements. The programs for these purposes should provide for the active participation of scientists and non-governmental organizations at national, regional, inter-regional and global levels. Programs of international cooperation in science and technology should be included in national programs of socio-economic development and become a subject of inter-governmental bilateral and multilateral negotiations. It must be noted that the existing structures of the United Nations systems should be improved accordingly and adapted to meet the challenge of using science and technology to promote mankind's socio-economic progress.

THE SOCIAL AND HUMANIST ORIENTATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

Professor *Günther Kröber*, D.Ph.
Director, Institute of the Theory, History and Organization of Science, Academy of Sciences of the GDR

Q. How would you assess the social and humanist orientation of scientific and technological progress? Why does it in some cases have effects that are undesirable or even dangerous to mankind?

A. As far as man, his natural and social environment and his material and cultural world are concerned the effects of scientific and technological progress are manifold. They comprise both desirable results, such as growing labor productivity and hence growing social prosperity, and undesirable results imperilling social progress and the very existence of mankind. I wish to stress that the point at issue is something more than the effects of scientific and technological progress. The problems that crop up in this sphere are due in equal measure to the development of science and technology and to the prerequisites of this development.

These problems are largely identical in developed capitalist and in socialist countries. Energy, primary materials and the environment are only some of them. It is sometimes argued, therefore, that because the problems are similar they do not depend on the nature of the social system. But similarity alone does not warrant such a conclusion.

In regard to science and the utilization of its achievements, the development of capitalism has over the centuries established traditions that it has been impossible in several decades of socialist development to replace entirely by new ones where this would have been necessary and useful to social progress. The scientific and political task of combining achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system was not set until the early 1970s. An important historic problem which the socialist countries have begun to work on is to devise new forms of combining science with production that would meet the requirements of socialism.

The bourgeois thesis that 'scientific civilization' is socially neutral obscures the fact that most of today's science, above all natural science, took shape in an antagonistic class society. The 'ecological dysfunction' of scientific and technological progress (that is, its negative impact on the environment), a favorite example cited when speaking of problems alleged to be independent of the social system, is actually not a mere effect of this progress. Indeed, science's ability to evolve ways of improving the global ecological situation is as inexhaustible as its ability to indicate new ways of exploring nature. However, science materializes its ability to foster unlimited social progress only when the social conditions are favorable.

Social relations, refracted in economic, political and military objectives, may also hamper the materialization of science's potentialities or block them altogether. They may hamper these potentialities when, for instance, immense funds that could be used for the acquisition of knowledge are spent on the arms race. Or they may block them when, for instance, on the advice of their experts the monopolies restrict or even discontinue research into this or that field.

Socialist economic relations induce those who decide on the objectives and methods of current economic activity to take account of long-range and global requirements. What often came to the fore in the initial period of socialism was the need to solve acute social and economic problems without delay,

especially where a bitter class struggle was going on against capitalism. As a result, the corresponding measures do not ensure an ecological optimum. However, it is a characteristic and an advantage of socialist relations of production that under socialism economic growth leads directly to greater opportunities for long-term action and for steadily narrowing the gap between society's short, medium and long-term interests. Apart from difficulties due to insufficient knowledge, the ecological dysfunction of scientific and technological progress in socialist countries is not a product of economic growth but of inadequate economic development. This discrepancy diminishes as the economy advances.

Q. Would you say a few words about conditions under which scientific and technological progress could be channelled for the benefit of mankind?

A. Control of scientific and technological progress depends essentially on whether it can be pursued as part of an overall social policy serving the people's vital interests and meeting the development requirements of society as a whole. What I mean is the following:

First, scientific and technological progress is always part of the movement of the aggregate productive forces of society. The only way to harness it is, therefore, to understand the objective laws governing the development of these aggregate productive forces and channel them in accordance with cognized laws. This, in turn, calls for common interests, for an aggregate social will based on public property in the basic means of production. Once this condition is there the process of history and, along with it, scientific and technological progress can be controlled. The possibility is thereby opened for controlling not only individual acts of scientific endeavor but science as a whole, including its social preconditions and effects.

A second vital condition for controlling scientific and technological progress is that the laws governing the development of science itself must be understood. Both the socialist and the capitalist countries have only just taken the initial steps in that direction. Scientific progress did not become an object of sustained research until a few decades ago, and our knowledge of it is still very scanty. This is a clear indication of the magnitude of the task. Scientific and technological progress is still planned largely on the strength of empirical estimations of its trends and of relatively short-term forecasts. It seems to me that in the case of socialism a greater promise is held out by the attempts to work out alternative strategies of scientific and technological progress according to a system of values centered on the people's vital interest and the interest of society's advancement.

Lastly, the third condition is that humanist principles must underlie the promotion of science. If scientific and technological progress is to further rather than run counter to social progress, scientific development should not be based on purely rationalist criteria, let alone on capitalist profit. Of course, economic rationality, too, may serve as a criterion of scientific and technological progress but then it must be oriented on humanist goals, namely, improving the people's life by raising their material and cultural standards. This interconnection, which serves a definite purpose, is to be observed in socialist society. At the same time, economic rationality, which takes account of the requirements of scientific and technological progress, is an important condition for a social policy founded on humanist principles. This is why the occasional demand that scientific and technological progress should be stopped is contrary to both social progress and humanism.

As we see it, the problem we are discussing can be solved not by stopping scientific and technological progress, for that would be unrealistic, but by orienting it on goals meeting society's social needs. The fact that resources are always limited necessitates a system of priorities of possible trends of development in science and technology. Preference should be given to research likely to improve the people's condition in key quarters. This implies, first of all, working conditions and labor productivity (including energy, primary materials, new materials, automation and other problems) and, furthermore, the need to meet the people's material and cultural requirements, the problem of medical care and the environment.

Many of these problems can only be solved through international cooperation. The potentialities of scientific and technological progress would unquestionably be used to greater advantage if peaceful coexistence were consolidated and political détente extended to the military field. Since 1945, roughly 40 per cent of the world's appropriations for research and development have been used for military purposes, according to UN statistics. In 1976 alone, this spending exceeded $350,000 million.

Disarmament would preclude the particularly alarming possibility of scientific and technological achievements being used for destructive ends. It would release substantial funds which could help facilitate choosing preferable lines of scientific and technological progress, a problem arising from the scarcity of resources. We could also hasten scientific progress on lines that would not alienate it from mankind as a potentially destructive force but increasingly make it a direct productive force. This would open up new opportunities for intensive extended reproduction of the potential of scientific and technological progress itself.

The monopolies and the power structure in Latin America

Hugo Fazio
CC member, Communist Party of Chile
Arsenio Hernandez Fortuna
CC member, Dominican Communist Party

The growing concentration of production and centralization of capital are one of the noteworthy features of socio-economic development in Latin America today. This has resulted in an upgrading of monopolization in the economy, a process which has spread practically to all spheres — those that are more dynamic and those regarded as traditional. This process retains its impact at a time of economic growth and, still more, in periods of depression.

According to the UN Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), in the manufacturing industry, which is 'characterized by most intensive growth, large-scale production and monopolistic tendencies have resulted in a great concentration of property.' But 'the tendency toward concentration has evidently spread to the traditionally dispersed sectors, for instance, the distributive industry.'[1]

We believe that the basic features of Latin America's capitalist development can best be determined by studying such tendencies. In analyzing these features one should not proceed solely, as is done by some researchers, from the fact that there are both imperialist and dependent countries. This all too general demarcation leads, in our view, to an oversimplified approach to the main problems, namely, the problems of dependence. Nor does it allow studying the specific forms of capitalism's present evolution in the region and concentrating on the specifics of each individual country. Furthermore, this approach excludes the possibility of identifying new forms of imperialist domination, which has become a major component of power in many countries of the continent (mainly due to the strengthening of its positions in the peripheral economy).

Latin America is not a single whole as regards its prospects. This is accounted for, above all, by the uneven development inherent in the capitalist system. Lenin wrote that 'the *even* development of different undertakings, trusts, branches of industry, or countries is impossible under capitalism' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 295). This doubtlessly applies both to imperialist and to dependent countries and is therefore applicable whenever we speak about the Third World or a situation in any specific zone.

More than 60 years ago Lenin wrote: 'Not only the two main groups of countries, those owning colonies, and the colonies themselves, but also the diverse forms of dependent countries which, politically, are formally independent, but in fact, are enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence, are typical of this epoch' (Vol. 22, p. 263). He cited the example of South American countries, in particular Argentina, which in the early 20th century had the highest industrial level in the region.

In most Latin American countries capitalist development commenced when they were dependent, and they still remain as such. Objective reality has left its imprint on the form acquired by the monopolization process there. The concentration of capital and its product — the monopolies — have not come about as a result of free capitalist competition, which has so far failed to gain full scope for development. At the initial stage, when capitalism in the continent was in its incipient phase, this process was brought in mainly from the outside. Since then, imperialist capital has been dominating the key sectors of the Latin American economy. By the start of this century it was in control of its vital centers: the railways, mines, meat-packing plants, grain elevators, sugar refineries, plantations and the finance apparatus. 'This control increased with time, the chief role here being played by U.S. capital which gave preference to the Caribbean zone (above all Cuba and Venezuela), Central America, Mexico, and in the extreme south, to Chile.'[2]

This explains why monopolies began to be formed in the continent under conditions of dependence and coexistence with latifundism and numerous pre-capitalist forms of exploitation. Imperialist domination deformed the entire economic structure, creating increasingly more glaring imbalances between various sectors of production, giving impetus to the numerical growth of enterprises oriented on the export of primary materials, and causing the degeneration of industries working for the local market and, still worse, those that facilitate independent development.

In the first half of the 20th century, foreign capital was concentrated primarily in industries producing primary materials for export, which ensured quick profits. This situation slowed down the formation of local capital, while imperialist domina-

---

We continue our coverage of the international exchange of opinion, held in Prague, on a major aspect of the theoretical and practical struggle by revolutionary forces in Latin America — the level of the productive forces and relations of production in the region and the specifics of capitalist society there (see *WMR*, June 1979).

tion in the most dynamic areas of the economy resulted in a considerable and incessant drain of financial resources, which hits hard at the already limited source of domestic accumulations. The continuing outflow in interest and profit alone reached $9,700 million in 1978.[3]

After the Second World War, when most Latin American governments realized the need for import-substitution and took urgent measures to speed up industrialization, foreign capital infiltrated into many sectors of the economy so that in many cases goods previously imported were now produced by subsidiaries of the monopolies operating in the region. The position of Latin America in the international capitalist division of labor was changing. Foreign capital penetrated the entire economy, although it concentrated on the most promising sectors of the manufacturing industry.

During the decade of 1960-1970 this reshaped the sectoral structure of investment, which enabled foreign capital to enter new sectors and assume control over them. In 1960 the largest U.S. investments in Latin America were in oil ($3,100 million) and mining ($1,300 million). But the situation had changed abruptly toward 1969: in the manufacturing and the services industries investments totalled $4,300 million and $3,800 million respectively, exceeding the investments in oil and mining, where their level remained unaltered.[4] This tendency has grown more perceptible in the current decade.

The relations between Latin America and the imperialist states are now increasingly influenced by the global processes of internationalization and monopolization of the economy in the capitalist world. Investments are made in the continent mainly by the most powerful multinational corporations. The export of capital is being stepped up, particularly by the leading monopoly groups, which, naturally, induces them to intensify their activity in the continent and, as a consequence, gives them greater leverage in every sphere of life of the Latin American states and control of a number of key industries.

Despite domination by foreign capital, the development of capitalism in Latin America witnessed the appearance of local monopolies, particularly in industries that for some reason had been untouched by the multinationals.

The role of the state has been steadily on the upgrade, which has led to the building of large state-run enterprises and facilitated the emergence of local private monopolies. This role of the state does not always remain immutable. At times it may be positive and, therefore, progressive. But on the whole, as monopoly capital, foreign or local, grows stronger, the state begins to cater to it in the long run. In the most developed countries it has become an element of a new system of domination having, as Lenin noted when he analyzed similar phenomena, 'the beginnings of state-controlled capitalist production, combining the colossal power of capitalism with the colossal power of the state into a single mechanism' (Vol. 24, p. 403).

Big state-owned enterprises are created in industries where production problems have grown to proportions that cannot be handled by local private capital. Also, these enterprises spring up as a result of the people's struggle for the nationalization of foreign companies, chiefly those pillaging their natural wealth.

At the same time, yielding to the pressure of entrepreneurs, the state brings under its stewardship low-profit private enterprises, in which neither foreign nor local monopolies show an interest. This channel is often used for pumping resources into the private sector by means of tariff or price cuts or by developing the infrastructure on the insistence of monopoly groups.

Local private monopolies appear within the framework of the above-mentioned tendency before the enterprises under their control reach a high level of labor productivity and technical equipment, as normally happens during the concentration process in industrialized capitalist countries. The appearance of these monopolies is due to the most diverse reasons. In come of the countries this happens when the agricultural oligarchy extends its range of activity; in others, it is due to protectionism and stimulation by the state. In many cases, local monopolies are from the outset closely linked to multinationals, for the latter promote their growth in keeping with far-reaching plans for strengthening their own positions.

In the economic life of some Latin American countries the significance of the local monopolies is very great indeed. Their influence and power should not be underrated on grounds of dependence. Their power cannot be estimated simply by comparing it with the power of the multinationals. Their role should be viewed against the background of concrete reality. This is the only angle from which many of the processes going on in the continent today can be understood.

In Brazil (according to an annual report published by the *Vizao* magazine) in 1974 48 per cent of the businesses with assets exceeding $1,200,000 belonged to local private capital, 39.5 per cent to the state, and 12.5 per cent to foreign monopolies.

In Mexico, more than half of the 500 biggest private enterprises are controlled by local capital. Entire industries are influenced by them. 'Mexican finance capital,' writes Enrique Semo, a leading Mexican economist, 'has reached a high level. It is backed by powerful groups operating in the most diverse industries with a typically monopolistic structure.'[5]

A study of 100 of the biggest (non-finance) enterprises in Chile has shown that in 1978, 27 were controlled by multinationals, 23 were run by the state, and 50 belonged to local capital represented by the few most influential economic groups. In December 1977 the assets of state-run enterprises averaged $241,490,000; those of local private owners, $41,400,000; and the assets of foreign companies $29,200,000. A similar situation was observed in the financial sphere where local entrepreneurs controlled 50.3 per cent of the entire capi-

tal and reserves; the state, 46.3 per cent; and foreign capital 3.3 per cent.

In some Latin American countries local monopoly groups are gaining strength with the growth of relations of dependence. There are cases where they reach a level at which industrial and banking capital merge to form finance capital.

The accelerated growth of capitalism in Brazil, accompanied by intensified concentration of production and centralization of capital has given rise to local monopolies and a finance oligarchy that has considerable leverage in the national economy. In Mexico, says the Declaration of Principles issued by the Mexican Communist Party, 'the finance oligarchy has sprung up on the basis of monopolies, speculative banking operations, big property in land, trade, the state apparatus, and monopoly association with international finance capital controlled by U.S. monopolies.'[6]

Local economic groups act primarily as conglomerates intent on extending their influence to many spheres of economic activity. In Mexico, for instance, there are eight big finance groups. In 1973 they were in control of 83 of the 106 commercial banks operating in the country. Of these giants, six have their hands on over 80 per cent of all deposits. Besides, each group owns different types of enterprises. Banamex, for instance, controls 47 industrial firms, of which ten are among the country's 100 largest. It takes part in financing another 52 big enterprises and is broadly represented in commerce and in real-estate.[7]

An influential finance oligarchy has emerged also in Chile. A survey of the centralization of capital and concentration of property among major enterprises has revealed the dominating role of a very small number of groups linked in one way or another to the Pinochet dictatorship. The most prominent of these are the Cruzat and Larrain and the Vial, Matte and Edwards clans. The Cruzat-Larrain group, for instance, has complete or partial control of more than one-third of all the assets of local private companies figuring in the register of the country's 100 biggest enterprises. This group is rapidly enlarging its financial empire as well, buying up banks, investment and insurance companies, and various foundations. It is represented in Pinochet's cabinet by Alfonso Marquez de la Plata and Jose Pinera, both of whom were board members of one of the group's banks — Banco de Santiago. They now hold the posts of Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Labor respectively. This allows the group to step up their activity with government patronage. In 1976 the balance-sheet assets of their main enterprises increased by 57 per cent and their profits rose by 39 per cent.

The same process is going on even in the Dominican Republic, a country with a relatively low level of capitalist development: all sorts of companies (notably, construction agencies which have begun to flourish) are setting up their own banks. The largest private banks are investing in the most promising areas of economic activity. The Banco Popular Dominicano is a case in point.

On the national level, the big local groups are a major force. They have always sought to have firm relations with foreign capital, regardless of their own interests. We are referring mainly to the groups closely associated with international monopoly capital, although this does not at all mean that they are alien to the socio-economic structure in their own countries. In some cases they champion the interests of the consortiums with which they are associated, but in others they act in their own interests.

With the internationalization of capital and with the multinationals and the powerful finance groups winning stronger positions in the capitalist world, the local finance oligarchy regardless of how big the role it plays in its own country, is finding only limited opportunities in foreign markets. Its global significance is small partly because the manufacture of high-technology machinery is monopolized by the multinationals. Another reason is inadequate finances.

'In the obtaining conditions,' writes Enrique Semo, 'the new national monopolies have no choice but to associate themselves with transnationals. In other words, they can develop as production units and influence the international market solely through association with the powerful trusts dominating the capitalist world.'[8]

As a consequence, the large local economic groups often find themselves subordinate to foreign consortiums that are becoming increasingly an internal force, simultaneously stepping up pressure from without. The correlation between these two aspects of the multinationals' activity depends on many circumstances (significance of the home market, level of protectionism in the country, alignment of class and political forces, and so on). Parallel with the growth of the local groups, differentiation is gaining momentum among the bourgeoisie, because its largest segments are pressured by foreign capital and monopoly circles.

In some Latin American countries a new mechanism of power has emerged or is taking shape, in which imperialist capital, playing first fiddle everywhere, large local economic groups, and in individual cases also the landowners, collaborate ever more closely with the government. The trend is toward the merging of all these forces, toward the development of state-monopoly capitalism, with the sole difference that in this case it is a merging not of two components, as in developed countries, but of three: the multinationals, the local economic groups and the state. This is thus a special type of state-monopoly capitalism coming into being under conditions of dependence.

In this new mechanism of power the state and its entire administrative apparatus are beginning to play a fundamentally new role, as Latin American reality eloquently demonstrates.

The growing interest in drawing up (together with the monopolies) a 'global economic strategy' and in 'global planning' is a new development in Brazil following the 1964 reactionary coup. Research into the present structure of state invest-

ments shows that in line with this strategy they are expected to ensure the flourishing of the monopolies controlling dynamic sectors of the economy. 'The state finance system,' writes the Soviet researcher Anatoly Karavayev, 'through which nearly half of the gross product has been redistributed over the past few years, is being increasingly used as an instrument for speeding up accumulation. The huge funds received by the state are spent on supporting, above all, the top stratum of entrepreneurs, whatever their nationality.'[9]

In Mexico, the state, which previously performed only protective functions, is becoming more active in economic life. It seeks to create new or reinforce existing institutions to ensure the practical realization, and often coordination, of pressing tasks.[10]

At present, the state and the local and foreign private monopolies in Mexico maintain the closest and, according to the prominent Mexican economist Alonso Aguilar, amicable relations. 'Their links intertwine and, with the aid of monopoly capital, they support one another, especially in the sphere of accumulation, since on it depend material production and reproduction of capitalist relations of exploitation.'[11]

In the Dominican Republic, too, which is ruled by a social-democratic government, this process is gaining momentum. At a seminar in August 1978, the heads of the country's industrial associations arrived at the following conclusion: 'Optimal channels of communication with the state must be provided to enable it to extend the utmost support to private enterprises instead of restricting them, and to discuss all official instructions and acts — laws, resolutions, concessions, contracts and so on — with the entrepreneurs concerned.'[12] The new President, Antonio Guzman, acts in line with these wishes by appointing representatives of foreign and private capital to key posts in economic management.

After the 1973 military coup in Chile all the processes of concentration and centralization proceeded with strong backing from the state. It was the fascist regime that returned the greater part of state property and expropriated land to private capital and enacted a foreign investment act. It was this regime that granted subsidies to industries that are of special significance to the finance oligarchy and ensured favorable conditions for their development. At the same time, it cancelled some privileges (tax exemption, for instance) that had been granted to small enterprises and some backward regions.

The aforesaid, however, does not give a full picture of the state's new economic role, which, as Orlando Millas, member of the Political Commission, CC, Communist Party of Chile, pointed out in the late 1960s, 'is founded not so much on state-run enterprises as on monetary policies, crediting levers, the use of foreign trade factors, the taxation system, customs regulations, the prices and wages policy, state investments, the setting up of mixed companies, control over state expenditures, the criteria of the attitude to the agrarian reform, and so on.'[13] This new role of the state became especially pronounced under the fascist regime.

The question of whether or not such phenomena are to be attributed to state-monopoly capitalism is broadly debated in scientific and political circles. It would be wrong, in our view, to believe that these phenomena are identical with the processes going on in the highly industrialized regions of the capitalist world. The very unevenness of development is leading to growing differentiation between countries. It is for this reason that the main specific of the Latin American states lies in their dependence and, as a consequence, in the considerable participation of foreign capital in the nascent mechanism of power.

Capitalism in Latin America did not copy classical or 'pure' models. It has been developing under special historical conditions, when capitalism had entered its imperialist stage and the world economy had been increasingly internationalized. This explains why in many countries elements of state-monopoly capitalism developed in a situation marked by steadily increasing dependence which, however, could not retard the continent's capitalist development. New forms of imperialist penetration are stimulating these tendencies. The main thing here, writes Aguilar, 'is not so much the economic level as the level of concentration and centralization, the domination of monopoly capital, and its ties with the state.'[14]

Some researchers, who have analyzed these processes, deny that elements of a dependent state-monopoly capitalism exist in Latin America. Speaking about Chile, they argue that state property has shrunk under fascism. There is nothing special about the fact that this is exactly what happened. In most cases the ruling economic groups tend to reduce the size of state property when they are certain that their power is growing. This is what was expected to occur and what actually did occur in Chile where the process of revolutionary change was reversed by force. In other cases, the tendency may be toward expanding the state sector, but this is not what really matters — the main thing is the role played by the state machine.

Signs of state-monopoly capitalism surface when monopoly capital, domestic or foreign, begins to dominate the economy and joins hands with the state. This does not mean, however, that every component of the new-fledged system is not relatively independent.

Before the stage of state-monopoly capitalism is reached, the home market must become genuinely national, imperialist capital, which in some Latin American countries has long acted mainly as an 'enclave,' must extend its influence to all economic spheres, local financial capital must be formed, and industry must become the leading sector of the economy.

The emergence of a dependent state-monopoly capitalism does not, of course, spell out the end of free competition in various sectors of the economy, or the end of various forms of pre-capitalist exploitation, which are either survivals of the past or have

been brought in by deformed capitalist development.

The experience of countries where state-monopoly capitalism is in operation or where it is only taking shape, prompts the conclusion that along this path it is impossible to end the structural crisis gripping the economy of almost the whole continent. Quite the contrary: the crisis is growing deeper and moving to a new level.

It is of paramount political importance to study all these new phenomena. A scientific evaluation of the emerging mechanisms of power allows us to identify the principal enemies, single out the transformations most needed now, and set the main tasks for carrying through a democratic revolution spearheaded against imperialism and the oligarchy. This, in turn, is an indication of the depth a revolution may reach in Latin America, of the correlation between its democratic and socialist goals.

Thorough research into these developing phenomena helps the working class to draw up a political line in regard to its allies and find new ways of anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic struggle. It facilitates the formation of broad fronts of progressive forces and brings into the foreground the problems of democratizing the state apparatus and the role it is to play in the transformations to come. Furthermore, precisely such research will help reveal the new forms of imperialist infiltration in the continent and assess the links and antagonisms in the classes owning the means of production.

Such research is urgent, for the question of destroying the existing system of government and defeating its main forces is perhaps more pressing in our countries than anywhere else. This is the only way to reveal the new dimension the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggle is assuming in Latin America.

1. CEPAL. *Notas sobre la economia y el desarrollo de America Latina*, No. 236, 1977, p. 2.
2. Agustin Cueva, *El desarrollo del capitalismo en America Latina*. Mexico, 1978, p. 97.
3. CEPAL. *Notas sobre la economia y el desarrollo de America Latina*, No. 286-287, 1979, p. 2.
4. Enrique Ruiz Garcia, *Subdesarollo y Liberacion*, Madrid, 1973, p. 298.
5. Enrique Semo, Reflexiones sobre el capitalismo monopolista en Mexico. *Historia y Sociedad*, No. 17, 1978, p. 28.
6. *Partido Comunista Mexicano. Declaracion de principios, Programa de accion. Estatutos*, Mexico, 1978, p. 10.
7. Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo, *El Partido Comunista frente a la crisis actual*. Mexico, 1977, p. 12.
8. Enrique Semo, Op. cit., p. 32.
9. *Latinskaya Amerika*, No. 3, 1978, p. 43.
10. Alonso Aguilar Monteverde, 'La fase actual del capitalismo en Mexico,' *Economia y Desarrollo*, No. 45, 1978, p. 97.
11. Alonso Aguilar Monteverde, 'Capitalismo monopolista de Estado, subdesarrollo y crisis,' *Estrategia*, No. 10, 1976, p. 67.
12. *Listin Diario*, August 12, 1978.
13. Orlando Millas, 'El capitalismo monopolista de Estado en Chile.' *Principios*, No. 126, 1968, p. 49.
14. Alonso Aguila Monteverde, *La jase actual del capitalismo en Mexico*, p. 102.

Deepening of social antagonisms

Timur Timofeyev
Director, Institute of the International Working-Class Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences

SOME TRENDS OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

The invigoration of working-class struggles, the growing influence of working-class organizations, and the stepped up democratic actions of the masses characterize present-day social life under state-monopoly capitalism. In different countries these processes have their own specifics and they develop with dissimilar degrees of intensity, but everywhere they stem from one and the same source, namely, the social contradictions of capitalism. The rising tide of social tension in the capitalist world is now noted not only by Marxist scholars; it is acknowledged in their own way by many Western analysts, who are far removed from scientific communism.[1]

However, while acknowledging this fact, bourgeois and reformist spokesmen usually interpret it as a phenomenon unrelated to the basic antagonisms of capitalism, as due to transient situation changes. Some of them are evidently aware of the discrepancy between these interpretations and the actual situation and prefer to refrain from generalized assessments, asserting, for example, that a credible explanation cannot be given of the causes of the present upswing of the strike struggle, and holding that the accumulation of extensive material on this struggle is accompanied by a 'crisis of its interpretation.'[2]

It is not difficult to understand this confusion: the present strike movement in the industrialized capitalist countries does not fit into traditional apologetic interpretations of the class struggle. Today it is influenced by a wide spectrum of new, non-

transient, long-term factors linked to the aggravation of capitalism's general crisis.

When one analyzes the socio-economic and political situation in the imperialist countries one finds solid grounds for believing that the economic crisis of the mid-1970s in these countries was the commencement of a long period witnessing the deterioration of the conditions of reproduction, currency and financial disorder, and social convulsions. Some of capitalism's acute contradictions range beyond the cycle framework, intensifying the structural crisis and creating unceasing tension in the capitalist world economy. This situation is marked by the intertwining of many crisis processes: cyclic, currency and financial, energy, minerals and primary materials and so on. The mounting crisis of neo-colonialism is to some extent narrowing down the possibilites of easing these processes through the exploitation of the developing nations, which are upholding their political and economic independence with growing determination.

State-monopoly regulation has proved unable to curb the crisis processes. All its mechanisms are in serious disorder. This is seen most strikingly in the currency-financial sphere and in the labor market. The fusion of inflation with mass unemployment, a phenomenon unusual for any post-crisis phase of animated business activity, is becoming chronic. In 1978 alone consumer prices in developed capitalist countries rose by 8 per cent and the unemployment level topped 5 per cent. The deterioration of the condition of the working people caused by growing unemployment and inflation continues as a result of the 'anti-crisis' measures taken by the state to increase direct and indirect income taxes on the working people, freeze wages and salaries, extend tax and other benefits to the monopolies, and cut back state expenditures on education, the health services, housing construction and so forth. Moreover, the condition of the masses is affected negatively by the arms race and its consequences.

The conversion of mass unemployment into a permanent factor in the period following the cyclic crisis is seen in practically all the developed capitalist countries. Moreover, in some of these countries unemployment has grown substantially, as the following table illustrates:

*Dynamics of unemployment in leading west European countries** ('000)

	1970	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979 Feb.
Britain	640	615	978	1,359	1,484	1,475	1,452
Italy	609	560	654	732	1,545	1,571	1,632
France	262	498	840	934	1,072	1,163	1,342
FRG	149	582	1,074	1,060	1,030	993	1,134

**Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, September 1976, April 1979.

Altogether, in January 1979 there were 6.5 million registered unemployed in the EEC states, 6 million in the USA, and 1,240,000 in Japan. The growth of the number of totally unemployed is accompanied by an upward trend toward a growth of partial unemployment. In the Common Market states the number of partially employed fluctuates from 4 per cent of the total number of employed persons (Ireland) to 17 per cent (Denmark); in the USA it amounts to 20 per cent of the entire work force. The condition of this category of working people is unstable, they have flimsier guarantees of employment, their wages are smaller, and they have fewer possibilities for drawing upon social funds than permanently employed workers.

In the pattern of unemployment a more visible place than before is held, alongside groups of skilled industrial workers, by wage workers of non-physical professions, some of whom have the highest qualifications (engineers, teachers, managerial and office workers and others). The demand for labor has diminished in the services industry.

The aggravation of the problem of employment is largely linked to the attempts of monopoly capital to use scientific and technological achievements to step up the exploitation of the working people, to capitalist forms of rationalization. In summing up the views of researchers into the problem of employment in the FRG, the West German weekly *Der Spiegel* writes that the nation is on the brink of catastrophe. This assessment is the outcome of, in particular, the reasonable apprehensions of a large segment of working people (notably, steelworkers and printshop workers) that the 'miniaturization of electronic devices is threatening millions of jobs in industry and in the service sphere. Neither the government nor the trade unions know how to control these consequences of scientific and technological progress.'[3] The problem is thus extremely acute. Any attempt to resolve it comes up against the contradictions of modern state-monopoly capitalism. Whereas under socialism scientific and technological achievements steadily improve the condition of the people and are regarded by them as one of the greatest blessings, under capitalism they generate new social calamities.

The present socio-economic situation in the imperialist countries is eloquent evidence of the futility of the efforts of state-monopoly capitalism to ease the contradictions between labor and capital, between large segments of the population and the monopoly élite. Both the traditional modes of economic regulation and social maneuvering and the methods of organizing labor relations based on the latest scientific and technological achievements are only aggravating old and breeding new social antagonisms.

The spread of the strike movement is one of the hallmarks of the present phase of the class struggle in the industrialized capitalist states. During an economic crisis and in subsequent years the working-class movement acts resolutely against state-monopoly measures to freeze wages, abolish the employment guarantees won in the past, and curtail the right to strike, and in many cases it has been able to compel the governments and the monopolies to make concessions.

Unlike its development during some previous cyclical crisis, the strike movement, given all its fluctuations and even decline in some countries, grew perceptibly in the crisis situation of the mid-1970s. The following computations show that in 1970-1975 the number of strikers in the leading capitalist countries increased from 12.5 million to 23.5 million. The strike struggle retains its high level to this day mainly on account of the continued growth of unemployment, the deteriorating living conditions of the working people, and the attempts of the monopolies to shift the burden of capitalism's economic difficulties to them.

*Strike movement in large capitalist countries** ('000)

	1970	1975	1976	1977	1978**
USA					
strikers	3,305	1,746	1,420	2,300	1,700
strike days	66,414	31,237	37,859	36,000	38,800
Canada					
strikers	262	482	1,582	300	1,000
strike days	6,540	11,480	10,524	3,420	9,000
Britain					
strikers	1,793	789	666	1,135	939
strike days	10,980	6,012	3,284	10,142	9,306
France					
strikers	1,080	1,827	2,223	575	600
strike days	1,742	3,870	3,727	2,113	2,200
FRG					
strikers	184	36	169	34	488
strike days	93	69	534	24	4,290
Italy					
strikers	3,722	14,109	11,898	13,803	13,000
strike days	20,887	27,189	25,379	16,566	16,000
Japan					
strikers	2,357	4,613	3,400	4,000	4,500
strike days	3,915	8,015	3,253	5,000	5,500

*Computed by the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement from national and international statistics. This table does not include statistics for political demonstrators and protest marches, in which many millions of working people take part in, for example, Italy, France and Japan.

**Statistics for all countries, except Britain, are preliminary.

In recent years even 'quiet corners' in the capitalist countries have been affected by the strike movement. Strike struggles are shaking countries that have for many years boasted of 'social partnership' traditions (Sweden, the FRG, Norway, Switzerland) and countries that for long years have been ruled by fascist regimes (Spain and others).

The strike struggles of the 1970s have been distinguished by the massive scale of working-class actions. General strikes have become common. The powerful actions of the working people in Italy, in which practically the entire working class participates, have widespread repercussions. Large-scale class battles are gaining momentum in France. In Britain 13 major strikes in 1977 accounted for more than 26 per cent of the total number of strike days. In early 1979 the intensification of the strike struggle in that country was marked by a series of stoppages of entire industries which forced the monopolies and the government to make significant concessions. There were some general strikes in 1978-1979 in other Common Market states, for instance, the FRG, where only recently the strike movement had been developing chiefly on the local level. In the USA the 110-day miners' general strike was followed by other social conflicts.

Another clearly emerging trend of the class struggles in capitalist countries is that the social composition of the participants in anti-monopoly actions is growing increasingly more varied. To a large extent this trend springs from the effects of the scientific and technological revolution. On account of the numerical growth of engineers and technicians under the impact of these effects a large proportion of these people are losing their former material and 'prestige' benefits, while in terms of conditions of labor and social position they are drawing closer to the working class. The methods of exploitation used in industry are in the process of capitalist rationalization of labor carried over to the services industry and the administrative-managerial apparatus. The social calamities generated by capitalism are more and more tangibly affecting the condition of white-collar workers.

Under the impact of these factors more and more working people join the anti-monopoly movement. This is seen from the growth of the strike struggle of white-collar workers in the capitalist countries. For instance, the summer of 1978 witnessed one of the largest actions by municipal employees in Paris for a number of years. In Italy strikes were staged by tourist agency and cinema employees and public transport workers. In Belgium the strike movement was joined by education and cultural workers, employees of the radio and television network, and even by parliamentary employees. Many post offices in Spain and Britain ceased work time and again in 1978. In Portugal 300,000 civil servants staged a huge nationwide strike.

One of the significant factors enabling the working people to secure the satisfaction of their demands is that better tactical ways and means of class struggle are used. The increased interdependence of various branches of the economy of developed capitalism, on the one hand, and the widening coordination of the actions of professional and branch contingents of working people, on the other, are giving workers' organizations broader possibilities for employing new methods of strike action. For instance, a strike in a key sphere of the economy allows the trade unions to step up pressure on capital and the government on a national scale. This role was played, for example, by, among others, the steelmakers strike in the FRG at the close of 1978 and early 1979, and the strike of transport workers in Britain in 1979.[4]

The working-class movement in counterposing its own, proletarian system of safeguarding the socio-economic rights of working people more and more effectively from state-monopoly regulation of

the relations between labor and capital. The experience gained by the working-class movement in the imperialist countries in the 1970s indicates that as it reaches a certain level the strike struggle, in combination with action by the masses under political slogans, leads to definite results in the socio-economic and legal condition of the working people and, most importantly, to noteworthy changes in the alignment of class forces and ultimately to a weakening of the positions of state-monopoly capitalism.

As it translates the new possibilities into reality the working-class movement grows numerically, becomes more active, renews its forms and methods of struggle, makes greater demands, and exercises a growing influence on the working people and their organizations and on socio-political life. An analysis shows that of these phenomena the principal one is the mounting tendency toward making demands whose satisfaction weakens state-monopoly capitalism.

This tendency is seen distinctly in all the key areas of the working-class struggle. A new content is being acquired by the actions of the working people against unemployment. Under conditions where they have become stable, where the ruling circles cannot cope with their growth, these actions are spearheaded not only directly against concrete manifestations of unemployment but also against the socio-economic mechanisms that constantly reproduce it. Extremely indicative in this respect is the struggle for the working-class movement's active incursion into the processes of adopting decisions on the regional and branch distribution of investments, i.e., into an area to which only recently it had no access whatsoever. In Italy, for example, the trade unions are bringing increasing pressure to bear on entrepreneurs in order to compel them to channel new investments into the nation's southern regions, which suffer most from unemployment.

Not resting content with fighting for the solution of current social problems, the working people of France, Italy, Britain and other countries are having increasing recourse to measures such as the occupation of factories whose owners roll up production and discharge workers. In some cases these are not merely acts of protest against dismissals and difficult working conditions, but also an expression of the striving of workers to take production into their own hands.[5] More and more frequently this is linked to the demand for the nationalization of various factories and entire industries.

The broadening of the spectrum of socio-economic demands is a distinguishing feature of the class battles of the proletariat today. This trend is reflected, for example, by the leadership of Sohyo, Japan's largest trade union center, which stresses that the Japanese workers should fight not only for higher wages but also for an improvement of their condition in all spheres, that they should insist on an improvement of the system of social insurance, price controls, environmental protection and the uninterrupted operation of public transport.[6]

In the industrialized capitalist states the workers' organizations are demanding a linkage of automation and rationalization with measures to halt the growth of unemployment, namely, measures such as transferring redundant workers to kindred enterprises, their retraining and so forth. In the USA and some West European countries the trade unions are demanding a shorter working week that would compensate for redundancy of labor power in automated industries.

While making socio-economic demands, the organized working-class movement seeks to give them a scientific foundation. In many countries the communist parties and the trade unions have experts and research institutes analyzing social processes knowledgeably and conducting sociological, economic and other research that provides such a foundation. For example, the purpose of these analyses by the French General Confederation of Labor, Georges Seguy, General Secretary of the GCL, said, is 'to obtain a better understanding of the changes that have taken place in the organization of work and to ascertain the effects of the changes that may occur within the next ten years.'[7]

The deepening of the working class' socio-economic demands is closely linked to the intensification of its struggle for the participation of working people's representatives in decision-making in all areas of economic, social and political life. Depending on national conditions and the political orientation, workers' organizations put foward various aims and programs for this struggle and conduct it in different forms. Bourgeois spokesmen and the right social-reformists are attempting to approach the question of workers' participation in economic management from the standpoint of 'social partnership.' The communist parties and the left-wing trade unions counter these attempts with their own alternative, the essence of which is to fight for the actual democratization of managerial structures in the economy and other spheres of social life.

We are now observing a growing accent on the political aspects of the struggle of the working people not only against specific social calamities (unemployment, soaring prices and so on), but also against the existing political apparatuses that cannot cope with these calamities. The working-class movement is bringing to bear direct and constantly growing pressure on the parliaments and governments of a number of countries. Indicative in this respect are the developments in the 1970s in Britain, where the fall of the Conservative (1974) and then of the Labour (1979) governments took place in a situation witnessing an aggravation of the class struggle and was largely due to the fact that the policies of these governments came into conflict with the interests of the working masses.

The significance of this tendency is all the greater today when the political system of state-monopoly capitalism, which mirrors the deepening of social antagonisms, encounters symptoms of crisis, when contradictions rise to the level where the administrative mechanism of the state loses its ability to

control more or less significant areas of social life and cannot check the mounting political activity of the working people.

The growing political instability in developed capitalist countries is seen in the steady erosion of the centrist electorate, which has for many decades been the principal bulwark of the 'moderate' bourgeois parties. This is leading to a more clear-cut polarization of the political orientation of the bulk of the electorate. Between the left and right blocs, which are more distinct than ever before, there is an unstable equilibrium under which the change of political forces holding the instruments of power depends on the vacillations of a relatively small group of the population maintaining an intermediate stand in the 'grey zone.' In recent years this situation has in various ways affected the twists and turns of the socio-political struggle in Italy and France, and also in some ways in Britain, the FRG and other capitalist countries.

It should be borne in mind that political instability holds out the possibility for various developments. Under specific circumstances, the temporary equilibrium may be upset in favor of reactionary bourgeois circles with all the ensuing internal political and international consequences. However, this balance of political forces may tilt in favor of the working-class movement, the left-wing parties and organizations. The struggle for the realization of this possibility is now one of the major orientations of the efforts not only of the political parties of the working class but also of many trade unions demanding the democratization of state-political institutions as a vital condition for the satisfaction of the present-day demands of the working people.

There are, I believe, grounds for stating that the deepening of social antagonisms in the imperialist countries is inducing the working class to rise to new levels of confrontation with state-monopoly capitalism. As the communist parties of developed capitalist countries have noted in their documents, this trend is unfolding under complicated conditions and encounters many difficulties: the growing resistance of the class enemy, a lack of unity in the trade union movement in some cases, the attitude of some right-wing leaders of social reformism and so on. However, it continues to develop under the impact of capitalism's objective laws and the purposeful anti-monopoly actions of the left forces.

This tendency springs not only from the aggravation of imperialism's internal contradictions but also from the internationalization of these contradictions, a process that increases the need for coordinating the efforts of the various contingents of the working class and all the anti-imperialist forces on an international level. Today this is an exceedingly important task because the prospects for world development and the ways and means of resolving the question of war and peace and other global problems will depend largely on what class forces are predominant on the international scene.

New possibilities are opening up for the working class and its allies also in this area of social confrontation. These possibilities are linked chiefly to the changes in the alignment of class forces in the world under the growing influence of socialism, to changes that create favorable international conditions for the struggle of the working people in capitalist countries.

The proletariat of these countries uses countermeasures, based on proletarian solidarity, to fight the internationally coordinated policy of the multinational corporations and governments. The struggle against unemployment is ranging beyond national boundaries. The arsenal of the means of this struggle is augmented with a weapon such as the international strike. Such strikes have taken place in the 1970s at the Solvay and Saint-Gobain multinational chemical trusts, the Dunlop-Pirelli rubber monopoly, the AKZO multi-branch corporation and some other corporations.

Unlike the former solidarity campaigns, when the militant initiative of the workers of one country was supported by the working people of other countries (short-term strikes, demonstrations, collection of donations to an aid fund and so on), these were joint actions prepared in advance and they took place simultaneously under a single plan. These strikes are the first test of strength in an area that is largely new to the working-class movement. However, the direction given by this first experience is of the utmost importance; the logic of struggle for one of the most pressing demands — guaranteed employment — inevitably brings the workers and their organizations into direct confrontation with the multinational monopolies.[8]

The fact that capitalism uses immigrant labor in Western Europe poses the working-class movement with acute problems of an international character. In the FRG, Britain, France and other countries millions of permanent and temporary immigrant workers are employed chiefly on arduous, low-paid jobs. Discrimination and racism are widely used by the ruling circles to split the working class and stir up national prejudices among the working people. The workers' organizations are countering this policy with international solidarity, with coordinated actions in defense of the rights of immigrant workers.

The conditions are now taking shape for unitary action by trade unions of different political affiliation on many urgent problems facing the working people, including the problem of fighting mass unemployment, bridling the arbitrary rule of the multinational corporations and ending the arms race. As was noted at the 30th session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the attitudes of the main international trade union centers — the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the General Confederation of Labor — have many points in common.[9] This is evidence that despite some differences there are growing possibilities for invigorating joint action by various contingents of the trade union movement in the struggle for the settlement of urgent problems facing the working people.

In order to coordinate action on an international

scale and work out a common platform in the struggle against international capital a number of trade unions have set up permanent secretariats. Better organization in the working-class and trade union movements has opened the way to large-scale internationally coordinated actions. For example, in 1978 working people acted against unemployment, in defense of the right to work simultaneously in 18 West European countries in response to a call from the trade unions.

These actions are an extremely promising and rapidly spreading tendency, whose significance is made all the greater by the fact that it is developing in interdependence with analogous tendencies in other areas of the class struggle.

Thus, the aggravation of the antagonisms between labor and capital on both the national and international levels is today generating tendencies and prospects of the class struggle that despite the activation of rightist, reactionary forces in some capitalist countries may ultimately strengthen the positions of the working class and give its organizations new possibilities for an advance.

1. For instance: *The Resurgence of Class Conflict in Western Europe Since 1968*, Vol. 1, *National Studies;* Vol. 2, *Comparative Analyses*, The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1978, Ed. by Colin Crouch and Alessandro Pizzorno.

2. This is dealt with in detail in a joint publication brought out by the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Marxist Studies in Frankfurt on Main: *Western Europe: Class Battles of the Proletariat*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1978.

3. *Der Spiegel*, April 17, 1978, p. 80.

4. The forms of the strike struggle are now growing more varied: 'chessboard' or 'shifting' strikes (consecutive short stoppages in individual factory departments that disorganize the production cycle in the entire factory), 'sudden' strikes (organized without giving the management prior notification), 'zeal' and 'work to rule' strikes, 'reverse strikes' (when striking workers occupy factories and continue production), and so on. This question is dealt with in an analytical survey compiled by the Strike Struggle Department of the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement and published in *Rabochy klass i sovremenny mir* (No. 2, 1978, pp. 59-69) under the heading 'The Strike Movement in Leading Capitalist Countries in the 1970s: Changes in Tactics.'

5. Needless to say, under capitalism the social effect of experiments of this kind is ultimately extinguished by private proprietorship, by the entire way of life of bourgeois society which strives to prevent the existence of what are to it socially alien islands of workers' self-management. Nevertheless, these islands play a role of no little importance as indicators of the proletariat's growing readiness to manage production and administer society.

6. *Sohyo News*, September 15, 1978, pp. 10-11.

7. *Economie et Politique*, No. 21, 1978, p. 23.

8. These questions are considered in detail in a monograph prepared by the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement, *International Monopolies and the Working Class, Moscow*, Nauka Publishers, 1976 (in Russian).

9. *Trud*, April 12 and 14, 1979.

---

viewpoints

Reform policy in crisis

Kurt Schacht
Economist (FRG)

Like all other political forces in the Federal Republic of Germany, the social democrats ask themselves how they should react to the the new problems being created by the deepening crisis of capitalism. There are many of these problems. What conclusions should the social democrats draw from the fact, for instance, that even during the short-lived revival of the capitalist economy the unemployment rate remained high? How should they deal with the fact that monopoly capital increasingly abuses scientific and technological progress to 'rationalize' away jobs and downgrade skilled workers? What should they do about the younger generation's dwindling professional opportunities and chances for the future? How should they react to the strategy of the ruling circles of big capital, which takes advantage of the crisis to clip the social and democratic rights won by the working class, puts the burden of the crisis on the working people, and shifts the axis of political life still further to the right?

It goes without saying that in view of the social democrats' strong influence among the West German working class and trade unions and in view of the positions they hold in the federal government and some state governments, their answers to these questions are very important to the struggle waged by the working people and their allies for their rights and to the future development of the Federal Republic.

Speaking generally, the deepening capitalist crisis and its consequences have had a twofold effect on the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD): first, they have dispersed the concept of reform evolved by the SPD in the 60s and early 70s,

---

Continuing our discussion of problems of the capitalist crisis: see *WMR*, Nos. 1,3,6,11,12, 1978; No. 2, 1979.

and second, they have accelerated the differentiation in the SPD itself. To give an idea of the extent of the gulf between hopes and illusions pinned on reform, and grim reality, as well as of its consequences, it may be useful to recall once again the premises and content of the reform policy pursued by the social democrats until not so long ago.

When, in 1969, the SPD entered the federal government as the leading party, its top politicians took an optimistic view of the future social development of the Federal Republic. Some even spoke of 'entry into the golden age of social democracy.' The government program adopted by the SPD in 1969 said: 'Our successes and our political experience enable us to effect the far-reaching reforms needed for the renewal of the Federal Republic.'[1] It was on this optimistic note that Willy Brandt made his first government declaration as Federal Chancellor. 'We are not at the end of our democracy,' he said, 'but are only just starting on it.'[2]

In the past, the SPD stated that the key provision of its reform policy was to impart a social and material content to the 'basic assets' of 'democratic socialism' postulated by it — freedom, justice and solidarity. The social democrats described the envisaged reforms as a means of winning prestige for these basic assets in the FRG's social reality.[3] Needless to say, the reforms were not intended to go beyond the bounds of capitalist society.

In the early 70s, the social-democratic concept of reform was formulated as a program called at first the 'Long-Term Program for 1972-1985.' It set the task of specifying and quantifying the 'basic assets' of 'democratic socialism.' It indicated in precise terms and with regard to the various social and democratic spheres how the working people's material condition should be improved, what reforms should be tackled year after year and how much should be spent on them. The program proceeded from the fundamental reformist assumption that the development of capitalism can be made harmonious and crisis-free, and secondly, that the capitalist economy can be managed and controlled when the instruments of state-monopoly capitalism have been developed.

Objections to the thesis of crisis-free capitalist development that came from the SPD's own ranks were answered by the party leadership as follows: 'The theory of capitalist crises as set out so far may have some historical justification if applied to earlier development periods. As for modern industrial society, this theory does not hold water. It is a fact that there are instruments which can be used for developing an up-to-date and largely crisis-proof national economy. . . . The social democrats have proved that where they are in charge they devise and use such instruments.'[4]

In 1977, however, or a few years after the SPD had announced the beginning of the 'golden age of social democracy,' inexorable realities forced Erhard Eppler, a leading social democrat, to make a pessimistic statement at the SPD congress. '. . . None of us knows,' he said, 'what society will be like in the 80s.'

This swing from an optimistic to a basically pessimistic mood was a reflection of the worsened state of capitalism in the Federal Republic. The fundamental reformist assumption of crisis-free capitalist development turned out to be as wrong as the assumption that with the development of state-monopoly instruments the SPD would discover a means of managing capitalism without incurring crises. Yet it was precisely on these two assumptions that the SPD draft program raised, as has been said, the hope that the gross social product would show a real annual increase of 4.5 to 5 per cent. That, the SPD declared, would assure the material prerequisites of carrying out reform measures.

The economic crisis which broke out in 1973-74 brought the social-democratic concept of reform down like a house of cards. This confronted the SPD with the question: Should it reconsider its fundamental views and its attitude to existing capitalist society and shed reformist illusions or go on chaining its destiny to a society stumbling from crisis to crisis and unable to offer the working class a perspective, a secure future?

The SPD leadership and adherents of the trend dominant in the party answered these questions by explicitly reaffirming their favorable attitude to capitalist society. Faced with insistent questions from many working people, as well as from many members and supporters of social democracy, about the causes of the crisis and ways of overcoming it, top SPD politicians tried to prevent the questioners from drawing correct class conclusions. In discussions on the causes of the crisis they argued that the capitalist crisis was not an outgrowth of the socio-economic system. They affirmed that no dependable long-range forecasts of economic growth could be made in view of 'drastic changes in world politics and on the world market.'[5]

Moreover, the final wording of the SPD program for 1875-85, which was approved at the Mannheim Congress in 1975, described the crisis as 'unconnected with the system' (*systemneutral*). 'Highly developed industrial societies, whatever the economic and social order they belong to, have so far been afflicted with crises.'[6]

These arguments of the SPD leadership were designed to present its policy, directed against the working people's interests, as the only one practicable in the situation imposed by the realities of the capitalist crisis. At the same time, they were expected to make it more difficult for the working class to realize that reformism had proved incapable of offering a solution to the pressing problems of our time while the successful if not problem-free development of the countries of the socialist community had demonstrated the vitality of socialism. It is really a grave challenge to the SPD and social democracy generally that what world developments bear out is not social reformism, but the revolutionary teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The program reaffirmed the party's favorable attitude to the principles of the capitalist system. 'Private economic use of the means of production and market competition are largely inevitable,' it

says.[7] In line with this fundamental proposition, the SPD did not take a stand against the strategy of big capital. However, its leadership cannot give in to every demand of big capital if it wants to retain its influence over labor and its leverage in the trade unions, and this compels it to maneuver.

In 1974, the SPD-led federal government began to gradually renounce the further implementation of a number of reforms. Numerous measures were adopted that worsened the working people's social and material condition, for instance, in health services and pensions. In June 1978, for instance, the government passed a pension adjustment law retracting an increase in pensions totalling about 40,000 million marks that had already been decreed by law for 1979-81. Bound by monopoly interests, the SPD-led government cut unemployment relief and robbed itself of the possibility of searching for effective remedies against unemployment. Furthermore, the government has been increasing subsidies and various other benefits for the monopolies, which use this aid for their expansion abroad.

Contrary to the intention to 'venture into greater democracy' announced in 1969, the SPD has played a decisive part in the adoption and implementation of the policy of *Berufsverbot* against communists, left social democrats and other consistent democrats. It curbs many democratic rights and freedoms on the pretext of 'combating terrorism.' It has played a part in the revival of anti-communism, through which the ruling circles of big capital divide the working class, distract its attention from the crisis of the capitalist system, and resist the growth of the workers' class consciousness.

The question arises: How do the SPD leaders try to bring their policy of curtailing social and democratic rights into line with their continuing claim to being a reform party?

First of all, they are at pains to conceal the real causes of the deep and protracted crisis of capitalism. A further device used by them is to describe the earlier concept of reform as outworn and wrong and to argue that their current policy takes account of reality. There is also the fact that, to quote SPD Chairman Brandt, the party's 'capacity for thinking and patient discussion' had not sufficed to create 'a realistic program.'[8] As for the masses, the SPD would like to influence them by claiming that the Federal Republic has under its SPD-led government coped with the crisis better than any other industrial capitalist state. Public opinion is even made to understand that a 'German model' of an industrialized capitalist state has come into being. This is expected to give West Germany's working people a sense of pride tinged with nationalism as co-builders of a 'model' suitable for other capitalist countries.

SPD leaders back up their appeal to the trade unions for a restraint on wages with the same arguments as the employers' unions. They affirm that the 'excessive' wage increase has led to a rise in production costs, thus impairing the competitiveness of the West German economy in the world market. This, in turn, will cause a reduction in the number of jobs, they allege. The facts show, however, that the monopolies do not use the funds and benefits granted by the state as a means of preserving or creating jobs but use the greater part of these resources to 'rationalize' away jobs.

One of the main lines on which leading social democrats of the Federal Republic seek ideological justification is to lend the 'basic assets' of 'democratic socialism' a new, different content. This is seen above all in the report of the committee on basic assets set up by the SPD Board. The report, published in the autumn of 1977, is an attempt by leading social democrats to ponder from an essentially reformist standpoint on the new problems that have arisen in capitalist society. In an effort to remove the contradiction between the policy of worsening the working people's social and material condition and the proclaimed 'basic assets' of 'democratic socialism,' they give these 'assets' a more abstract character, and view them in isolation from the concrete tasks of the struggle to curb the power of monopolies, the struggle against exploitation. Worthy of note as an indication this tendency is an article by Hans Koschnik, Vice-Chairman of the SPD. Koschnik wants to create the impression that 'by far most social democrats are willing to give the preservation of human dignity preference in the society of tomorrow over greater growth and a higher standard of material well-being.'[9]

Further the SPD leaders call for a 'more equitable redistribution' among the working people of that part of the social product that goes to them. In other words, they appeal to skilled workers to renounce part of their wages in favor of their less skilled fellow-workers, and thereby compensate for the deterioration of the condition of one segment by an improvement of the condition of another. Experience has shown that appeals of this kind are a disguise for the strategy of taking the struggle for the redistribution of the gross social product to the working class itself, instead of carrying on this struggle between the working class and the monopolies.

There are social democrats who share the communists' view that the miscarriage of the SPD concept of reform is due to that party's policy, to its close links with the capitalist system, and the reluctance of its dominant forces to resist the power of monopoly capital. Their opinion was expressed by Detlev Hensche, board member of the union of printing and paper industry workers. His investigations of the causes of the failure of the SPD reform policy brought him to the conclusion that the party increasingly commits itself as manager of the employer's interests. Hensche urged the SPD to resist capitalist blackmail. 'What can be brought about in the matter of reform as well as in the economic field,' he wrote, 'depends very largely on support from society, and hence on the balance of social forces.'[10]

But the SPD leadership turns a deaf ear to these warnings from its own ranks. Nor does it lend an ear to those in the party and the trade unions who

demand an end to the arms race and insist on using the resultant released funds for social reforms. This would be very important, for the fast-rising cost of armaments (which has doubled under SPD-led governments) is another major factor of the failure of the party's reform policy. It is realized more and more that the arms race, for its part, reduces the scope of necessary reforms in the interest of labor and that, moreover, it threatens to torpedo disarmament and complicates the joint struggle of the communists and social democrats to press forward détente and safeguard peace in Europe and the world.

The deepening crisis of capitalism and its pernicious impact on the working people's condition give rise in the trade unions and part of the SPD to new schools of thought different from the one desired by the party's leaders. Of particular importance are the discussions now going on in the trade unions, at which delegates of seven million organized workers, office employees and junior officials discussed ways of combating unemployment, protecting themselves from the effects of capitalist scientific and technological progress, and safeguarding the social and democratic rights won by them. The delegates analyzed the strategy of the monopolies and their political spokesmen to make the working class pay for the capitalist crisis. They had to decide how the unions should respond to that strategy. The congress was still under the fresh impression of strong controversies over wage rates in the printing, paper and metal industries. Memories were still vivid of the fact that the companies had replied with massive lockouts to the struggle of the printers' and metalworkers' unions for job security, wage rises and against professional downgrading.

A tendency toward a more explicit class attitude and greater militancy, that is also typical of many social-democratic trade unionists, surfaced at the congress. Nor should it be forgotten that a number of union leaders were reluctant, considering the SPD's leading role in the federal government, to use the unions' entire fighting power to uphold the interest of labor.

In contrast with the SPD leadership's allegation that the crisis is unconnected with the system, the congress pointed to 'the crisis-like character of the Federal Republic's economic system, geared exclusively to profit and based on competition, and to its increasing proneness to crisis,' and stated: 'It is evident that the interests of labor and capital are incompatible, that contradictions between interests are growing and that the economic system of the Federal Republic provides fewer and fewer guarantees of job security, an adequate standard of living, better working and living conditions and so on.' The congress confirmed the need to turn key capitalist industries and enterprises dominating the market into public property under democratic control.

The congress made a fundamental statement running counter to the pro-capitalist policy of the SPD leadership. 'Without changing the balance of economic and hence social forces in favor of wage labor,' it said, 'no secure future can be achieved for the factory workers, office employees, officials and students.' It did not confine itself to such basic estimations but drew up a whole program intended to combat unemployment effectively and preserve the working people's social and democratic rights.

The SPD debate on how the capitalist crisis should be assessed and what conclusion should be drawn from the intensification of class conflicts and new problems goes deep. It is interesting to note, however, that a representative poll held among the membership revealed that not more than half of them adhere to a 'socialist' position — whatever they may mean by that — and that one-fourth of the membership say they are 'anti-socialist'. . . .[11]

The debate in the SPD is going on against the background of the greatly whittled influence of the Young Socialists, once the strongest left-wing force in the SPD. The influx of young people critical of the system into the SPD has stopped abruptly due to the anti-reform policy of the SPD-led federal government.

In 1978, worsened relations between the party leadership and anti-capitalist-minded young people expressed themselves in the expulsion of the chairmen of two major social-democratic youth organizations: Klaus Uwe Benneter, Chairman of Young Socialists, and Mechthild Jansen, Chairman of the Socialist Union of University Students. The SPD leadership accused the expelled above all of having cooperated with the communists in democratic movements (such as those against *Berufsverbot* and for an end to the arms race).

Through these expulsions the SPD leadership hinted that while it allowed a certain scope for debate in the party over fundamental social issues, those who accepted the Marxist theory of state-monopoly capitalism and who deduced from their experience the necessity for unity of action of the working class and for cooperation between the communists and social democrats, and moreover, engaged in such cooperation must reckon with the possibility of disciplinary action, including expulsion.

However, the SPD leadership cannot bring the growing class awareness of the membership under control. There was a minor sensation when, late in 1978, Hans Ulrich Lose, the social-democratic mayor of Hamburg, who had belonged to the right wing, said in an interview that his own experience as mayor had confirmed the correctness of certain aspects of the Marxist analysis of state-monopoly capitalism, and that he had learned by experience that the state was a repair shop of capitalism.

True, the leftists in the SPD encounter rather considerable difficulties in trying to evolve a theoretical concept opposed to the classical function of reformism as a doctor at the bedside of capitalism. Their theoretical predicament or weakness also manifests itself in falling back on ideas of the father of revisionism, Eduard Bernstein, ideas that may suit only those who are not interested in alternatives to monopoly power. But the companies' un-

scrupulous shifting of the burden of the crisis onto the working people, the massive abolition of jobs, and arbitrary massive lockouts gradually bring it home to workers and trade unionists belonging to the SPD and experiencing direct pressure from monopoly capital, that there is an unbridgeable gulf between labor and capital and that the working class and their organizations must counter the monopolies' brutal bid for power by fighting.

In the course of recent major actions, workers and other employees from among the social democrats, communists, Christians and non-party people have shown their resolve to fight in unity in the trade unions and the factories for job security, a 35-hour week and higher pay, against professional downgrading and in defense of social and democratic rights. Young communists and social democrats have made common cause in important youth actions against unemployment among young people, for the right to education and work and guaranteed opportunities for the future. In democratic movements against *Berufsverbot* and neo-nazism, for an end to the arms race and for steadfast progress in détente, communists and social democrats join forces with other democrats.

It is these real movements and pressure from below that compel the SPD leadership to reconsider its own position (as on *Berufsverbot*, the demand for a 35-hour week, the banning of lockouts and the creation of an adequate number of openings for the training of young people). But the concessions that it has made are still verbal; it does not put them into practice. Dissatisfaction is growing among the social democrats and trade unionists with the vacillation shown by leading SPD politicians who hold government posts and are not prepared to recognize decisions of party bodies as binding.

Success in the fight of the working class for its rights can only be guaranteed, now as in the past, through concerted action by the workers themselves and the full application of the unions' fighting power. Since the efforts of the SPD leadership to shackle communist-social-democratic unity of action and the communist-baiting carried on by the ruling class and its media cannot prevent cooperation on common issues that emerge time and again, it is obvious that life itself, the grim reality of every-day capitalism, imperatively makes working-class unity of action the order of the day.

How very seriously the German Communist Party is working for greater unity of action between communists and social democrats is seen in the party's activity in the trade unions, factories, universities and working-class neighborhoods. More explicitly than before, the GCP states in the program adopted in October 1978 that what it seeks is not merely unity of action 'from below,' as the social-democratic leaders often assert, but 'a trustful, comradely attitude to the members, supporters and organizations of the SPD;' that prompted by the interests of the working class, it declares 'for cooperation with the SPD'[12] and seeks not only 'cooperation with the social democrats in the current struggle for a turn toward democratic and social progress,' but also cooperation in the future struggle against monopoly power, for anti-monopoly democracy, for the socialist transformation of the Federal Republic.'[13]

The GCP supports whatever serves the interests of the working class. It bears in mind the great significance of joint struggle by the communists and social democrats to preserve the working people's social and democratic rights, which are in jeopardy, bring about social and democratic reforms and curb monopoly power. What the GCP says in its program about intending to use the slightest agreement as the starting point of 'joint action for common interests'[14] and laying 'no claim to leadership in alliances'[15] is not, as many social democrats have seen for themselves, a mere declaration but everyday communist practice.

The GCP is aware of the difficulties attending its effort to bring about working-class unity of action and trustful cooperation between communists and social democrats. It seeks dialogue and discussion with the SPD comrades, putting what they have in common above what divides them.

At the same time, however, our party sees it as its class duty to criticize the monopoly-oriented line of the SPD leadership and SPD-led federal government — a line detrimental to the working class. We cannot renounce principled criticism of reformism which can show no way out of the capitalist crisis.

The new program adopted by the Mannheim congress of our party provided the working class with a dependable guide in the struggle for its present and future interests. It is an answer to the new problems posed by developments in the world and hence in the Federal Republic. In reply to the inability of capitalism and the political forces representing it to cope with the challenge of scientific and technological progress and the problems of unemployment, environmental protection, education and training, our party's program calls for a turn toward democratic and social progress.

We consider it important to defend democratic and social gains together with the working class and other progressive forces and to ensure continuing détente. We see it as an important task to build up the working people's rights in the course of the class struggle, press back monopoly power, and significantly alter the balance of political forces in favor of the working people. The success of the struggle for social progress will depend in decisive measure on strengthening the GCP and promoting unity of action of the communists, social democrats and Christians as well as non-party working people.

Our party maintains that the class struggle is the best teacher and confirms time and again that it is not reformism but the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, creatively applied in national conditions, that pave the way to a society in which the working class and its allies will win freedom, a society free from the evils of capitalism.

1. *SPD — Jahrbuch 1968/69*, p. 434.
2. *Das Erste Jahr der Regierung Brandt-Scheel*, Bonn, 1970. p. 105.
3. *Neue Gesellschaft*, August, 1975, p. 612.
4. *Reihe Jugend*, Heft, p. 25.
5. *Vorwärts-Beilage*, January 16, 1975, p. 3.
6. *Okonomisch-politischer Orientierungsrahmen für die Jahre 1975-1985*, Bonn, 1975, p. 23.
7. Ibid., p. 41.
8. *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt*, April 2, 1978.
9. *Vorwärts*, May 18, 1978.
10. *Vorwärts*, May 4, 1978.
11. *Vorwärts*, March 9, 1978.
12. *Programme der Deutschen Kommunistischen Partei*, Düsseldorf, 1978. p. 73.
13. Ibid., p. 74.
14. *Programme der DKP*, p. 74.
15. Ibid., p. 81.

Alternative to the oligarchy

Pedro Ortega Diaz
CC Political Bureau member, CP Venezuela

WMR has received a letter from Mohammed Salim of Baghdad, who asks what is the CP Venezuela's attitude to the COPEI Party, which won the latest election. An answer will be found in the following article by Pedro Ortega Diaz, a leader of the CP Venezuela.

The political power of the Venezuelan bourgeoisie appears to be strong, but it is incapable of solving the economic problems facing the country or of satisfying the people's numerous needs. That is its organic weakness. Closely tied to the multinational monopolies (and dependent on them), 'our' bourgeoisie, consisting of large economic groups, owns the bulk of the country's chief resource — oil. These groups also own whole sectors of the economy: the iron ore and cement industries, electric power, the production of sugar, fats, butter and rum, credit and financial institutions. They make up the oligarchy which now rules the country by means of a two-party system.

This system was established as the bourgeoisie connected with imperialism fortified its positions and the left-wing forces which carried on an armed struggle in the 60s suffered defeats. In practical terms, its development was promoted by the government led by Romulo Betancourt, a right-wing social democrat and the founder and leader of the Democratic Action Party, who was supported by the U.S. monopolies. In order to set up the two-party system, he even countenanced the strengthening of a rival party, the Social-Christian Party (COPEI).

The two parties engage in a 'division of labor': when one party is in power and runs the country, the other is in opposition to it, apparently voicing the discontent and aspirations of the masses. This political game played by the two parties, which vie with each other for power, while collaborating in order to keep the existing system going, is supported by the state machine, the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and the mass media. The party in power recognizes the representative role of the opposition. The two share the chief posts in parliament, the judicial system and other state bodies. Both parties receive financial aid from the dominant economic groups. The mass media owned by the bourgeoisie vocally advertise the merits of the two-party system. As a rule, the press carries a debate on every problem, so setting forth the attitude of the Social-Christians and of the Social Democrats. The two parties became most active in electoral campaigns. In the 1978 election, both spent hundreds of millions of bolivars on propaganda, so managing to influence a majority of the population. Under the two-party system, the bulk of the electorate does not vote for the program of this or that party, but for the lesser of the two evils. In the 1978 election, for instance, Venezuelans who opposed the running of the country by the Democratic Action Party were left with no alternative but to vote for COPEI, the only party capable of defeating the former. Conversely, those who believed that COPEI's victory would harm the country voted for Democratic Action. As a result, a majority of the votes is shared mainly by the two parties. That is the whole point of the system. As in the 1973, so in the latest 1978 elections, Democratic Action and COPEI candidates for the post of president and for parliament won an overwhelming majority of the poll.

But there are some differences between the 1973 and the 1978 election. In 1973, the total number of votes cast for the Democratic Action and COPEI presidential candidates came to 80 per cent, and in 1978, to 90 per cent; the figures for the National Congress and the states' legislative assemblies were, respectively, 72 per cent and 80 per cent. This shows that the existing system has been further fortified. In 1978, the COPEI candidate, Luis Herrera Campins, became the new President of the Republic. For the first time, COPEI managed to forge ahead in the number of votes in the parliamentary election, although it does not have a majority either in the House of Deputies or in the Senate. While Democratic Action had a majority in both Houses in 1973, now neither of the parties has an edge over the other. Despite the growing influence of the two-party system, the left-wing forces have on the whole somewhat improved their positions. In the 1973 parliamentary elections they won 11.97 per cent, and in 1978, 13.5 per cent of the total.

So, it is now the turn of the Social-Christian Party to run the country. Democratic Action is in opposition; its political weight is considerable and its leaders believe that it can climb back to power. COPEI owes its victory to the serious discontent caused by the activity of the preceding government, under which the cost of living increased, administrative corruption (embezzlement of government funds) was widely reported and the social services (water, electricity, transport and medical services) were unsatisfactory.

However, we do not expect any important changes from the COPEI government either. The situation in the country may improve, but that will largely depend on pressure from the masses.

The Communist Party of Venezuela, the vanguard of the proletariat, will take a principled class stand in opposition to the bourgeois COPEI government, but we will support every positive step by the new authorities and, together with the masses, fight for the immediate satisfaction of their needs and fulfillment of electoral promises.

Unity of the left-wing forces and progressive circles could become one of the definitive factors in the political situation in Venezuela. They have different ideological positions, ranging from social democratic to ultra-leftist, but we can all join on the basis of a program of independent and anti-oligarchic development, without stopping our ideological struggle in the course of which positive trends will gain the upper hand. If this takes place, a new force will emerge in the political arena to put an end to the system of government set up by the ruling classes. Contacts were first established for the purposes of unification even before the 1978 election. The CP Venezuela did all it could to reach an agreement to nominate one presidential candidate. Although no agreement was reached, relations between the different groups improved. They acted together in the trade unions and also during the election of governing bodies in some unions in the liberal professions and student organizations. In a recent election of the Board of the University of Zulia where the Social-Christians had always been unrivalled, a union of left-wing forces scored an impressive victory by winning five of the seven seats. Besides, the left-wing forces have, in fact, already reached an agreement on the establishment of a unity parliamentary bloc which is of great importance because both COPEI and Democratic Union need left-wing votes to win a majority in parliament. In the municipal elections last June the left-wing forces, including the communists, acted in a united front with a common electoral roll for the first time in the country's history and scored a success.

In the 1978 elections, the CP Venezuela won more votes than in 1973, but its share dropped from 1.15 per cent to 1.04 per cent. In the National Congress, our party is represented by only one deputy (earlier we had two). Having analyzed the results of the voting at its 16th Plenary Meeting, the CPV Central Committee noted the objective factors operating against the communists. There are the relatively strong enemy, who has established a two-party system of government, all manner of advantages which he enjoys and, during the elections, fraudulent counting of the votes. Besides, the Venezuelan bourgeoisie has enough means to win over the middle strata of the population and a part of the working class.

The splits within our party since the 60s are a factor which has directly harmed it. The latest split after the 1973 election negatively affected the results of the 1978 election as well.

Another important negative factor is the emergence of numerous and diverse left-wing and pseudo-left groups which confuse the electorate.

The 16th Plenary Meeting sharply criticized the mistakes made by the party, and pointed out the major shortcomings in conducting its policy with respect to the COPEI and Democratic Action governments and the two-party system, the ineffective forms of struggle and inadequate activity among the masses. It urged the need to overcome the lack of contacts between the party and the worker and peasant masses, and the women's and young people's organizations. The leadership and the grass-roots organizations seek to correct their mistakes. There are no defeatist attitudes in our ranks. Although the results of the elections were unfavorable, for the first time since 1958 the number of votes cast for the communists went up from 52,000 in 1973 to 55,000 in 1978.

We do not at all believe that our efforts in the 1978 elections were futile. The communists' call reached broad masses of people and yielded results: independent groups friendly to us have been formed, and new contacts established in industry, in the workers' neighborhoods and in the rural localities. The campaign backing our party's presidential candidate, Hector Mujica, was broad and well organized. All of this helps to create prerequisites for future successes.

The Central Committee urged the party and the young communists to overcome their mistakes and to improve the party's work. It called on the people of Venezuela tirelessly to fight against dependence and for the country's sovereign development.

African panorama

Sergio Vieira
CC member, Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO)

IN STRUGGLE FOR PROGRESS

The Third Congress of FRELIMO, held in February 1977, was unquestionably the most outstanding recent event in our country. The reason for this is mainly that it adopted the historic decision to reconstitute FRELIMO into a vanguard party of workers, peasants, soldiers, revolutionary intellectuals and other working people, with the ideological and organizational principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism, as its foundation.

Before speaking of the content of party building, it must be noted that the Third FRELIMO Congress summed up the results of the long and bitter revolutionary struggle of the working classes of Mozambique. FRELIMO began the armed liberation struggle on September 25, 1964, and within a few years there were liberated areas in the northern provinces of Cabo Delgado and Niassa. Naturally, after the colonialists were driven out of these areas we were faced with many vital problems. There was a shortage of food, clothes and many other items. In order to resolve these problems we had to organize production. But when the production of material goods is considered, the question of the socio-economic foundation of such production always comes up.

This was not a theoretical but an urgent practical problem. We fought and we liberated our land from the colonialists not in order that it should fall to a handful of exploiters and be harnessed to new slavery. The colonial administration was destroyed. How was state power to be exercised and what sort of apparatus was needed for this? In the country and our ranks we still had elements of the exploiting classes seeking to replace the dictatorship of the colonial bourgeoisie with a dictatorship of national exploiters.

A clear-cut answer to these questions was given by the Second FRELIMO Congress held in Niassa Province in 1968. It set the orientation toward building up a national economcy and people's power. Fulfillment of the congress directives in relation to the economy was expressed, for instance, in the setting up of cooperatives in the liberated regions. As regards power, it was exercised by committees consisting of FRELIMO members, soldiers of the liberation army and cooperated peasants. These committees became instruments of the class dictatorship of the working masses.

Following the Second FRELIMO Congress much was done by the leadership to generalize the accumulated experience. Political and military cadres helped the people to study our experience, to understand our situation and the laws of revolution, so that we could reshape society. A large contribution to this intensive and difficult work was made by FRELIMO's publications and radio broadcasts.

It was in the same period that the question was raised of reconstituting FRELIMO into a vanguard party of the working classes. In a message in September 1970, on the sixth anniversary of the commencement of the armed struggle, Samora Machel, President of FRELIMO, noted that the conditions for this reconstitution had to be prepared. This question was then considered in December 1972 at a Central Committee plenary meeting, which set the task of ensuring the revolution's advance on all fronts: economic, ideological, political, organizational, production and, of course, military. The first party committees were formed in 1973 in the Mozambique People's Liberation Forces (FPLM), in accordance with the plenary meeting's decisions. The Party School, where Front activists improved their knowledge of theory, studied Marxism-Leninism and shared experience, was founded in January 1974.

The decision to form a vanguard party, adopted at the Third FRELIMO Congress, was thus the result of long and painstaking work. All the conditions had been created for forming the party. The most important of these was the existence of a core of genuinely revolutionary cadres capable of rallying innumerable activists from among the working people, activists who had proved their mettle in promoting production and labor efficiency, fighting economic and ideological subversion by enemies of the revolution, and unmasking agents of the secret police and other repressive agencies of the fascist colonial regime.

The campaign to build the party lasted from February 3 to November 11, 1978. A few words on how that campaign proceeded.

Since this was to be neither a mass party, nor a broad front, but a vanguard party of the working people that would lead Mozambique to socialism, admission to it was limited by definite, clear-cut criteria. At the first stage the local FRELIMO committees screened candidates for admission to the party. At the next stage the candidates were discussed at mass meetings where each person could freely state his opinion of any one of them. After that the party provincial committees announced the names of approved candidates.

In this way, tens of thousands of people joined the party. They took their place in the vanguard be-

cause they were exemplary workers, had close contact with the masses, had shown that they were ideologically committed fighters, and had distinguished themselves by their conduct. The party thus consists of the Mozambique people's finest, most worthy and most esteemed sons. Today we have a political vanguard that is firm, unflinching, tempered, organized from top to bottom and prepared to wage a struggle for socialism.

The formation of the party was paralleled by the creation and strengthening of democratic organizations. As regards youth and women's organizations, some advance has already been registered. The organization of 'continuadores' — the children who will continue the revolution — is to be set up in 1979. The workers' organizations are getting on their feet. The impetus for this development came in October 1976 at a meeting addressed by our President, Samora Machel. Production councils began to be formed then, and these became an important school moulding cadres capable of organizing the working class. We shall thus reach a stage where the entire nation is drawn into the fulfillment of the tasks of the socialist revolution.

Another key aspect of the present stage of the revolution, mirrored in the decisions of the Third FRELIMO Congress, is the creation of a new state apparatus. At the time of our victory the colonial bourgeois administration had been destroyed on more than one-third of the nation's territory. Needless to say, the dismantling of colonial institutions had to be accompanied by the establishment of new organs of administration, a people's democratic state, a dictatorship of the working people, with the goal of achieving a dictatorship of the working class. A vital stage in the building of the new state culminated with elections to the people's assemblies, which are the solid foundation and tangible expression of people's state power, both central and local. These first-ever general elections in our country were held from September 25 to December 4, 1977. This protraction was due to the size of the nation's territory and the difficulties stemming from lack of transport, mass illiteracy and so on. It will be noted that in areas bordering on Rhodesia, elections were delayed as the military situation there remained tense.

What did these elections show and what were their results? A total of 1,027 people's assemblies were elected and they now function throughout the country. They consist of nearly 30,000 deputies, of whom — and this is extremely significant — 27 per cent are women (in Africa this is probably the largest proportion of women in organs of state power). As regards the class composition of the assemblies, over 30 per cent of the deputies are workers, more than 25 per cent are cooperated peasants and farm workers, and 15 per cent are veterans of the liberation movement and representatives of the nation's armed forces and security services. The rest are civil servants and revolutionary intellectuals.

These statistics show who wields power, what classes exercise the dictatorship in our country. We are now continuing the build-up of the new state apparatus and are preparing for the election of people's judges. Undoubtedly here, too, the working class and the cooperated peasants will predominate.

The third and last element linked with the fulfillment of the directives of the 1977 FRELIMO Congress consists of economic matters. As a result of the steps taken by our government — especially the takeover of control, or nationalization, of large factories, banks and insurance companies, the establishment of state property in land, the formation of cooperatives and communal villages, and the institution of effective control of production — the conditions have been created in Mozambique for the emergence and extension of socialist relations of production.

Socialism unfetters the productive forces, the laboring masses who, led by the working class, are the only ones capable of resolving the basic problems of development, problems of promoting social well-being. Although our people won independence not long ago, they have scored some tangible successes despite the state of war, the imperialist pressure and sabotage, provocations and economic subversion. Moreover, we have had natural disasters, especially floods. Nevertheless, it may be said with certainty that the social conditions of the people's life have improved substantially. For instance, the education system is expanding quickly. In 1975, the year Mozambique was liberated, less than 600,000 children went to school; today their number has reached 1,800,000. Significant steps have been taken to improve the health services.

Agriculture is the foundation of our economy. At present about 10 per cent of the peasants are in communal villages and cooperatives or work at state farms. But cooperative methods of production are employed to a varying degree by nearly one-third of our peasants. In recent years there have been good harvests of rice and corn, the staple products of our agriculture. The tea crop has exceeded the target set for 1980. Matters are not as good in the production of sugar on account of subversion by foreign sugar refiners. However, the activities of these companies have now been placed under state control and we expect the situation to improve soon.

Our party is optimistic about the possibilities and prospects for promoting agriculture and expanding its direct links with industry. An agro-industrial project has now been started on the Limpopo. Its area of irrigated land will be enlarged to 300,000 hectares in Gaza Province with the assistance of Bulgarian comrades. Similar projects are planned in Niassa, Tete, Manica and Cabo Delgado provinces.

In industry, which we regard as the vitalizing and decisive factor of economic development, the situation has likewise shown a considerable improvement. Some of its branches have overfulfilled the plan set for 1980, and we are confident that the same indices will be reached by all the other branches. This confidence is based, in particular, on the development of the coal industry which was for-

merly owned by foreign capital. After independence was won the former owners engaged in large-scale provocations, having recourse to economic subversion to paralyze the work of the mines. This did disrupt production there, but the miners worked hard to eradicate the effects of this subversion and coal output has now exceeded the previous level. This is a striking example of the staunchness, political awareness, and revolutionary determination of our working class.

In economic strategy our party attaches great significance to building a heavy industry as a decisive element of development. We are beginning to promote the chemical industry on the basis of coal (the output of which is to be increased) and natural gas, and we are planning to build engineering plants, especially plants manufacturing farm machinery and transport vehicles. Much attention is being given to creating metallurgical capacities for our economy. We are studying the feasibility of aluminum production, for which we have the necessary resources. Due significance is also attached to enlarging the light industry, particularly food and textile production. By and large, it may be said with confidence that despite the virtual war forced upon us by the racist Smith regime we shall make further progress in economic development and in building the material foundation of socialism.

In its foreign policy the People's Republic of Mozambique proceeds from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. As a vital element of the struggle for peace, independence and peaceful coexistence, for the deepening of détente and its conversion into the basic trend of international relations, proletarian internationalism is enshrined in the Constitution of our Republic.

In our region the issues linked with the struggle for peaceful coexistence and détente have a somewhat different dimension than in other parts of the world. Imperialism cannot ignore the existence of socialist countries in Europe, Asia and even America: it has to take into account the reality of peaceful coexistence and the trend toward détente. But in the case of our region it has not reconciled itself to the existence of Mozambique and Angola and is out to destroy us. It is using ideological, political, economic and military means in an effort to do away with the first countries in our region that have people's democratic regimes and are determined to reshape society in accordance with the principles of scientific socialism. Therefore, our struggle for peaceful coexistence and détente in the African continent faces many difficulties. We can win this struggle only if we reinforce our defense capability. We shall compel the enemy to recognize the reality of peaceful coexistence, détente and the struggle for peace in the African continent only if we are in a position to safeguard the nation's security.

In the decisions of the Third FRELIMO Congress and in the Constitution of the People's Republic of Mozambique immense importance is attached to the strengthening of relations with all communist and workers' parties, for these are fraternal parties. The same may be said of interstate relations with socialist countries, which are a dependable strategic buttress for the building of socialism in Mozambique. It must be emphasized that treaties of friendship and cooperation have already been signed with a number of socialist countries — the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and with the People's Republic of Angola. Durable friendly relations are being promoted with other socialist states as well.

At the same time, Mozambique wants good relations with all the countries of the world, regardless of their social systems. We are interested in promoting political, diplomatic, economic and cultural cooperation with foreign countries on the following principles: complete equality, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual benefit. Mozambique maintains such relations with many capitalist and developing countries.

The situation in southern Africa is a special issue. On the one hand, it is the main bastion of imperialism in our continent. But, on the other, following the proclamation of people's republics in Angola and Mozambique, it also has become the most dependable anti-imperialist bastion in Africa. In southern Africa today, the borders of Angola and Mozambique not only separate new independent states from countries with apartheid and colonialist regimes. These are also borders marking distinctions in the roads of social development. As a result of the victory of the national-liberation movement in our countries the balance of forces in this part of the world has undergone a radical change. The liberation movement in the south of the continent, particularly in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and also in South Africa, was considerably strengthened when its rear was reliably covered by our countries, which pursue a policy based on the principle of proletarian internationalism.

Imperialism has launched a series of moves to eliminate the threat to its domination in southern Africa. While persisting in its policy of terror, provocation, and aggression, it is trying to deceive the embattled peoples. What mask is it wearing today? It is vainly trying to pose as a friend of the national-liberation movement of southern Africa, as a force capable of helping it to win, and sometimes goes so far as to criticize and denounce — hypocritically of course — its traditional allies, the racist regimes in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa, while at the same time continuing to extend financial and military assistance to them. Nevertheless, these moves are evidence that the balance of strength in southern Africa has changed.

The maneuvers of the imperialists have several aims. One is to isolate the national-liberation movement from its reliable and natural allies, chiefly the socialist countries. Another is to split that movement into 'moderate' and progressive wings, destroy the latter and completely subordinate the former and use it to ensure a neo-colonialist settle-

ment. This would make it possible to preserve the capitalist structures and the political, economic and military supremacy of imperialism in the south of our continent.

However, maneuvers of this sort are doomed to failure. The liberation struggle in Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO and in Zimbabwe led by the Patriotic Front has gained considerable momentum. For instance, the Patriotic Front forces have launched military operations even in the country's capital city. They are operating in practically the whole of Zimbabwe and are in control of a part of that territory. Despite fascist violence, terror, torture and assassinations, the mass liberation movement is growing stronger in South Africa, too. All this allows us to be optimistic about the future. Unquestionably, the peoples of southern Africa will move to new successes in their anti-racist and anti-colonial struggle, which will ultimately end in complete victory.

Book reviews

DEVELOPED SOCIALISM INEXORABLY MOVES FORWARD

L.I. Brezhnev, Following Lenin's Course. Speeches, Messages of Greeting, Articles, Reminiscences, Vol. VII, Moscow, Politizdat, 1979, 672 pp.

This latest, seventh volume of Leonid Brezhnev's *Following Lenin's Course* contains speeches, messages of greeting and articles of the period from January 1978 to March 1979. They telescope the CPSU's Leninist political line, its domestic and foreign policy as laid down by the 25th Congress and subsequent CC plenums, and show the party's unbreakable unity with the people.

The works in this volume are further eloquent evidence of Leonid Brezhnev's constructive contribution to the collective work of the CPSU Central Committee, Political Bureau, and Secretariat, to the many-sided work of the party and the Soviet government.

The volume opens with Leonid Brezhnev's reminiscences *Malaya Zemlya (Little Land)*, *Rebirth*, and *Virgin Soil*, which were read widely in the Soviet Union, and in the editions brought out by foreign publishing houses attracted world public attention. These reminiscences by a direct participant in the Great Patriotic War and in postwar economic rehabilitation speak of the unparalleled heroism displayed by Soviet people led by the Communist Party and show how the communists united the people and oriented them on the fulfillment of tasks whose complexity, weight and significance went far beyond the interests solely of the Soviet Union. The reminiscences reveal the modern dimension of these tasks and draw instructive conclusions for the future.

The book gives a lucid picture of the people's creative effort in carrying out the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and analyzes what has been achieved during three years of the tenth five-year plan. Leonid Brezhnev makes the point that a key specific of the Soviet Union today is the drive for efficiency and quality. This line of the party has been adopted seriously and for a long term. This is not only the key target of the current five-year plan but also the factor determining our economic and social development for many years to come (p. 284). During the first three years of the tenth five-year plan there was a considerable enlargement and renewal of the Soviet economy's basic production assets. They increased by 195,000 million rubles, and toward the close of 1978 reached the sum of 1,000,000 million. 'This,' Brezhnev notes, 'is a very sizable addition and it is almost equal to all the basic production assets at the beginning of the 1960s' (p. 527).

The volume makes it plain that the rapid growth of the Soviet economic potential was due to the dynamic development of industry. During three years of the tenth five-year plan industrial output exceeded that of the first three years of the ninth five-year plan by 450,000 million rubles (p. 528). A fundamentally new element of Soviet economic development under the tenth five-year plan is the creation and development of a number of territorial-production complexes, notably in the country's eastern regions. In the course of three years these complexes accounted for the entire increment in the output of oil, almost the entire increment in the output of gas, and a large increment in the output of electric power, iron ore, coal, trucks and tractors (ibid.).

Leonid Brezhnev devotes much attention in his works to the problem of advancing agriculture, primarily by building up its material and technical basis. The current agrarian policy was adopted by the CPSU Central Committee at its March 1965 plenum, to which Leonid Brezhnev presented a report. This policy, the author says, is the party's Leninist strategy and tactics in agriculture under developed socialism. The documents of the 25th CPSU Congress revealed the economic and social achievements of Soviet agriculture. The Congress defined the party's tasks in agriculture under the tenth five-year plan. A new important stage in the development of agriculture was ushered in by the July 1978 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. Leonid Brezhnev's report to the plenum deeply analyzed the progress made in agriculture and put forward a well-grounded program for further advance.

Gains in the economic field have made it possible

to effect a series of new important measures for raising the people's living and cultural standards. All the measures for increasing the population's cash incomes envisaged by the tenth five-year plan for the first three years have been carried out.

Summing up the work done, Leonid Brezhnev stresses that the country has made substantial economic and social progress in three years of the tenth five-year plan. The facts given in the book show that the whole meaning and chief purpose of the party's activity is to serve the people, to see to their welfare, to raise their living and cultural standards.

The promotion of socialist democracy is a key subject of the book. Leonid Brezhnev reveals the substance and historic significance of the new Constitution of the Soviet Union and the constitutions of the Union and autonomous republics reflecting, as he points out, the most characteristic and most lasting aspects of statehood under developed socialism, of the whole system of its social relations. The USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium do much to review legislation in line with the Constitution; they steadfastly guide local government bodies and supervise law enforcement. A sound, well-considered legal system and unfailing law enforcement, Leonid Brezhnev stresses, 'are precisely what make up legality, in other words, law and order, without which the socialist way of life, socialist democracy, is unthinkable' (p. 616).

In accordance with the new Soviet Constitution, the CPSU and its Central Committee have drawn up a program to reorganize the work of government and non-governmental organizations. Its purpose, Leonid Brezhnev notes, is to ensure that 'every Soviet citizen is aware of playing a part in public affairs and is confident that his opinion and his voice are heard and taken into account in making decisions, big or small' (ibid.).

The party and the state consider it necessary to press forward their active, resolute and uncompromising struggle against every breach of legality, every attempt to stifle criticism, every instance of red tape or formalism, every bureaucratic practice. They insist on unfailing publicity in every matter, on paying greater attention to people's needs and opinions and maintaining direct, receptive contact with the masses. 'That is how the party approaches the problem,' Leonid Brezhnev stresses. 'That is how all Soviets of People's Deputies ranging from the Supreme Soviet to village and township Soviets should work' (ibid.). Such is real democracy in a developed socialist society.

The advance of science and culture and the ideological and political education of Soviet people in the spirit of communist ideals are among the important questions considered in Leonid Brezhnev's works. That is quite natural, because the realization of all of the party's plans and successful progress toward communism ultimately depend on human beings, on their knowledge, culture and level of political consciousness.

Of fundamental importance here is the decision of the CPSU Central Committee 'On Further Improvement of Ideological, Political and Educational Work' adopted on April 26, 1979. Guided by Lenin's precepts, the party combines in its ideological and educational work in-depth and conscious study of Marxist-Leninist theory by broad masses of people, and their education in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian, socialist internationalism, a communist attitude to work, social activity and attainment of high moral qualities by every citizen of the USSR. A most important result of this work is the moulding of the new citizen who has strong ideological convictions and tremendous vitality, culture, knowledge and the ability to use them.

The party, its Central Committee, and its Political Bureau headed by Leonid Brezhnev have shown constant concern for and given close attention to foreign policy. It is emphasized in the volume that in our age foreign policy, in effect, predetermines the destiny of mankind (p. 447). Indeed, Leonid Brezhnev says, whether we are to have war or sound and lasting peace is now a question of the future of the whole of human civilization, of the very existence of whole nations, and of the preservation of the material values and intellectual culture created over the centuries and millenia by the brains and hands of innumerable generations.

A further, vivid expression of the peaceful, humane policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government was the Vienna Brezhnev-Carter talks in June on strategic arms limitations (SALT-II) and the signing of the relevant treaty.

An important aspect of the party's foreign policy, Leonid Brezhnev says, is the further strengthening of the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries. The party and the Soviet government have done their utmost to develop cooperation with the forces of peace, freedom and progress, to nullify the schemes of the aggressive circles, to safeguard and deepen détente, and reliably to assure the Soviet people, our allies and friends the possibility of living and working in peace. The author emphasizes that one of the chief features of our epoch is the confident and dynamic development of the forces of peace and socialism, and the steady growth of the beneficial influence of socialism on the minds and hearts of hundreds of millions of people all over the world, and on the international situation as a whole.

In foreign policy, the Communist Party and the Soviet state have steadily pursued the Leninist line of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, of strengthening cooperation among nations on the basis of equality, scrupulous observance of and respect for their independence, and non-interference in domestic affairs. They resolutely oppose the forces of reaction and war, and give all the help they can to the liberated peoples in their fight to consolidate their freedom and national independence.

Leonid Brezhnev exposes the aggressive schemes of the forces of reaction and militarism, whose undisguised allies the Peking leaders have now become. In a speech to his constituents in the Bauman

Electoral District of Moscow on March 2, 1979, Leonid Brezhnev said that Vietnam's cause was invincible, and that the aggressor's schemes were doomed to fail. That is exactly what happened. However, despite the ignominious failure of their gamble, the Maoists have not abandoned their dangerous designs. All of this calls for more vigorous struggle against Maoist ideology and Peking's great-power ambitions. Peking's aggression is visible confirmation of the fact that Maoism has nothing in common with the theory and practice of scientific socialism and communism, with proletarian, socialist internationalism.

Leonid Brezhnev's works included in Volume Seven are a further creative enlargement of Marxist-Leninist theory. They help to gain a deeper insight into the uniformities of social development, and are permeated with historical optimism, and deep faith in the triumph of the ideas of progress, peace and socialism.

Professor *N. Kuzmin*
Senior Pro-Rector,
Academy of Social Sciences
of the CC CPSU

IN THE NAME OF FRANCE'S FUTURE

Georges Cogniot, *Parti Pris,* Vol. I, *D'une guerre mondiale a l'autre.* Paris, Editions sociales. 1976, 540 pp. Vol. II, *De la liberation au Programme commun*, Paris, Editions sociales, 1978, 583 pp.

Under the overall title *With Distinct Purpose* Georges Cogniot's memoirs cover a period of nearly three-quarters of this century. Cogniot himself calls his memoirs a book by a 'witness of the epoch,' while Raymond Guyot writes in the Preface to the second volume, published after the author's death, that Cogniot's life mirrored 'the life of his party.'

Teacher, writer, internationally known personality, member of parliament, journalist (Editor-in-Chief of *L'Humanité*), and political secretary of the French Communist Party leader Maurice Thorez, Cogniot wrote books devoted to Marx, Thorez and the Soviet Union. He wrote about problems of education, Lucrecia, Heine and Goethe. In prison during the nazi occupation he learned Arabic, and later produced an absorbing book of short stories.

Had he lived he would have celebrated his 40th anniversary as a deputy in 1976. His work in parliament was dedicated mainly to improving the education system. For more than half a century, ever since as a young teacher he became an activist of the Education Workers' International he was in the thick of the fight to improve the lot of his colleagues and of the children of proletarian families, and to introduce advanced teaching methods.

He writes that as the FCP representative in the Communist International he had the honor of working with Manuilsky and Dimitrov in 1936 and 1937. In 1969 he wrote an article on the 50th anniversary of the Communist International. 'I felt it was my duty to tell the people ... about the eventful, contrast-rich, but always glorious history' of an organization that existed nearly for 25 years. (Vol. II, p. 507).

Cogniot remained at his post in the Comintern until October 1937, the year Paul Vaillant-Couturier suddenly died, and he took over as Editor-in-Chief of *L'Humanité*. He describes Paul Vaillant-Couturier as a man of thought and social action who always combined the two callings of his life. These words may be applied in equal measure to Cogniot himself. His memoirs allow us to relive together with him the seven years between the day Hitler came to power and the day the Second World War broke out, and to draw lessons from these years. He brings back memories of those years: the Joint Action Pact in France signed in 1934 between the Communist and the Socialist Parties, the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935 which approved the People's Front strategy against fascism and war, the emergence in France of the first People's Front government and the Franco insurgency in Spain. This was soon followed by Munich. The French Communist Party emphatically denounced the Chamberlain-Hitler plans. 'The integrity of Czechoslovakia means peace,' the communists said. 'To agree to something like Sadova for Czechoslovakia means to prepare another Sedan for France' (Vol. 1, p. 408).[1]

When, nevertheless, the agreement was signed, compelling Czechoslovakia to surrender Sudetenland to nazi Germany, the Socialist leader Leon Blum expressed 'a cowardly relief' (ibid). He adopted a similar stance when the world war broke out. Late in 1939, when Admiral Darlan planned to cut the Murmansk-Leningrad railway with the help of White Guard Finns, Blum wrote in the newspaper *Le Populaire:* 'If a war between France and the Soviets can be avoided, so much the better. If not, it can't be helped' (vol. II, p. 548).

Already then it was obvious to Cogniot that 'only the USSR can smash Hitler' (Vol. I p. 385).

In 1940, as a reservist officer, Cogniot found himself in nazi captivity and because he was a communist he was sent to the Royallieu Camp near Compiègne.

On June 21, 1941 he and some friends escaped from the camp through a 48-metre underground tunnel they had dug themselves. Within a few days he joyfully embraced Jacques Duclos and Benoit Frachon. He was assigned by the party to help the Secretariat and *L'Humanité*, which was published underground. On January 21, 1943, he wrote an article headed 'Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg; Appeal of Heroes to the People of France' to mark the 200th issue of the newspaper. 'We knew,' he wrote, commenting on the event, 'that in recent weeks the nazis had to go over to the defensive everywhere. The decisive victory at Stalingrad was now close' (Vol. I, p. 493).

After France's liberation, Cogniot resumed his duties as the Editor-in-Chief of *L'Humanité*, and in the summer of 1947 he was appointed the FCP representative at the Secretariat of the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties. His international activity did not prevent him from con-

tinuing his work in France. As a deputy, he reported to the National Assembly on the draft budget for public education. Each May and June he wrote editorials regularly for *L'Humanité*, and often addressed Central Committee meetings.

In 1951 he gave all his time to party work in his own country. When seven people were killed and more than a hundred wounded (mostly Algerians) in the Place de la Nation on July 14, 1953 as a result of police provocations, Cogniot, who witnessed what had happened, spoke in the National Assembly charging the Minister of the Interior: 'The blood that was jointly shed demonstrates that solidarity is forged in struggles and sufferings. You, Messrs imperialists, are its forgers' (Vol. II, p. 385).

In 1953, after Maurice Thorez returned from the Soviet Union, where he underwent medical treatment for almost three years, Cogniot became his political secretary. This was a period of immense importance: the war in Algeria was still raging, and the CPSU held its 20th Congress.

With Distinct Purpose may be described in the words Cogniot himself used in his reviews of the best Soviet films: it 'disperses prejudice, awakens sympathy and fosters enthusiasm,' Although Cogniot ends his memoirs with the signing of the joint program (June 27, 1972),[2] noting that 'the powerful stream which has become invincible needs, naturally, to be constantly and critically reviewed,' the reader closes the book knowing that Georges Cogniot not only served his country well in the past but devoted all his energies to helping the party pave France's way into the future.

Pierre Hentges

1. In the battle of 1866 at the small town of Sadova near Hradec Kralove, Austria suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Prussia. This defeat threatened Austria's existence, and it had no choice but to sign a peace treaty with Prussia, following which the latter became the leading power in Germany. By comparing the Battle of Sadova with the defeat of the French Chalons Army by the Prussians at Sedan in 1870, Cogniot had in mind the subsequent humiliating agreements with Prussia. — *Ed.*

2. On June 27, 1972 a joint governmental program was signed between the FCP and the Socialist Party, which was soon approved at a plenary meeting of the FCP Central Committee. The program, which provided the political basis for working-class unity and for an alliance of all democratic forces in France, covered many of the economic, social, political and international problems confronting France, and, as the plenary meeting stressed in a resolution, created the conditions for powerful anti-monopoly unity among the people. — *Ed.*

ORIGINS OF THE PALESTINIAN MOVEMENT

Dr. Emile Touma, Sittuna 'aman 'ala al-haraka al-qawmiyya al'arabiyya al-filastiniyya. Matba'a al-sharq al-ta 'awuniyya. Jerusalem, 1978, pp. 274.

Among Dr. Emile Touma's many works on the Arab national-liberation movement, his *Sixty Years of the Palestinian Arab National Movement* is the first definitive study covering the period from the establishment of a British mandate over Palestine (and actually even before that) until the mid-70s. This is a chronicle of the struggle carried on by the Arab people of Palestine against colonialism and Zionism, and for liberation and independence, and the establishment of a Palestine Arab state. It is a historical work in which concrete facts and events are analyzed from the scientific, Marxist-Leninist, class angle, and which clearly shows the close connection between the Arab liberation movement in Palestine and the struggle of the other Arab countries for independence.

Considering the origins of the liberation movement of the Palestine Arab people, the author takes the reader back to the period in the 19th century when a British colonialist, Hollingworth, urged the establishment of a Jewish state on the territory of Palestine in the hope that this would help to protect the overland route to India and so tighten Britain's hold over it. This call also took into account the aspirations of the big Jewish bourgeoisie and was in line with Zionism, its reactionary chauvinist ideology and practice.

The author emphasizes that the Zionists' racist acts and policies have always been aimed at depriving the Palestine Arabs of their national home. He shows that the Zionists' acts became extremely dangerous as early as the end of the 19th century, when the settlement of Jews in Palestine and the buying up of lands there was started with the financial backing of Baron Edmond de Rothschild and other magnates. These acts were, in effect, endorsed by Britain, which occupied Palestine during the First World War, and which later issued the Balfour Declaration. The latter envisaged the establishment on Palestine lands of a Jewish national home but said nothing about an Arab state, despite the fact that at the time Arabs made up the bulk of the population (91-93 per cent). Subsequently, the text of the mandate for the British administration of Palestine, which was approved by the League of Nations in July 1922, stressed the need to create conditions for the establishment of a Jewish national home in the country and enjoined the British administration to promote Jewish immigration.

The author analyzes British colonial policy and the Zionists' aggressive and provocative activity, and reaches the conclusion that Britain's pro-Zionist stand went to benefit the leaders of Zionism, who, like M. Nordau, declared the need to allow the Zionists to become a force adequate to realizing the provisions of the Balfour Declaration (p. 12). This policy also had the backing of Arab reactionaries who were henchmen of British colonialism. At the same time, this policy aroused protests and action by the Arab part of the Palestine population, while the Arab press urged a more vigorous struggle against Zionism, a struggle which brought together Palestinian patriots and Arab nationalists outside Palestine. A national movement began to take shape in the states of the Middle East set up after the First World War, and it reflected the specific conditions and goals of each of these states.

A fresh upswing in the Arab national-liberation movement, the author says, was generated by the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution on world developments. On February 27, 1920, 40,000 Arabs marched through the streets of Jerusalem in protest against the imperialist plans to partition and occupy Palestine (p. 22). This demonstration is regarded as the start of the organized Palestine Arab movement.

The Third National Congress in Haifa on January 14, 1920, was the first step toward the establishment of a Palestinian Arab national organization. The author notes that most members of the leadership of this movement came from the families of feudal landowners, and this did not rule out the possibility of mutual understanding between them and the British colonialists. In consequence of this, the author says, a contradiction emerged within the Arab national movement in the early 20s between the forces inclined to make a deal with imperialism, on the one hand, and broad masses of peasants and workers fighting imperialism, on the other. Accordingly, a moderate and a radical trend took shape within the leadership of the movement. The Communist Party of Palestine, which consistently represented the interests of the working masses of Jews and Arabs, fought against British colonialism, Zionism and Arab feudalism.

At the end of the 20s, Zionist agencies, with the connivance of the British authorities, continued to provoke clashes between the Jewish and the Arab population amid a growing influx of Jewish immigrants into Palestine, the purchase of Arab lands, the expulsion of peasants and a sharp economic crisis. The author also lays emphasis on the fact that conciliatory trends within the traditional national leadership intensified with the growth of the revolutionary action by the masses and the extension of their struggle against colonialism.

In the 30s, action by the Palestinian people started an armed revolutionary uprising against the British colonialists. The British government responded with the most savage punitive measures, which resulted in the death of over 1,000 people (p. 167), apart from those killed and wounded in the operations to wipe out and blockade individual villages.

After the Second World War, the Palestinian Arabs resumed their struggle for their country's independence. That was the period in which the National Liberation League emerged as a union of Arab communist organizations. In early June 1946, the League took part in establishing the Supreme Arab Front, consisting of various parties and organizations. The League set itself the task of creating a patriotic movement of the Palestinian Arabs for liberation from British rule, while the Front demanded that the UN Security Council should consider the Palestine problem. It was toward the end of the war, the author says, that the United States showed a growing interest in the Middle East, including the Palestine problem.

On November 29, 1947, the UN General Assembly, having discussed the Palestine question, passed a resolution which provided for winding up the British mandate, partitioning the country and establishing two independent states: Arab and Jewish. The Soviet Union voted for the plan because it led to the extension to the Arab and the Jewish people of the right to self-determination and the establishment of their own states. This UN decision was supported by the progressive forces and the National Liberation League. But it was rejected by the Palestine national leadership and was also opposed by the Arab League countries. The author says that reactionary Arab governments were in collusion with the colonialists, who were trying to prevent the establishment of a Palestine Arab state and to divide the territory allotted to it between Israel and Jordan. On the eve of May 15, 1948, when the British mandate was due to expire, the establishment of the State of Israel was proclaimed, and on the night of May 15, the first Arab-Israeli war, broke out, which had been provoked by the imperialist powers with the help of their allies — the Zionists and Arab reaction.

Its results are well known: despite the Palestinian people's resistance, strikes and protest demonstrations, Jordan annexed the West bank of the River Jordan.* Israel occupied a part of the territory allotted to Palestine, and the author emphasizes that 'the Israeli authorities blocked every possibility for a settlement of the Palestine problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict on a just and sound basis . . . They refused to accept the proposal put forward by the Arab countries expressing a readiness officially to recognize Israel, provided the Israeli government agreed to a return of the refugees to the areas allotted to the Arabs under the partition decision' (p. 108).

Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy caused the Palestine people to unite and set up its own organizations, which subsequently provided the basis for the establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization. In 1964, a National Palestine Congress in Jerusalem decided that the PLO was the representative of the people of Palestine.

The author notes the PLO's tremendous impact in raising the level of militant action by the whole Palestinian Arab people and in winning broad international support, and sets out the stages through which the organization has gone in its development, noting the strong and weak aspects of its stand and policy in various periods. The recognition of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people by the Arab summit in Rabat in October 1974, and a decision taken by the 29th UN General Assembly Session to grant PLO observer status at the UN were tremendous achievements in this just struggle. These decisions reaffirmed that 'the Palestine problem lies at the root of the Middle East crisis, that it is the crux of the Arab-Israeli struggle, and that the crisis cannot be resolved without its solution' (p. 277).

The author gives a broad panorama of the PLO's

---

*This territory was occupied by Israel in June 1967 in the course of the six-day war. — *Ed.*

struggle for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and cites numerous facts about the plots by imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction to destroy the PLO. At the same time, the author emphasizes the PLO's readiness to set up a Palestine state that would include the West bank of the Jordan, the Gaza strip and the Arab part of Jerusalem, a state that would exist alongside the State of Israel.

Dr. Touma ends his book on a note of optimism: 'The 60 years of the Palestine Arab national movement, the wealth of experience it has gained, the heroic battles it has fought — be it in the hills of Palestine during the 1936 revolution or in the narrow streets of Tell Zaatar in the Lebanon — have welded the Palestinian people into a monolith of steel which is capable of displaying steadfastness and defending its militant organized vanguard and securing victory' (p. 282).

Zahi Karkabi

TOPICAL PROBLEMS

Rostislav Ulyanovsky. *Problems of Asia and Africa Today: Politics and Economics.* Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1978, 296 pp. (in Russian).

Professor Ulyanovsky (USSR), who has long been studying problems confronting developing countries in Asia and Africa, now concentrates on the most topical questions related to their economic, social and political advancement. This book deals with methodological problems, brings out the intransient significance of Lenin's ideas for analyzing social practices in newly-free countries, and describes the CPSU's approach to the cardinal issues of national liberation and social struggles.

Almost one-third of the book is devoted to the economic struggle waged by the newly-free countries against neo-colonialism. The author shows that the outcome of this struggle, stemming from the exploitation of the developing countries by the imperialists, is predetermined. He examines in detail the causes and worldwide implications of the energy crisis and the methods employed by the imperialist powers to adapt themselves to the new situation in which energy (oil) resources of the developed capitalist countries are being steadily depleted, while concerted action gives the raw-material producing countries increasing leverage in the shaping of equitable international economic relations.

Ulyanovsky examines a broad range of political and economic problems of key significance to the Afro-Asian world and, therefore, some of the problems are given a fragmentary assessment. However, his generalized formulation of some of the questions opens the way for their subsequent study.

As time passes since the emergence of the first newly-free states, which have been independent for decades now, the problems of the correlation between the general laws and the specifics of social development in the Orient and in Africa grow more pronounced. Today this is not merely a question of theory but an urgent issue of practical policy linked to the ideological choice and philosophical substantiation of the social orientation of various classes and forces. It is only logical therefore that this subject is now debated by scientists more and more often. Professor Ulyanovsky, too, has made a close study of some aspects of the problem (for instance, the simultaneous existence of many socio-economic structures in one and the same society). In his new book he argues against absolutizing the specifics of the Orient, let alone regarding it as something exceptional. He arrives at the conclusion that 'for all their singularity, the Eastern countries are, on the whole, developing like the Western countries . . ., that the specifics of the countries of the Orient fit into the general socio-economic pattern revealed by Marxist-Leninist science' (p. 144).

He points to many historical parallels in the development of European and Afro-Asian societies, although this does not diminish the specifics of the latter's evolution. Today a student of Asia and Africa is confronted with phenomena that are unparalleled in world history, such as the unique ways of capitalist evolution (bureaucratic state capitalism, and so on), the immense role of the middle strata, and the powerful influence of traditionalism and religion on society, on social structures and on the state. These and many other processes and distinctive features have increasingly become the object of Marxist study.

The book will, no doubt, be of interest for both specialists and the general international readership.

Rustem Sevortyan

A STIRRING CHAPTER OF FRIENDSHIP

I.I. Kuznetsov, *Khalkhyn golyn baatruud* (Heroes of Khalkhin Gol). Ulan Bator, 1978, 127 pp.

In the area of the Khalkhin Gol River 40 years ago, in August 1939, Soviet and Mongolian troops defeated an enemy who had encroached on the freedom and independence of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The invasion of the MPR was launched shortly before World War II by militarist Japan, one of the assault forces of international imperialist reaction. It was a serious test for the forces of peace and socialism. The Soviet Union went to Mongolia's aid in that hour of mortal danger. At the request of the Mongolian government, Red Army troops and a large amount of war material were rushed to the theatre of war. Outstanding Soviet generals and seasoned flyers and tankmen were sent to the MPR.

Professor Kuznetsov's book, with a preface by General D. Tsedev, draws on documentary evidence, the recollections of participants in the fighting, and other sources to describe the unfading exploits of Soviet and Mongolian soldiers.

The fighting raged for four months. It ended in the total defeat of a Japanese army of 75,000 crack

troops, over 500 pieces of artillery, 180 tanks, and between 300 and 350 aircraft.

That historic victory of Soviet and Mongolian troops safeguarded the independent statehood and territorial integrity of the MPR against imperialist Japan. Moreover, it had a sobering effect on Japan's attitude to the Soviet Union in the subsequent period, during the Great Patriotic War, and inspired the peoples of Asia to greater effort in the liberation fight against the aggressive forces of imperialism.

The Khalkhin Gol events demonstrated the solidity and vitality of Mongolian-Soviet friendship, which is based on the principles of proletarian internationalism. Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First Secretary of the CC MPRP, has pointed out the immense military and political significance of their victorious outcome. 'It confirmed the thesis,' he wrote, 'that peoples fighting for progressive ideas, for a just cause, for their power and revolutionary gains, peoples united by common goals and by bonds of fraternal friendship and mutual assistance, cannot be defeated.'

In fighting a common enemy to defend the freedom and independence of the Mongolian people, Soviet troops displayed unparalleled courage and self-sacrifice. Troops of the Mongolian People's Army fought gallantly shoulder to shoulder with them.

The exemplary feats accomplished in the Khalkhin Gol campaign won 70 Soviet soldiers (20 of them posthumously) the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. The title of Hero of the Mongolian People's Republic was conferred on nine Mongolian soldiers.

This book is part of the celebrations of the Khalkhin Gol victory going on all over the MPR. It will undoubtedly help educate the Mongolian people in the spirit of the friendship which has traditionally linked the peoples of the MPR and the Soviet Union.

Badamyn Lhamsuren

The party press

After a hiatus of 13 years, *Khalq (The People)*, the weekly newspaper of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, has resumed publication in Kabul. It is printed in the Pashtu and Dari languages. Its resumption was timed to coincide with the date of its first publication in 1966, when only six issues were printed, following which it was banned by the reactionary regime.

The first issue opens with a message of greetings from Noor Mohammed Taraki, General Secretary of the Central Committee, PDPA, and Chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council. This paper, he writes, will play an important role in the country's revolutionary transformation and the building of a new society.

P.S.

In Teheran publication has resumed of the newspaper *Mardom (The People)*, central organ of the CC, People's Party of Iran (TUDEH), which is now legalized. During the many years the party was banned the paper continued its work. It was published fortnightly abroad. At present it is a weekly but it is planned to publish two issues a week.

The first issue carried materials of the 16th CC plenum. The lead article 'Hail, the Revolution,' is dedicated to the newspaper's 37-year history. Other articles state the demands of the Iranian working class and underscore that alliance and unity among all the democratic and anti-imperialist forces participating in the country's revolutionary movement, irrespective of their ideological, political, and philosophical views, are the main condition for attaining the goals of the revolution.

H. Bahrami

Newspaper of working-class Turkey

For some time the organized working class of Turkey has had a weekly newspaper, *Savas Yolu* (The Road of Struggle). The authorities began to persecute the weekly and people associated with it as soon as it first came out. A few days after it was advertised its director, Ali Ihsan Özgür, was found dead, his body mutilated beyond recognition. The day the first issue appeared in Istanbul, hundreds of distributors were seized; police and troops raided the headquarters of a number of progressive organizations that had received the weekly. Shortly afterwards the authorities banned the weekly under the martial law imposed in some parts of the country.

Notwithstanding massive repression by the class enemy, *Savas Yolu* continues to appear. It is now published in Izmir, outside the zone covered by martial law. It joins in class struggles and links action in support of the everyday demands of the workers and other working people with struggle for a progressive, democratic Turkey and for socialism. The weekly advocates legalization of the Communist Party of Turkey, the repeal of martial law and the banning of the fascist National Action Party. Along with the class struggle of the proletariat, it covers major problems of the national democratic forces, especially of the peasants, and contributes to unity of action and the formation of a united front.

Kemal Kervan

Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

World Marxist Review

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England

Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada

Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA

New Horizon

New Horizon Publications,
14 Tamakloe/Kelani Street,
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Editions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Editions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban

Al-Thakafah Al-Jadidah,
Al-Saadoon Street,
Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Baghdad, Iraq

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckách, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

FLEMISH EDITION: Inatituut voor
marxistische vorming (IMAVO),
Stalingradlaan 18-20,
1000 Brussel, Belgique

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrief
der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,
701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR

Brücken-Verlag GmbH Literatur-Vertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papayannis Stephanos,
Menandru 66, Athens, Greece

People's Agency
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyv-és Hirlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, Fö u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya,
Punjabi and Tamil

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITION: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

RUMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia

Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR

Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A.,
Filosofia y Letras 34,
Col. Copilco Universidad,
Mexico 20, D.F., Mexico

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama

Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantaclaro, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlart, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp,
kháu sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng,
Há-Nôi, Vietnam