WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

March 1980, Volume 23, Number 3 $1.00

Greece / 45

Lenin's legacy and our day / 16

Symposium — the national question / 52

Communists and the women's movement / 61

The slide to cold war / 3

South Africa / 13

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

March 1980, Vol. 23, No. 3

Features

3 Stop the slide to cold war
J. West

8 Facing problems of the epoch
S. Gaspar

13 Racism in isolation
O. Tambo

16 110th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin. Lenin's legacy and our day
WMR correspondence round table

29 New stage of revolution
Reports by Afghanistan's mass media

Viewpoints

32 Existing socialism and its impotent bourgeois critics
J. Fojtik

37 Choice of way
A.H. Yahya

The party

41 Our aims and our course
P. Saad

45 Report at first hand
V. Moyev

Exchange of views

52 The nationalities question in developed capitalist countries
International theoretical symposium

61 The communists and the women's movement
N. Duleimi and R. Öhman

66 Capitalist rationalization strategy
M. Graber

The press

69 Book reviews

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, Guyana, 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, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, 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

Stop the slide to cold war

James West
member, Political Bureau, Central Committee, CPUSA

The international situation has been markedly complicated. The world is alarmed. How and why has this happened? What will happen now? These questions are now on everyone's mind.

U.S. official propaganda and the big business press have been working overtime to promote answers which they claim represent 'the American view.' But the view they offer is that of the U.S. ruling circles. There is another view of current world developments that is no less American and that is closer to the truth. It springs from the analysis of these developments by the communists of the United States, and below are some of our assessments and conclusions.

The Main Political Resolution of the 22nd National Convention of the Communist Party USA (held in August 1979) emphasized the need to 'reveal the truth that the primary danger to world peace and the primary threat to the movements for national liberation are the policies of U.S. imperialism.'[1] Today, this task is all the more meaningful because the bourgeois mass media have been working hard to create the impression that it is the Soviet Union that is to blame for the deterioration of Soviet-American relations and for the overall worsening of the world political climate, and that the negative turn in world politics has been caused by the entry of Soviet troops into Afghanistan.

I am not going to assess the Afghan government's decision to invite a limited contingent of Soviet troops. That is up to the Afghan comrades, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.[2] But I should like to draw attention to the fact that it is highly primitive to ascribe the current cooling of the world political climate to the Afghan situation. The cooling which threatened to freeze détente, above all in Soviet-American relations, did not start in the past few months. It was noticed long ago in the United States by many public leaders and political analysts who issued warnings about the twists in U.S. policy that jeopardized the strengthening of world peace. Take one article by Professor Fred W. Neal, Vice-President of the American Committee for Accord Between East and West, on which incidentally, we find such internationally renowned political analysts as J. K. Galbraith, Donald M. Kendall and George F. Kennan. In an article which appeared in *World Issues* in 1978, Neal gave a fairly detailed analysis to show that with the installation of Jimmy Carter in the White House the U.S. Administration began to take steps to block the policy of détente while paying lip service to it. He drew the following conclusion: 'The result has been a serious deterioration of U.S.-Soviet relations.'[3]

While the swing away from détente in U.S. foreign policy was noted even in some bourgeois circles and was a source of some concern, it definitely alarmed the country's progressive forces and forward-looking people, including a number of peace organizations and trade-union leaders. The Carter Administration's foreign policy was resolutely criticized by the U.S. communists, above all because, despite Washington's peace-loving statements, it was dangerously complicating the world situation in deference to the interests and pressures of the Pentagon and the major monopolies.

These complications have now materialized. But in the light of what has been said it is clear that if one is to establish their causes one must reckon with the Carter Administration's three-year gravitation toward formulas and modes of action more characteristic of the cold war than of détente. The President has now shelved the ratification of SALT-2, allegedly because he had been forced to do so by the Soviet Union's policy. Would it not be truer to say that this is only a continuation of the policy of dragging out the SALT negotiations, a policy Carter adopted as soon as he was installed at the White House? Let us recall that the present Administration started out by going back on the Vladivostok agreements. It is also well known that it has constantly complied with the demands of those forces in the United States that have been openly and persistently attacking any agreements with the USSR aimed at checking the arms race. Did not, for instance, the Administration toe the line of the rabid opponents of SALT-2 last fall when they tried to prevent its ratification by means of an artificially inflated 'Cuban mini-crisis?' And isn't this fabricated crisis being used to increase the U.S. military presence at Guantanamo and in the Caribbean area generally, and posing a heightened threat to Cuba and the liberation struggles there?

Just now U.S. imperialism, represented by its generals and diplomats, seeks to impose on its NATO partners a program for Western Europe's nuclear-missile rearmament. Once again, the impression is being created that the Soviet Union is to blame because of the 'preponderance' of Soviet military strength in the European theater that has supposedly come to light. Isn't it truer to say that once again an effort is being made to implement U.S. plans for escalating the military confrontation in Europe? Have the plans for developing and de-

ploying neutron weapons been so soon forgotten? Is it not logical to connect the NATO Council's December 1979 decisions on the deployment of 572 U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe with the tactics of endless delays used for many years by the Western participants in the Vienna talks on arms and troop cuts in Central Europe?

Carter has now made decisions which destroy the incipient system of healthy economic ties between the United States and the USSR. He has embargoed the export of goods already contracted for delivery in 'retaliation' against the Soviet Union. But wouldn't it be more logical to regard this as a continuation of the same old policy of U.S. imperialism, which back in 1974 was expressed in the passage by Congress of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment aimed against normalizing U.S.-Soviet economic relations?

Carter has now come up with a 'doctrine' proclaiming and justifying the extension of the U.S. military presence in the key areas of Asia, and this is once again presented as retaliation for some imaginary Soviet 'expansionism.' Wouldn't it be more correct to regard this explosion of bellicose neocolonialism as a natural continuation of the policy which led to the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, which led Washington to support the Israeli invaders, and which for years called forth all of the acts of the Pentagon, the CIA and the State Department in suppressing national-liberation movements?

Lastly, Carter has now called for a boycott of the 22nd Summer Olympic Games in Moscow, justifying this act, which is at variance with the letter and spirit of the Olympic movement, by a 'Soviet threat to peace' allegedly compelling the USA to take counter-measures. Wouldn't it be more correct to see this as yet another step along the path chosen earlier by Washington of retreating from the frontiers already reached in détente and from the commitment to assist its promotion as recorded in the Helsinki Final Act? Indeed, one needs only a modicum of objectivity to reach this simple conclusion: it is not the Soviet Union, not the socialist-community countries generally, not the forces of national liberation that are to blame for the current increase in international tension; the blame for this falls entirely on U.S. imperialism. To present the matter differently, to try to apportion the blame for the aggravation of the international situation 'equally' between the United States and the Soviet Union means to do a disservice to the cause of peace and intentionally or otherwise, to connive at imperialism's propaganda and policies.

The U.S. hawks are rubbing their hands in glee over the turn in international events. They are now also satisfied with Carter whom they had long reproached for not being 'tough' enough in foreign policy. Now, they say, he has displayed this 'toughness.' But analyzing the situation in such terms, one would have to say that the President has displayed flabbiness by his inability to stand up for his publicly expressed view and to resist pressure from those who differ from him. After all, it was Carter who said that 'peace can be won only if we have pursued it and struggled tenaciously to keep the peace all along.'[4] It was Carter the peace-maker who, when signing SALT-2 in Vienna, committed himself to being especially circumspect on issues of war and peace. Had he displayed due firmness in pursuing that policy, the current poisoning of the international situation could have been avoided.

Of course, one has to go beyond the President's personal qualities. Our party has emphasized that U.S. imperialism has continued to be expansionist and aggressive. The power of monopoly capital, the strength of militarism, the intimate interpenetration of the ties between the Pentagon, the multinationals and the top echelons of state power constitute the base to which U.S. foreign policy is closely tied. This is why it always has a tendency to imperialist diktat in international relations, a tendency that is a danger to world peace.

In his report to our 22nd National Convention, Gus Hall showed that the policy fuelled by this tendency is designed to 'stop the world' and that 'the overall direction of the policy has not changed. U.S. imperialism pushes it to the best of its ability.'[5] At the same time, the U.S. communists also reckon with the fact that there are fissures in the ruling class and accordingly, differences on foreign-policy issues. There are, as we said in the Convention resolution, circles which 'take a more realistic view of the new balance of world forces, and seek ways of adjusting to it. They are for policies of détente and trade.'[6] There is also the pressure from the public, the masses, for whom there is naturally no question of what is more important: world peace or monopoly profits? In short, forces operating in the United States are capable, if not of eliminating the prevailing foreign-policy tendency of imperialism, then at least of hampering its expressions and even forcing the authorities in Washington to take steps to get around it.

It is the maze of these contradictory influences on U.S. foreign policy that constitutes the fundamental cause of its glaring inconsistency and ambiguity of approach to the basic international issues in the late 1970s, above all to détente, the Soviet-American dialogue and cooperation. That is not an expression of some conflict between 'toughness' and 'flabbiness,' but between a sober view of world realities and a wild urge to satisfy at any price the narrow class interests of monopoly capital. For a long time, neither side in this conflict managed to gain the upper hand. By the beginning of the 1980s the situation has changed and one has to note with regret that the most conservative, right-wing forces have the preponderance.

So, why has the edifice of détente been shaken? It has been shaken because the influence of the most reactionary, militaristic wing of the monopoly bourgeoisie has got the upper hand on the top levels of government decision-making. But then another question inevitably arises: what has caused this shift in the balance of forces which determine U.S. foreign policy? Let me try to answer it as well.

It is, of course, impossible to consider and

analyze all the causes in a short magazine article, but the main points can be brought out.

First, there is the role of class fear which is common to all the monopoly bourgeoisie, to all its political spokesmən, in face of the inexorable world revolutionary process. The imperialist circles have panicked at the growing strength of the world socialist community, the broad social and political offensives by the working people and the democratic, left-wing forces in the capitalist countries and the series of major victories scored by the national-liberation movement.

In the mid-1970s, U.S. imperialism suffered a heavy defeat in Vietnam. From this a part of the ruling class drew the sober conclusion that it was futile to pursue a policy relying on armed intervention, on armed force as an instrument for suppressing national-liberation movements. The advocates of this view also relied on the conviction, which had earlier spread among the American people through the militant action of the massive peace movement that there should be no more Vietnams and that the United States should give up the idea of policing the world. Official U.S. foreign policy was influenced by these views and attitudes. At any rate, the arguments of the most bellicose wing of the monopoly bourgeoisie urging open U.S. intervention to stop revolutionary developments in Angola, Ethiopia, Iran and Nicaragua did not have a crucial influence on U.S. policy.

That was the situation up until the late 1970s, when the erstwhile realists in the bourgeoisie began to yield their positions. Blinded by the fear of the rapidly mounting revolutionary changes in the world, they began to forget the logic of their own reasoning. Fear, it is said, is a bad counselor, but fear is what began increasingly to possess the thinking of the political representatives of the U.S. ruling class, both 'hawks' and 'doves.'

They reacted most painfully to the revolution in Iran in a mixture of emotions: fear of losing a rich source of oil, fear of losing face through inability to rescue the shah, a loyal ally, the prospect of billions of dollars in military and other 'aid' to Iran going down the drain, and bitterness over the loss of a strategic bridgehead close to the Soviet border. It so happened that U.S. imperialist circles managed through massive media manipulation to convince many sections of the American people that their fear of the consequences of the Iranian revolution was concern for U.S. national interests and dignity. Accordingly, the case of the hostages in Tehran was overdramatized. Profiting by the fact that the detention of the U.S. Embassy personnel was in obvious violation of the Vienna convention on diplomatic relations, everything was done to create an atmosphere of chauvinistic hysteria. The most reactionary, militarist circles had the far-reaching aim of ridding American society of the 'Vietnam syndrome' and preparing it psychologically for a return to the policy based on saber-rattling and overt use of armed force. In this they had some success and the influence of the 'hawks,' the advocates of the 'tough' foreign policy, sharply increased.

Second, the growing resistance to détente on the part of the military-industrial complex was a factor working for the change in the balance of forces determining U.S. foreign policy.

It has been frequently and fairly noted that up to now none of the Administration's peaceful gestures, none of its steps to normalize relations with the Soviet Union prevented the build-up of the U.S. military arsenal, the increase in government spending on armaments and consequently the growth in the profits of the arms monopolies. The Carter Administration for instance, has never stopped short of going back on its own promises or acting contrary to the principles it had itself enunciated in order to promote the interests of these monopolies. Thus, Carter's electoral promises to cut the arms budget were soon forgotten. Instead, there is now a five-year program providing for an increase in inflation-discounted military spending by more than 4.5 per cent a year. Just before leaving for Vienna to sign SALT-2 Carter found it necessary to soothe the arms manufacturers by deciding to develop and deploy the MX missiles.

Still, the advance of détente was constantly a source of grave concern for the military-industrial complex and that was a matter of profits running to billions of dollars. For instance, the program for manufacturing only three types of weapons (the Trident sub, the MX missile and the MX-1 tank) assures it of contracts worth over $75 billion. Monopolists in the military-industrial complex have naturally no fear of losing these and many other contracts under adopted programs. But what about the future? What if SALT-2 were ratified? The answer is there. Congressional estimates of the rise of military spending with the defeat of SALT-2 range from $50 to $60 billion. This means that from the standpoint of the military-industrial complex those are roughly the losses it could incur if the treaty were ratified.

It is highly indicative that the New York Stock Exchange instantly reacted to Carter's January blows at détente with a marked shift in stock prices favoring military-related industrial groups.

That is one more reason why by the end of the 1970s, and especially after the Vienna meeting, the military-industrial complex intensified its unrelenting activity aimed to frustrate détente and to have its own interests prevail in Washington.

Third, the positions of the opponents of détente were bolstered by exploiting the build-up of crisis phenomena, the growth of inflation and unemployment in the United States and other capitalist countries. It is the traditional method of imperialism to seek a way out of socio-economic contradictions by aggravating the international situation. The U.S. ruling class has resorted to it now, once again, when all the indications are that the country's economy, still laboring under the upheavals of the 1970s, is heading for another depression.

The cry of 'national emergency' is being used to

demand a cold war-type unity on the home front, to force the trade unions to retreat, to crack down on strike struggles for higher wages, and to demand sacrifices and to impose the draft of young men into the armed forces.

In Western Europe, the end of the past decade was marked by a political shift to the right in a number of countries, notably Great Britain where the Conservative government, acting the loyal junior partner of U.S. imperialism, has been front-running for Washington. The most reactionary forces of the United States took this as a signal for mounting their own offensive. The Administration was unable to withstand their demand to make use of the opportunity presented by the West European shift to the right for stepping up NATO's activity, for building up the military strength of that aggressive bloc.

Fourth, the playing of the 'China card' has yielded its natural results. Gus Hall hit the nail on the head when he said that 'it (Maoism) is basically anti-national liberation, anti-socialist and anti-working class.'[7] The rapprochement with a partner like the Peking leadership naturally increased the stock and influence in Washington of the political circles which, like the Maoists, are possessed by great-power, hegemonistic aspirations and regard world problems only through the prism of anti-Sovietism and a militaristic haze. It is well known for example, that Carter's National Security Adviser, Brzezinski, like the Maoists, minimizes and dismisses the disastrous consequences of using atomic weapons.

Finally, there was the politics of the electoral campaign. Bourgeois contenders for the White House are well aware that, as yet the military-industrial complex holds one of the main keys to success and that one's chances are markedly reduced by its displeasure. Let us recall that Carter was constantly accused of lacking 'toughness' by those who are close to the Pentagon and the arms makers. While that is to be regretted, it could explain why his acts did not reveal the policy of a President taking a responsible approach to the national interest and the maintenance of world peace, but rather of a Presidential candidate expecting support from influential behind-the-scenes forces.

It is the combination and interaction of these diverse factors that has, I believe, produced a situation in which the checks on the development of the inherently imperialist aggressive-militaristic trend in U.S. foreign policy have markedly decreased.

Our Party emphasizes that as long as U.S. foreign policy is directed against the revolutionary renewal of the world a number of results will follow: 'the world will continue to face the danger of war and nuclear catastrophe. The war budget, the taxes and inflation will continue to escalate. Anti-Sovietism and attacks on Cuba and other socialist countries will continue to be front-page items in the mass media. The U.S. will continue to support all the decaying, reactionary, fascist, militaristic regimes and counter-revolutionary forces around the world.'[8] But that does not mean that so long as U.S. imperialism exists it is impossible even to consider the strengthening of world peace and the security of nations. We do not at all support this ultra-left idea that efforts for détente are futile, an idea which is basically being plugged by the right-wing forces.

Indeed, what is now the political philosophy of the opponents of détente? One will easily discover three main lines of argument.

The first is that détente is an empty concept, a formula of words without body that has no place in the realities of world politics. An effort is being made to prove that détente never existed, that it was only a figure of speech used to cover up the growing confrontation of states with opposite social systems.

The second is that détente, a recent political reality, has now disappeared for good. The leading newspapers of the United States and Western Europe abound in headlines like 'End of Détente,' 'Cold War II Starts,' and so on. Hence, the gloomy forecasts in which there is no place for healthy international life based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Finally, the third line of argument recognizes détente in the past, denies it in the present and allows for its revival in the future, a possibility depending on a 'change in the behavior of the Soviet Union.'

How valid are these conclusions?

The nations of the world and among them of course, the people of the United States, who have gone through the hysteria and repression of the cold war, will never agree that détente is no more than a set of stock phrases. The contractual and political structure of détente provided an effective basis for restructuring the relations among states with different social systems. The more than a score agreements constituting the treaty basis for developing cooperation between the United States and the USSR provided a real opportunity for substituting a system of mutually advantageous ties and contacts for hostility in Soviet-American relations. Détente has tangible results in Europe. Of course, some regard the Helsinki Final Act as no more than a scrap of paper, but it is actually a document recording the profound change in European and world political realities. The mass awareness in the 1970s of the fact that the threat of a world war has been pushed back gave a new quality to the life of billions of people all over the world.

Of course, the development of détente has never been without conflict and has never attained the point of an international political idyll. A great deal has been done but many outstanding and highly complicated problems remain. Still, to deny or scrap the achievements of détente is to display a total lack of political realism. Let us recall in this context that Carter's attempt in January to start a crusade against détente did not meet with the support Washington had expected on the part of its allies, nor does he have the complete support of his allies for many of his most recent anti-Soviet proposals. The bourgeoisie did display its international class solidarity but not to the extent of forcing the

ruling circles of West European and other capitalist countries to blindly follow U.S. imperialism in defiance of the results of the long effort to consolidate peace.

Those who have been shouting about the end of détente clearly engage in wishful thinking. Détente is in difficulties but in the contemporary world the supporters of the policy of peaceful coexistence definitely prevail over its opponents. They are not equally consistent or resolute, but the idea that détente is the only reasonable alternative to a world nuclear conflagration unites them and turns them into a mighty political force capable of checking imperialism's aggressive militaristic encroachments on world peace. That, one might say, is the subjective factor operating for the maintenance and development of détente.

There is also an objective aspect of the matter. It is that the policy of détente has deep roots in the socio-economic structure of the contemporary world and in its balance of class forces. It emerged—and could have emerged—only when the world positions of imperialism were substantially weakened and when socialism became a major force of international life. The edifice of détente has for its foundation the success of communist and socialist construction in countries in Europe, Asia and America, the revolutionary gains of the peoples of the erstwhile colonies and semicolonies, the unprecedententedly increased political weight of the international working class and the forces of democracy and social progress. Because of this it is absurd to say that the policy of peaceful coexistence has no prospects before it. History marches on. It does not retreat. It cannot return to the time when imperialism dominated the world and made world war fatally inevitable.

But while it is absurd to claim that détente has no future, it is equally wrong to hold that international life will of itself be stabilized on the principles of peaceful coexistence in virtue of say, the common fear of war. That is a widespread delusion and the current acts of U.S. imperialism show how dangerous it is. These acts provide a fresh reminder that peace has to be consolidated through tireless anti-imperialist struggle, with more and more efforts aimed to check reaction politically and to expose its ideological moves.

Right now one big problem, the U.S. communists say, is to help the masses realize how far it is from the truth for imperialist propaganda to claim that the U.S. ruling class and the U.S. Administration bear no responsibility for the future of détente. We believe it to be exceptionally important for people to realize that what is necessary for the peaceful development of international life is not a 'change in the Soviet Union's behavior,' but a struggle for an overhaul of the basics of U.S. foreign policy so as to align them with the objective world realities.

In the United States, the mass media do not consider it necessary that Americans should give thought to the substance and significance of the peace programs of the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU or to ponder and independently to evaluate the numerous constructive proposals of the USSR, like those made by Leonid Brezhnev in Berlin in October 1979. A great effort is being made to present the Soviet Union as an international trouble-maker. This is being done with the obvious aim of covering up and justifying the overt and covert aggressive acts of U.S. imperialism in the world arena, where it has never learned to act otherwise than with a police truncheon. This is a matter of the thief shouting 'stop, thief!' to distract attention from his own plunder.

In assessing the prospects for international development in the 1980s, the U.S. communists share the optimism which Leonid Brezhnev expressed on behalf of the CPSU and the Soviet people. We have no doubt, as he put it, that the policy of détente has every chance of remaining the leading trend in relations among states.

We have no illusions. It is not easy to change the existing balance of forces which influence U.S. foreign policy. But one should not assume that this cannot be done at all. Our 22nd National Convention said that 'the pressures for a change in the direction of U.S. foreign policy are growing.'[9] The pressures are still there. They will be even stronger tomorrow. At any rate, our party will spare no effort to increase them so as to avert a return to the cold war.

1. *The Struggle Ahead: Time for a Radical Change!*, New York, 1979, p. 43.
2. See 'New Stage of Revolution. Review of Reports by Afghanistan's Mass Media' in this issue p. 29
3. *World Issues*, April-May, 1978
4. *The New York Times*, June 19, 1979.
5. Gus Hall, *Labor Up-Front in the People's Fight Against the Crisis*, New York, 1979, p. 18.
6. *The Struggle Ahead: Time for a Radical Change!*, p. 12.
7. Gus Hall. *Labor Up-Front in the People's Fight Against the Crisis*, p. 19.
8. *The Struggle Ahead: Time for a Radical Change!*, pp. 11-12.
9. *The Struggle Ahead: Time for a Radical Change!*, p. 43.

Citizenship of the USSR

A legal study

Cloth, $4.25, 290 pages

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario Canada M5V 2P6

Facing problems of the epoch

Sandor Gaspar
President, World Federation of Trade Unions,
General Secretary, All-Hungary Council of Trade Unions

Our time sets every mass movement committed to the struggle for a better life, freedom and democracy a number of key tasks on whose fulfillment the very future of mankind depends. They may be listed as averting a new world war, promoting peace, curbing the arms race and using the resources and labor it involves for peaceful purposes, for the solution of global energy, ecological and other problems, combating the disastrous effects of the deepening capitalist crisis, fighting against reaction and racism, and striving for social progress and higher standards of living. The problems that crop up in this connection also confront the trade unions.

None of us has the philosophers' stone. Neither individuals, nor the trade unions of any country can claim that they alone have the answer to the highly intricate questions of our time. Nor is this answer simple at all, for one must not only choose a goal but convince the masses that this choice is correct, find the requisite forms and methods of action and chart the road to the goal. This is why I will only deal with some aspects of the contemporary trade union movement, without attempting to encompass all its problems.

The trade union movement has become an important part of politics. It influences home and foreign policy and in turn, is influenced by it. The growing world role and impact of the unions may rightly be described as historic. What has brought about this growth?

There would appear to be several fundamental factors behind the changes taking place in the world trade union movement. To begin with, the trade unions of the socialist countries have won greater influence. They constantly perfect their work to meet the development needs of socialist society. New fruitful forms of cooperation, solidarity and unity are developing between the trade unions of the various socialist countries. The contacts between them cover their entire activity. Their cooperation is based on common interests and objectives, primarily the effort to consolidate the working people's power and build a developed socialist and a communist society. The trade unions of the socialist countries take the most diverse actions and use every form to strengthen the unity of the international trade union movement, doing this most consistently. This undoubtedly earns them the esteem of the trade unions of other countries and strengthens the positions of the movement as a whole.

Secondly, the position of the trade unions has changed in the capitalist countries as well. Their activity increasingly ranges beyond the bounds of the so-called classical trade union movement, that is of struggle for only the economic needs of labor. Today the unions also try (if in different ways — I am not making any specific assessments but merely stating a fact) to win such demands as participation in the management of enterprises and the right to a say in decision-making on the country's destiny. Besides, they concern themselves with the workers' cultural requirements and education more than ever before and seek the place they must hold in the struggle for peace, disarmament and reconversion. A new development in the activity of some trade unions of France, Italy, Portugal and other countries is that they are working out constructive action programs, often on socialist lines. Needless to say, this new quality has not come of itself. It is a result of a gradual realization of the fact that the classical forms of trade union activity no longer meet the exigencies of the struggle, the requirements of the masses or progressive social aspirations. The workers and other working people are growing more militant, showing greater readiness to fight for their rights and interests. It is also important that nowadays power in some developed capitalist countries passes frequently to socialist and social democratic parties. In election campaigns they rely on trade unions led by the social democrats, and this in turn offers the unions new opportunities to influence government policy directly or indirectly, which both extends the range of their duties and adds to their responsibility.

Lastly, we are witnessing and taking part in a phenomenon so vastly important to the whole international trade union movement as the formation and rapid growth of trade unions in developing countries. This process is far from painless everywhere. The nature of the unions that spring up varies and so does their social standing. In some developing countries they are compelled to win and uphold their rights in bitter struggle entailing great sacrifices. Even so, we have good reason to say that the youngest trade union contingent, heterogeneous though it may still be, already plays an important and increasing role in the struggle for the interests of the workers of its countries and has entered the international arena. This has considerably strengthened the world trade union movement while at the same time facing it with certain new and specific tasks, both in the struggle against diverse forms of neo-colonialism, for complete na-

tional and economic independence and a new, just economic order, and in the vocational training of cadres, education, culture and other spheres.

Other contingents of the world trade union movement have problems of their own. Our worker brothers and their unions in capitalist countries use economic and political means in their stubborn class struggle against unemployment and the omnipotence of monopoly. They defend the rights they have won and seek an extension of these rights. They insist on the right of labor to participate in the shaping of its own destiny. We know that this is a difficult, complicated and in some cases, grim struggle.

The workers and trade union organizations of the socialist countries have other problems. These are neither unemployment, nor social insecurity; they stem from the fact that some tasks in building a socialist society have not yet been accomplished. Nor could they have, for it is a young society. However, even today this society guarantees its members lasting security and a life fit for man. This is an achievement that rightly appeals to workers and progressives all over the world.

The distinctive nature of the tasks arising from the social and economic conditions, national peculiarities, or development level of a country should not make us forget that the fundamental interests of the workers of the world coincide and that their defense is a common responsibility of the trade unions. Wherever the workers live — whether in a socialist, capitalist or developing country — they have an equal stake in peace. They want durable security, a guaranteed right to work, equitable remuneration, rest and recreation, health protection and education. They want to see their children live in a happy, socially just world. Lastly, well aware of their responsibility to the present and future, they also want to take part in deciding on the development paths of the world, to build and control it.

In short, the basic interests of the workers of the world coincide and are inseparable. This is why the trade unions of countries with different social systems are faced with problems that are similar or even identical. Now that imperialist reaction has plainly begun a new round of its campaign against the workers of its own and other countries (a campaign coordinated both at the level of transnational monopolies and at government level — witness the latest NATO decisions which promise the people missiles and bombs instead of bread, jobs, schools, homes and hospitals), the trade unions cannot do without one another's experience and backing, without coordinating their positions and action in the interest of better, more expedient representation and defense of the interests of labor.

The question is often asked whether fruitful cooperation between trade unions of different orientations or trade unions of countries with different social systems is possible at all. I think it is not only possible but necessary. Solving the key problems of our epoch depends on unity of the international working-class movement and within it, on the extent to which international trade union unity can be strengthened and its goals and activities coordinated. The experience of 1945, when a common trade union organization was founded in a world that was anything but homogeneous, shows that it is realistic to approach the issue in this way. However, it also shows that it is not easy to achieve unity; the road to organized unity during World War II led through unity of action and the formulation of common political goals in the fight against fascism. But afterwards the bourgeoisie contrived with help from reactionary trade union leaders in capitalist countries to bring the various contingents and groups of workers into opposition against each other and to split the international trade union movement. It published numerous anti-Soviet, anti-socialist, and anti-communist fabrications to persuade the workers of the capitalist world that some of their union leaders acted rightly by refusing to cooperate with communist-oriented trade unions and the unions of the socialist countries.

However, the situation has changed in many respects and goes on changing. More and more, the masses realize that ideological divergences are no obstacle to trade union unity at the national or international level. The workers learn gradually by experience that when someone attacks the socialist world, this attack is also directed against them no matter where it comes from, that bourgeois slander against the socialist countries and their trade unions always turns out to be directed against the working class and trade unions of one's own country, and that every trade union organization and every contingent of the trade union movement which takes a stand against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for tactical reasons or under the influence of bourgeois propaganda stops serving the workers' class interests. More and more often, reality compels trade union organizations and centers of different political and ideological orientations to bear in mind that all trade unionists are members of one class and so cannot dispense in their struggle with the tremendous strength of international solidarity.

By organizing joint or parallel actions, trade unions of different orientations, backed by the strength of hundreds of millions of organized workers, fight much more effectively than in the past for the maintenance of peace and security in Europe and the world. Joint actions help to defend the vital interests of labor more effectively and to promote and implement democratic and trade union rights and freedoms.

The growing division of labor, for its part, brings into life many new features, fostering closer cooperation between trade union organizations both in the various countries or groups of countries and between different socio-economic systems. This is as it should be, for economic relations more and more often go beyond national frontiers. There are now many instances where West European enterprises cooperate with enterprises of a socialist country. This trend of economic relations leads to an expansion of cooperation between labor and its

unions although even here certain difficulties understandably arise.

In the nearly 35 years since it was founded, the World Federation of Trade Unions has consistently championed unity of the international trade union movement. Now as in the past, it considers that differences in social system and ideology are no hindrance to cooperation between trade unions. While the trade unions are class organizations expressing political, economic and ideological views of the given class, ideological distinctions are not an insurmountable obstacle to unity. Communists, social democrats and members of other political parties, believers, atheists and others can cooperate productively in one and the same trade union organization, center or federation (as experience has shown). This also applies to the international activity of the trade unions. Controversies may certainly arise in an organization or center or throughout the international trade union movement. But if those involved in the debate display a spirit of mutual tolerance, show no bias and do not allow the debate to assume a hostile character, it will never result in a split. Indeed, it will lead to more effective representation and defense of the workers' interests and trade union rights and to better fulfillment of our common tasks, both today and in the future. Polemics or even competition are quite proper. There will be no losers in such a competition; in fact it will only benefit the international working class. It is thus vital to renew the struggle for international trade union unity.

Of course, this does not mean renouncing what has been achieved or ignoring experience gained over many years. On the contrary, to renew the struggle for unity implies that we must determine the substance and aims of our joint actions with the greatest accuracy and clarity, and in areas where the workers' principal interests coincide agreement must be reached on specific actions at the international level and the obstacles to our unity must be removed. Realizing this and upholding this point of view, the WFTU has worked in the past and will do its utmost in the future to advance the cause of our unity and organization throughout the world.

The conditions for the growing cooperation among international trade union centers of different orientations have been developing ever since 1970, as a result of closer relations between them. In January 1974, following years-long preparations, the leaders of the major European trade union centers met for the first time; Geneva played host to the first European Trade Union Conference in 1975, to the second in 1977 and the third in 1979. The significance of these conferences, whose work has involved diverse international trade union centers — the WFTU, ICFTU, CGT — goes, of course, beyond the European continent.

The same period witnessed the beginning of regular talks between the WFTU and CGT. The WFTU, CGT and ICFTU now cooperate more and more at the annual ILO conferences.

The WFTU sees one of its duties arising from international working-class solidarity in contributing to the growth of the trade union movement in developing countries, its consolidation and its success in fulfilling its tasks and in striving for complete national and economic independence. It cooperates systematically with the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions and the Standing Congress of Trade Union Unity of Workers of Latin America. We support the struggle of the trade unions of developing countries on the international scene. True to the internationalist traditions of the working class, we share with them the political and methodological experience gained by the international movement.

The WFTU attaches extraordinarily great importance to every meeting with other trade union centers. We know that those who attend these meetings are not always entirely satisfied with their results, with the exchange of views that takes place. But it is up to us, representatives of trade unions of different orientations, to assure the success of our common cause. We are often like distant relatives who get together only on rare occasions and know little about one another's troubles, problems and joys, talk on neutral subjects, recall days long gone, or do not talk at all. Also, we often talk with one another somewhat perfunctorily, avoid issues of interest to all or fail to discuss them as we ought to. There is a need for greater courage in raising questions and for greater mutual confidence. For instance, we should look into the factors determining the character of this or that trade union. This could be done in the form of an unconstrained and frank exchange of opinion. Given common interest, we could also discuss, for the benefit of all, subjects such as prices, wages, living standards, industrial democracy and the tasks of trade unions in the matter of meeting the workers' cultural needs. This would give us a better insight into one another's concerns, ideas and aspirations, and bring us closer to our common goal, which is to serve the cause of the workers and other working people of both Europe and other regions more effectively.

In view of the latest Pentagon and NATO plans for the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and Carter's decision to put off the ratification of SALT-2, it would be particularly relevant to evolve a common policy in the struggle against the arms race. This matter is unquestionably complex. Different trade union organizations and centers often differ in attitude or even hold contrary views. Nevertheless, a platform for united action can be found if we proceed from the real interests of labor and show sufficient patience, mutual confidence and impartiality.

It might be useful to touch on yet another problem that has a direct bearing on the struggle for trade union unity. Many people contend that as there are numerous points on which opinions meet and hence numerous similar or even identical tasks, the trade unions of the socialist and capitalist countries alike should work by identical methods. Our critics constantly equate the difficulties encountered by the trade unions under capitalism and socialism. They would like the workers of capitalist and de-

veloping countries to believe that under socialism the trade unions do not uphold the interests of labor and are subservient to the party and state apparatus. This prompts me to deal with certain basic differences in the work of trade unions under socialism and capitalism.

I believe trade union functionaries are well familiar with the meaning of the terms *employer* and *worker*. Under capitalism, the employer is a capitalist, whose class, state and political parties defend his interests. Hence, it is only fair and understandable that in capitalist countries most trade unions proclaim and strive to maintain their independence from the bourgeois state and bourgeois parties. In these countries the slogan of independent trade unions implies that the unions want to act in complete freedom from the capitalist system in defending the interests of labor. It is contended that the unions could acquire an equal measure of independence from the socialist state and the communist party. But what would be the real meaning of this slogan? Under socialism, it is the workers themselves, all working people, that are the employer. They are the owner and employer whom everyone else—the parties, the government and the trade unions—serve. The latter can only do what the working class demands, appreciates and supports. If in these circumstances the unions posed themselves against party and state this would mean that they would no longer be serving the class that brought them into being and for which they live and work. This is why we say that under socialism the trade unions are autonomous and not independent politically or legally.

I need hardly note that in the socialist countries as well, the trade union movement has its difficulties and problems. It must be borne in mind that it was slightly more than three decades ago that most trade union organizations of the socialist countries, drawing on the experience of the Soviet trade unions, began to function in a situation in which power had passed to the working class. We can now say that Hungary's trade unions are structured on essentially socialist principles. But we stress time and again that while we have laid the foundations, we have yet to build the edifice. It would be wrong therefore, to consider that the building is completed and on these grounds to demand every amenity. Besides, socialist society is developing continuously. Even under working-class rule, with the trade unions enjoying broad rights and manifold possibilities, we cannot always find the right form of participation in socialist construction. This breeds mistakes and an occasional conflict. No human weakness is alien to us. Bureaucratic practices too, often prevent us from fulfilling our tasks in time. Much harm is done by irresponsibility, carelessness and neglect. Still, we say to our critics: come and look. You will see for yourselves that our workers' life differs considerably from that of the workers of capitalist countries. It is better even though some workers in one or another developed capitalist country for the moment have a higher living standard than our workers. Come and you will see how this young, really existing and developing socialism has far surpassed the most developed capitalist state, for it gives and holds the promise of giving the workers infinitely more than capitalism can. It also creates qualitatively new conditions for trade union activity.

In Hungary as in other socialist countries, the trade union movement is autonomous and no decision can be made without it on either national issues or matters relating to any given enterprise. The working class influences through the unions socio-economic planning at the level of enterprise, industry and country.

Under socialism, nobody and nothing limits the free formation of trade unions. They are strong public organizations of socialist society that have material means and political and legal possibilities. They have become an influential partner of the political and economic leadership. Their attitude to socialist power and the socialist state has acquired a new form.

The trade unions of the socialist countries have to answer thousands of new questions. We learn severally and collectively to find answers to them and to solve problems as they arise. Some of these problems concern the development of socialist democracy. The trade unions are among those responsible for the creation of forums of industrial democracy. We are largely responsible for training the masses in the management of enterprises and the country; initiate them into the mechanism of management and in the process they learn to think and act with a sense of responsibility. Workers' participation in decision-making is a most important condition for our progress. They have rights in this sphere but this is not enough. We must perfect the forms and methods of exercising these rights. Society as a whole must be advanced in such a way as to ensure that its inner demand for democracy steadily grows and that people know how to exercise their rights in increasing measure and moreover, consider this their duty.

The trade unions' activity on these lines is particularly important because nearly all workers are members of one or another union. Trade union life has become a vast field in which people are initiated into the ways of leadership. On the one hand, workers in trade unions learn to lead big and small collectives and, on the other, to exercise this leadership. People are not born as socially conscious and well-educated individuals, not even under socialism. They only become publicly active as a result of participation in their country's everyday life.

We have repeatedly stressed (because we consider repetition useful) that in a socialist society, as a party to power the trade unions are a component of power which the government of no socialist country can dispense with in any weather, 'fair' or 'foul,' when the support and solidarity of the masses and their active participation in the solution of the country's problems are particularly necessary. A government really expressing the interests of its people cannot take proper account of the opinion of

the masses and encourage their activity in adequate measure without help from the trade unions. This is why, seeing how the Hungarian government constantly extends the opportunities for the unions' participation in the management of the country, we say that it proceeds not only from socialist principles but from a necessity it is well aware of.

The trade unions help solve all problems of social development by their own distinctive means. And while they naturally cooperate in socialist countries with government bodies, there often arise differences of opinion that lead to controversies.

What is the origin of these controversies? We can assure our critics from the outset that what we have in our countries is not clashes of the antagonistic interests of hostile classes. The reason for controversy is that even socialist development is not free of contradictions. In many respects, we are still at the stage of renewal and quest. We want for example, to develop a modern socialist economy in Hungary but we cannot always find a short cut to it. Enormous funds are needed to develop industry, agriculture, science, technology and culture. Yet our conditions do not always enable us to bear this burden. The country's raw material and energy problems are growing. It is with difficulty and at increasing prices that we acquire raw materials and energy. The situation is made worse by the impact of the crisis of the world capitalist economy—an impact which also affects us—and occasionally by the weak points of our own effort. In these circumstances, economic executives and government officials do not always take account of every suggestion of this or that group of workers for a number of objective and subjective reasons when dealing with problems of various enterprises or of society as a whole. I must say it is sometimes these people who prove to be right. But on other occasions it is the trade unions that are right. In such cases, we are convinced that the unions should engage in an open polemic if necessary. However, it should not be forgotten that the unions and the socialist state are in the same harness. If either of us stops and does nothing but argue or if he pulls obstinately in the direction and at the speed he considers optimal, the carriage will hardly reach its destination. Differences between government and economic bodies and trade unions are likely. They develop once in a while and debates produce correct solutions. We seek these solutions carefully, seeing to it that while we are doing so life does not come to a standstill.

The unions take a constructive stand on problems of socialist society because they have an excellent knowledge of the nature of this society and as representatives of the interests of labor bear their share of responsibility for their solution in common with the government and other leading agencies.

This is the basis for the conviction of the socialist countries' trade unions that such forms of struggle for the workers' rights as boycotts and strikes—forms which have developed under capitalism—cannot lead under socialism to the set goal and may even prove harmful. We know that socialism is a society in which the economy has yet to rise to a communist level. We still lack conditions for satisfying all requirements. Even when meeting the workers' justified interests, we must always think of the objective possibilities at our disposal. In this situation, a boycott or strike would upset the process of building socialism and communism and slow down the creation of conditions for meeting the working people's requirements to a growing extent.

This is why they put the emphasis not on confrontation with state power but on effort to ascertain each other's interests, decide on mutually acceptable conditions for meeting them and provide these conditions. This activity may seem less noticeable than, say, the strike movement in capitalist countries. It may even create the wrong impression that in socialist countries the trade unions are passive and make no effort to defend the workers' interests. The fact is however, that they are very active, except that their methods differ entirely from those of the trade unions in capitalist countries.

We do not deny that the trade unions of the socialist countries are not yet entirely equal to the historic tasks set them by the epoch. I believe that the trade union movement in capitalist countries, for its part, has by no means solved all the problems of the struggle for the working people's interests. Does this mean that we must oppose the trade unions of the socialist and capitalist countries to each other or equate the difficulties encountered by them? Of course not; it only implies that a common problem facing all unions is to develop new ways of serving the workers' interests more effectively.

What has enabled the international trade union movement to sustain its dynamic strength in the course of a whole century? First of all, the fact that this movement serves man, is steadfast in struggle and is loyal to the tried and tested ideals of international working-class unity and solidarity. Internationalism has always been a guarantee of success for the trade union movement. National interests are important of course, and no nation can renounce them. But internationalism does not come into conflict with them. In fact, as we know from history, it allows giving full expression to national interests because no matter how markedly the tasks and methods of the struggle of the working class differ in everyday life, this struggle is by its very nature, both national and internationalist. This explains why service in the cause of the working class does not admit of national narrow-mindedness and selfishness. Internationalism has lost none of its significance. What has changed is the situation, for the enemies of labor have come to realize that internationalism is a formidable weapon and have launched a general and steadily intensifying offensive against it, using nationalism, violence, anti-communism and racism as *their* weapons. International imperialism is uniting its forces in an all-out attempt to prevent international working-class unity.

The world has certainly become more complex and we are compelled to fight on many fronts. But while the enemy is growing more skillful we must

show greater resourcefulness, and while our tasks are becoming harder we must achieve closer unity. The WFTU has always upheld this principle, never renouncing the slogan of unity of the international trade union movement, unity of the workers of all countries. Motivated by its allegiance to internationalism, it invariably directs all its efforts toward serving the cause of the workers and other working people, promoting unity, cooperation and solidarity and supporting the forces of peace, progress and democracy. The workers of the world seek a road on which their efforts and their personal destinies will have more encouraging, favorable and humane prospects. We are confident that these goals and aspirations are correct and justifiable and that they can be attained.

Racism in isolation

Oliver Tambo
President, African National Congress of South Africa

South Africa has for decades been the only country in the world which has codified the doctrine of racial superiority into a statutory system and established it as the basis of state ideology and policy. Our people spare no effort in their courageous fight against the evils of racism and make enormous sacrifices, but the system of racist and fascist enslavement has yet to be defeated. In South Africa the whites maintain their colonial rule over the Black population, or the majority.[1] The living and working conditions of the Black population are worsening; the Blacks are treated like colonial slaves. They have no political rights of any kind, no representation in parliament, no vote and exercise no power, even indirectly. Surely these features are most typical of classical colonialism.

Racism in South Africa has been used to divide the population not merely by isolated acts of discrimination, to draw a line of division between the white minority and the majority of the people. It expresses itself in apartheid, a system legalizing what the racists would like to be *permanent* division along ethnic and tribal lines. The racists' fundamental strategy is to perpetuate the division of South Africans economically, socially and politically into a privileged white minority and a disinherited Black majority.

A second line of racist policy is to divide the oppressed into Indians and Colored people (who enjoy some limited economic and social privileges denied to the majority of Africans), and Africans proper.

Lastly, the regime divides the population according to tribal origins under the system notoriously known as the Bantustan Program. Now attempts are being made—some initial steps have already been taken—to transform the bantustans into a constellation of supposedly independent mini-states, or appendages to fascist South Africa, all serving the interests of the white minority, of South African and international capital. The racists' aim is to make the enslavement of the majority of the people perpetual.

The apartheid regime retains its essential characteristics. Progressives should not be deluded by the steps it is taking to embellish its racist rule. Imperialist propaganda gives these steps quick publicity. One of them is the abolition of 'petty apartheid.'[2] If they had come some 20 years ago, when we still believed that by peaceful demonstrations and protests and representations we could influence the regime into introducing changes and reforms, they might have been regarded as significant. But these purely cosmetic reforms come instead, at a time when colonialism has been all but banished, when the Vietnamese have won a heroic war against French colonialism and U.S. imperialism, when, by great sacrifices, Cuba has overthrown its tyrants and is building a socialist state, when Portuguese colonialism of many centuries' standing, has been demolished as the result of an armed struggle by the people of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau, and when the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia are engaged in a broad struggle.

The slight, inconsequential adjustments made by the South African regime come much too late. Having lost faith in the possibility of bringing about substantive reforms, our people have begun an armed fight against racist rule, for the total transformation of our society. As for the modifications of apartheid we have mentioned, they leave racist rule essentially intact. Their purpose is to ensure the survival of an anti-popular regime, perpetuate imperialist dominiation and the oppression and exploitation of the Black majority by a small minority. Faced with the growing liberation movement of the oppressed and exploited in the south of the continent and with an intensifying armed struggle in South Africa and neighboring countries, the racists would like to maintain their positions by preserving the status quo.

The regime is looking around for individuals and groups among the Black population in general and the Africans in particular whom it could install as local leaders controlled by it, above all in the 'independent' bantustans. It plans to recruit from among the oppressed a Black bourgeoisie linked to the system by selfish calculations and a drive for profit and hence willing to collaborate with the

white oppressors and having a stake in the preservation of the system. It is desperately recruiting Blacks into the white police force and the army. The entire trend of the regime's strategy is to try and get the oppressed and exploited to sustain their own oppression and exploitation.

The survival of the regime is a special concern of the multinationals directly responsible for plundering our country and developing countries of their natural resources and for the brutal exploitation of our people and the people of other countries. Between 1972 and 1978, nearly $8,000 million in loans from Western banks went to buttress the apartheid economy. The imperialists have invested more in our manufacturing industry than their total investment in similar enterprises on the entire African continent. Nowhere is the political motivation of this investment more apparent than in the efforts to assist the regime to meet its oil needs. In 1976 West German banks, many of them state-controlled, provided Pretoria's strategic oil fund with loans amounting to $140 million. By early 1979, such loans had exceeded $440 million. Economic, military and political cooperation between South Africa and the imperialist powers is expanding rapidly. There is an obvious reason for this—imperialist setbacks in Asia, the greater part of Africa and in Latin America now compel the ruling circles of the West to hang on to their positions in South Africa, which abounds in natural resources.

The political forces active in South Africa could be identified as, first, the extreme right embodying the regime and led by the Nationalist Party; second, moderately liberal whites; and third, the revolutionary forces headed by the ANC and its allies. Unlike the ANC, the moderately liberal white opposition, represented in parliament by such organizations as the Progressive Federal Party, is actually against the total liberation of the Black people. It favors minor reforms and has been outspoken about 'petty apartheid' while taking care not to touch fundamental issues. It is people from this group that have been looking around for 'moderate' Africans who could become available to the regime as collaborators. Moreover, there is common ground for collaboration between these whites and the fascist regime. It is their desire to preserve and consolidate the exploiting system. To blunt the edge of the revolutionary struggle, they have tried to build up 'leaders' from among the Africans.

But as a rule, when the effort succeeds, these 'leaders' begin to lose touch with the people and prove unable to influence the oppressed. In short, they become useless to those who have appointed them. This also applies to Africans who shatter the regime's hopes by refusing to collaborate with it after giving it cause to believe they would. For instance, the bourgeois press holds forth about the 'moderation' of Buthelezi, an influential chief, whom it sees as a potential supporter of plans for giving the country a liberal face-lifting. Yet Buthelezi has turned out to be sensitive to the people's mood. He has refused to have anything to do with plans for declaring the 'independence' of a major bantustan, Kwazulu, in contrast with such accommodating leaders as Chief Matanzima, the puppet head of the 'independent' Transkei.

The fact is that those pseudo-independent bantustans cannot solve the problem.[3] Popular discontent persists and this is highly indicative. South Africa has entered a period of its history when no reformist solution produces any tangible effect, especially when carried out according to a racist recipe. The growing revolutionary liberation struggle has spread to vast sections of the people in town and countryside. This offers new opportunities for the ANC.

Our analysis of developments shows that in our time repression and terror can fan the flames of the revolution and add to the people's discontent.

Our students and teachers have maintained magnificent unity against apartheid in education. They dare to challenge many expressions of white racist arrogance. South Africa's youth, who have often spearheaded this militancy, have kept alive the spirit of the 1976 uprisings in Soweto.

Lately the Black working class has demonstrated its militancy and potential by using its most powerful weapon, the withdrawal of its labor power, on numerous occasions to prevent the exploiters from making the workers pay for the crisis of the capitalist system. The working class of our country is the biggest on the African continent and its leverage among the economically active population is great. This class is objectively the main force of our revolution. It counters ruthless exploitation and racist discrimination by coming out more and more resolutely for its rights and social liberation.

The peasantry, for its part, is joining gradually in the fight against racism and colonialism. Many of the peasants brought to the cities as labor are not allowed to stay there indefinitely; they are eventually forced to return to the countryside. They take back with them their experience of participation in labor organizations and close association with the working class, which influences their political position.

The revolutionary forces comprise all anti-fascists and anti-racists. They include not only Blacks but also democratic and progressive whites who condemn and fight the apartheid regime.[4] Racism is criticized even by churches, though in the past they collaborated with the regime. For some time past, many church leaders have identified themselves in significant measure with the cause of justice regardless of the consequences, which may take the form of repression and persecution.

A most important development is that units of *Umkhonto we Sizwe* (Spear of the Nation), the combat arm of the ANC, are spreading their armed presence in the country. The experience of our lifetime, including the experience of June 16, 1976 (the Soweto uprisings) and after, indicates that the issue of power, peace and justice in our country will be resolved in our favor only by an effective combi-

nation of political and armed activity targeted, however, not on persons but on the racist system.

The ANC is demonstrably a peace-loving people's movement, because the majority of the people of South Africa whom it has led for decades want nothing but peace.

In the 1950s, the militant struggles led by the ANC were governed by the principle of non-violence. But in 1960 the racists' armed police opened fire on unarmed people demonstrating in Sharpeville.[5] It was the police, incited by Vorster himself, who murdered nearly 1,000 children in Soweto alone in 1976. Then, how can we forget the great casualties inflicted by the racists and their leaders—Vorster, Botha and Smith—on the people of Mozambique, Zambia, Botswana, Angola, Namibia and Lesotho?

Our people have been unable to achieve their legitimate goals by non-violent means. The experience of Angola, Mozambique, Namibia and Zimbabwe suggests that patriots cannot count on peaceful methods alone. The experience gained by the ANC over many years has led us to the conclusion that we must launch an armed struggle against apartheid. We are now making a special effort to this end. Being an illegal movement, due to the ban imposed in 1960, the ANC relies on building up a powerful country-wide underground organization that lives with the masses. This organization must be able to inspire the actions of the people and create conditions in which the armed force can grow.

To begin armed battles and guarantee our final victory, we must work harder to mobilize the masses. This means carrying out a two-fold task: leaning on the growing political activity of the oppressed and exploited for support, while at the same time drawing them into the armed struggle. By mobilizing the forces following us for the solution of specific local, regional and national problems, we help the masses realize the need to use what at this stage is the supreme method of revolutionary action. We consider that the masses must take up arms. Then, as they gain in class consciousness and in strength as the political army of the revolution, they will become its chief military combat force. This will result in steadily heightening the fighting efficiency of the ANC and winning it more fighters for its just cause. Today we see to it that our comrades take part in the increasingly numerous armed operations against the regime and strive to give the armed struggle for freedom a new dimension.

Our movement is inspired by the aims and objectives of the ANC approved over two decades ago. Our key goals are: to unite the African people in an effective instrument to secure their complete liberation from all forms of discrimination and national oppression; to promote and protect the interests of the African people in all matters affecting them; to create a united democratic South Africa on the principles outlined in the Freedom Charter;[6] to support the cause of national liberation and the right to independence of nations in Africa and the rest of the world.

Our national liberation movement, like other present-day revolutionary contingents, maintains that its goal cannot be merely a fight to change the color of the men at the head of the state. There was a time when just to do that was a great achievement, an enormous step toward Africa's total liberation. The people of Mozambique, Angola and other countries owe their splendid victories in no small measure to the fact that in the 1970s there were independent African states as distinct from the 1950s. They constituted an impressive force and acted together in the Organization of African Unity against imperialism, colonialism and racism. But many African leaders recognized that that independence was not complete, that it lacked many essential characteristics of genuine national independence.

The ANC has learned that lesson. In defining our tasks, we take into account the general development trends of the world revolutionary struggle. The African liberation movement considers that unless it is total, liberation is non-existent; therefore, it has to be either total liberation or continued war for liberation. This was demonstrated by events in Angola, where the people won the war and achieved total liberation. A struggle for total liberation is now going on in Namibia and Zimbabwe. In South Africa too, untold sacrifices are made and people give their lives to bring about final victory and a radical transformation of the country. The people of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa took up arms to remove both colonialism and neo-colonialism, win total liberation and establish their own political and economic rule.

The record of liberation struggles in southern Africa shows that the struggle throughout the continent increasingly acquires an anti-neocolonialist orientation.

In more general terms, the struggle of the ANC is important because it is directed against a regime not only oppressing our Black people but also serving as a laboratory and a breeding-ground of international racism. Here there are formed and nurtured the bacilli which continually feed the diseases of racist arrogance, hatred and racial discrimination. This fact was recognized by world opinion, which emphatically condemned the man-hating ideology and practices of apartheid. In recent years the international movement against the evils of racism has assumed unprecedented dimensions; new important measures were adopted against the apartheid state and in support of the struggle of South Africa's oppressed and exploited. The ANC hailed the decision of Iran to cut the supply of oil to the racist regime of South Africa, thereby depriving it of 90 per cent of its imported oil, which during the Shah's reign came from Iran. The decision of Nicaragua and El Salvador to sever diplomatic relations with fascist South Africa underscored the growing isolation of the regime. The lawful measures taken against foreign oil companies in Nigeria, where they acted in violation of the country's boycott of South Africa,[7] were very

important to the people's struggle in the south of the continent.

The tremendous role of the southern African countries in aiding our liberation struggle is common knowledge. Yet these countries themselves make enormous sacrifices for final victory over colonialism and racism. We have the backing of the Organization of African Unity, the non-aligned countries and some West European states. Our people enjoy the solidarity of numerous liberation movements in other parts of the globe, the working people of capitalist countries and the masses in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We respond by identifying ourselves with their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, against oppression and exploitation.

Special mention must be made of the support given to the people of southern African by the Soviet Union, the GDR and other socialist countries. They are in the van of the global fight against imperialism and this predetermines the decisive role which their support plays in the cause of liberation. These countries are our tried and tested allies, as events in Angola and Guinea-Bissau and the struggle of the people of South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia and other countries have shown.

The leaders of liberation movements and all embattled peoples welcome this assistance, for it enables them to defend the ideals of freedom, justice, democracy and progress all the more effectively.

1. According to the terminology of the South African liberation movement, the term 'Black population' applies to Africans proper, the Indian community (people of Indian origin) and Colored.—*Ed.*

2. Regulations which prohibit Blacks from using public transport, benches and so on, reserved for whites.—*Ed.*

3. For details, see Oliver Tambo, 'South Africa After Soweto,' in *WMR*, February 1978.—*Ed.*

4. For details, see Alfred Nzo, 'Powerless to Stop the Storm,' in *WMR*, June 1979.—*Ed.*

5. In Sharpeville, 69 people were killed and protests against the racists' atrocities surged high in South Africa and internationally.—*Ed.*

6. Adopted at the Kliptown Congress of the People in 1955, the Charter declares that government by the people, equal rights for all ethnic groups, equal human rights for all and other freedoms, and nationalization of monopoly industries are fundamental principles of a free and democratic South Africa. — *Ed.*

7. Meaning the nationalization of the British monopolies, which supplied oil to South Africa.—*Ed.*

110th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin

LENIN'S LEGACY AND OUR DAY

To mark the 110th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin *WMR* sponsored a correspondence Round Table devoted to the significance of Lenin's theoretical legacy today. The following are abridged contributions from Austria, Britain, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and the USSR.

I. *Theory of socialist revolution*

The significance of Lenin's work in elaborating the principles underlying the struggle of the working class against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism is dealt with by *Ezekias Papaioannou, General Secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL).*

Lenin made an immeasurable contribution to the development of the working-class scientific world outlook, namely, Marxism. This is seen in the term 'Marxism-Leninism,' which we use to designate our revolutionary science. This contribution has lost none of its significance: Lenin's ideas are constantly borne out by practice and like a beacon illumine the road for millions of working-class fighters against imperialism, fascism, racism, neo-colonialism and capitalist exploitation. The bourgeoisie and its hired spokesmen go to all lengths to make people believe that Lenin's ideas are outworn and obsolete. But, obviously nobody fights what is outdated or dead.

In order to undermine the principles of revolutionary theory, imperialism's spokesmen assert that in our epoch the class struggle has given or is giving way to class collaboration in the 'welfare state,' and that the scientific and technological revolution is leading to the disappearance of the working class, of the proletariat. But reality refutes these assertions. The 'welfare state' exists only in the imagination of those who seek to embellish capitalism. Have massive unemployment, inflation and the crisis in the economic, ideological, political, ethical, ecological and other areas of the life of capitalist countries not become the constant concomitants of imperialism? Are not all these phenomena implicit in it? Capitalism's development confirms Lenin's prevision about the further concentration and centralization of capital, the internationalization of monopolies and the further polarization and exacerbation of the contradictions between the handful of monopolies and the huge mass of workers, of other working people exploited by the finance oligarchy.

Far from disappearing, the working class, in which Lenin had boundless faith as the most advanced class with the historic mission of putting an end to capitalism and building a new, higher soci-

ety — socialism and communism — is constantly growing, becoming more organized and militant. This is shown even by the official statistics of capitalist countries. There were 80 million workers early in the 20th century, 300 million (in non-socialist countries) in the middle of the century and 500 million in 1977. Proletarianization has now spread also to the middle strata: office employees and intellectuals are increasingly becoming wage earners exploited by the bourgeoisie and this draws them steadily closer to the working class. As regards the assertion that 'workers are integrating with bourgeois society,' its untenability is manifest in the light of facts showing that in the capitalist world the class battles are mounting and embracing economics, politics and ideology.

This leaves no doubt about the significance of Lenin's contribution to the elaboration of the principles of the class struggle and organization of the working class, of its alliance with the peasantry and other strata of working people and about the viability of his teaching on the new type of party functioning in keeping with the principles of democratic centralism, on the revolutionary party being steadfastly guided by the theory of Marxism.

Our class adversaries and also the reformists, attack Lenin's theory of revolution, concentrating in particular on the proposition about the dictatorship of the proletariat performing, among other things, the function of safeguarding revolutionary achievements. The bitter experience of blood-drenched Chile is a grim refutation of the views of those who, while acknowledging that the working class can assume power peacefully, disregard the need for consolidating victory by breaking up the old state machine and building a new, socialist state implementing democracy for the working class, for all working people and defending the people's revolutionary gains against all the attempts of the exploiters to restore their tyranny.

Lenin's proposition on the international proletarian alliance — an alliance not only of class brothers of all countries (which comprises the backbone of proletarian internationalism and is expressed in the slogan formulated by Marx and Engels, 'Workers of All Lands, Unite!), but also of the working class with the peoples oppressed by imperialism — is of fundamental importance. We see the practical embodiment of Lenin's ideas in the natural alliance of the international working class and the socialist-community nations with the national liberation movement and the young independent states, many of which have opted for non-capitalist development.

It may be said that Lenin stood at the source of the solution of the most burning problem of our epoch — the problem of peace. The removal of wars from the life of society is one of the basic and highest ideals of Marxism-Leninism. In advancing the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, Lenin defined the practical ways and means of attaining this ideal in the present epoch. The Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the CPSU plays a key role in ensuring global peace. It combines consistent peaceableness with firm resistance to imperialism. Peaceful coexistence, détente and disarmament are the only way to ensure the fundamental conditions of the existence and progress of the human race in our nuclear age.

Remaining unchangeably topical, the cause of Lenin lives and will continue to live through the ages. His theoretical legacy and his whole life will always be an inexhaustible source of inspiration and guidance in the struggle against oppression and exploitation, for peace and democracy, for socialism and communism.

The importance of Lenin's analysis of state-monopoly capitalism for studies of its new, specific forms and for defining the strategy of the anti-monopoly struggle is considered by *Hans Kalt, Political Bureau member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria and Editor in Chief of the newspaper 'Volksstimme.'*

The new features characterizing state intervention in the economy give rise to various assessments of Austria's socio-economic system. Austria is one of a group of countries where the state controls a large segment of the heavy industry and the major banks. One of the features of state intervention in the Austrian economy is that the social democratic leaders and the right-wing social democratic trade unions take part in and direct it. So-called social partnership institutions, which include top functionaries of entrepreneur associations and trade unions and act as centers regulating all key problems of economic policy, have sprung up. The social democrats use this institutionalization of 'social partnership' and also the fact that for a number of reasons there was no serious unemployment in Austria even during the 1974-1975 crisis of overproduction to foster the illusion among the working class that the system of social relations now obtaining in the country can no longer be called capitalist in the true sense of the word.

This makes Lenin's teaching on state-monopoly capitalism of particularly great significance for us. During the First World War Lenin conducted a sharp polemic with the right-wing social democrats, chiefly with German social democrats (in particular, Scheidemann and Lentsch), in the course of which he analyzed monopoly capitalism's evolution into state-monopoly capitalism. In those years the right-wing social democrats regarded state intervention in the economy (labor conscription, state control of raw materials, distribution of labor power, food and so on) stemming from the tremendous economic strain of the imperialist war as a sort of 'war-time socialism.' Lenin made it clear that this 'war-time socialism' was 'war-time state-monopoly capitalism' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 357), that the imperialist war had 'immensely accelerated and intensified the process of transformation of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 383). In the capitalist countries today direct

militarization of the economy is accompanied by the nationalization of factories and entire industries, monetary and tax policies, the policy of subsidization, regulation of foreign economic links and so on. As always, direct compulsion, regulation of raw material supplies and similar other measures are enforced in critical situations on a national and international scale. In short, we now see that even in peacetime (to say nothing of wartime, as the two world wars exemplified) capitalism can no longer dispense with increasing state intervention in reproduction. All these measures of state management pursue one and the same class-conditioned aim, namely to maximize monopoly profits and at the same time keep the capitalist system going, i.e., maintain the reproduction of the capitalist economy without catastrophic convulsions such as the world crisis of the close of the 1920s and the early 1930s.

Also an important point is that in his very first definitions of state-monopoly capitalism Lenin attached cardinal significance to the class character of state management of the economy: 'Now try to *substitute* for the Junker-capitalist state, for the landowner-capitalist state, a *revolutionary-democratic* state, i.e., a state which in a revolutionary way abolishes *all* privileges and does not fear to introduce the fullest democracy in a revolutionary way. You will find that given a really revolutionary-democratic state, state-monopoly capitalism inevitably and unavoidably implies a step, and more than one step, towards socialism!' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 357-358).

When we analyze Austria's socio-economic system, all the features of that system, we attach paramount importance to identifying the class essence of the state. This criterion, established by Lenin, was decisive in bringing our party round to the conclusion that the 'social partnership' system is a variety of state-monopoly capitalism that has taken shape over the past three decades in the specific conditions obtaining in Austria. This conclusion, based on a Leninist analysis of state-monopoly capitalism, underlies our party's anti-monopoly strategy, which takes the concrete situation in Austria into account. It sets the orientation toward struggle for broader democracy, for the fullest implementation of democracy in the interests of the working people, which under state-monopoly capitalism is the cardinal direction of the struggle for socialism.

What conclusions stem from the law of capitalism's uneven economic and political development, identified by Lenin, for the present-day strategy of the class struggle in Britain? This is discussed by *Ron Bellamy, Economic Commission member, CPGB Executive.*

The law of uneven development of economics and politics under capitalism is among Lenin's most important contributions to Marxism. Like all his advances in theory, it derived from a study of new features of concrete reality and was applied to the most concrete political problems facing the revolutionary movement. Its mastery and use was and is, vital to the strategies of workers' parties everywhere.

From the law of uneven development Lenin drew the conclusion that socialism could initially be victorious in a few or even in one country. As early as 1915 he rejected the assertion that socialism could not triumph in one country (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 342). And in 1919 he wrote: 'If any Marxist, or any person, indeed, who has a general knowledge of modern science, were asked whether it is likely that the transition of the different capitalist countries to the dictatorship of the proletariat will take place in an identical or harmoniously proportionate way, his answer would undoubtedly be in the negative. There never has been and never could be even, harmonious, or proportionate development in the capitalist world' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 308). These conclusions are being borne out by the course of history.

With capitalism, accumulation of surplus value and faster technical progress afford more scope to the law of uneven development. Larger firms and an increased role for fixed capital, with longer gestation periods and longer life, decrease the capacity for smooth adjustment. Moreover, rapid technical progress under competition and anarchy of production, requires this or that capitalist to innovate and disrupt the established proportions. As credit gives a new twist to uneven possibilities of accumulation, spasmodic and violent disruptions take place in the capitalist economy. With the emergence of monopoly and finance capital it is true that powerful barriers can be erected to protect privileged enclaves. This has led some Marxists, following Kautsky in fact if not in intention, to deny the existence of price competition or the possibility of bankruptcy of the larger firms. Yet huge capitals (Rolls-Royce, British Leyland, Chrysler and AEG among them) have been bankrupted or saved from it only by state intervention.

Some economists have also argued that state-monopoly intervention and integration regulate and retard uneven development. Arguments of this kind were rebutted by Lenin as early as 1915: 'Of course, *temporary* agreements are possible between capitalists and between states. In this sense a United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the *European* capitalists . . . but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty *against* Japan and America' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 341). From such a standpoint we may assess the petty-bourgeois dreams of reconstructing the world monetary system on some 'rational' basis, the hopes of restabilizing the capitalist economy through EEC mechanisms.

Uneven development is political as well as economic. Lenin wrote: 'Each country has developed more strongly first one, then another aspect or feature or group of features of capitalism and of the working-class movement ... For several decades this advanced capitalist country (Britain. —

Ed.) lagged behind in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 308-309). The end of the 'great sleep' in the 1870s began with the erosion of Britain's monopoly position in world trade, based on industrial strength. But the reawakening of the working class was retarded and the opportunist trend in the British labor movement was reinforced by the development of modern imperialism, based on *finance* capital and *capital* export. Indeed, despite the price paid in the first imperialist war and in the growing relative backwardness in productive forces, the financial and commercial strength of an imperial center preserved the basis for opportunism through World War II and beyond, especially as partial and relative economic stabilization of some aspects of economic life after World War II gave for a time considerable job security and rising living standards.

But overtaken industrially by Japan, West Germany and France, and plagued by financial instability after the world monetary system collapsed in 1972, a diminished imperialist power (Britain. — *Ed.*) in a world of decaying imperialism sought to place the whole burden upon the working people. Social advance goes into reverse. Britain is becoming a deindustrialized, high unemployment and low wage country.

The objective external relations of Britain evolving from trade monopoly to imperialist privilege, gave rise to the contradiction noted by Lenin, between advanced capitalism and a politically backward working-class movement. But the many-sided operation of the law of uneven development has eroded the material base of that contradiction. New possibilities emerge for defeating the opportunist trend and for uniting the working class as the leader of a broad democratic alliance which can make inroads into the power of state-monopoly capital and reopen the revolutionary perspective.

Paulo Diaz, Central Committee member of the Communist Party of Chile, speaks of Leninism's revolutionary vitality, of its constant absorption of everything new in life and of the struggle for Leninism in Chile.

As we see it, Lenin's theory of socialist revolution owes its unfading significance, first to the fact that for the majority of the human race the socialist revolution is objectively still an unresolved task which, however, the aggravation of the class struggle has brought into a concrete perspective; second, to the fact that being the theoretical and methodological foundation of the strategy and tactics of the struggle of proletarian parties in different countries, Leninism continues to reveal its revolutionary vitality.

Lenin evolved the theory of socialist revolution in the process of upholding and creatively developing Marxism. He regarded the socialist revolution as a global, uneven process comprising the content of a whole epoch in the history of mankind, the epoch we are living in. The Great October Revolution was the first practical embodiment of Lenin's theory and the whole of Marxist science. All subsequent revolutions without exception have borne out Lenin's scientific conclusions and previsions. Even the temporary setbacks suffered by the revolutionary forces of one country or another produce empirical facts in favor of Leninism, because in most cases these reverses were the outcome of an inadequate account of the laws of socialist revolution generalized by Lenin.

Imperialist propaganda denies the significance of Leninism. The bourgeois ideologues declare that Lenin's legacy is useless for the struggle of the working class.

Lenin's theory of socialist revolution stems from his analysis of imperialism. He rebutted the opportunist assertions that imperialism differs essentially from capitalism and that the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are no longer needed for the assertion of socialism. Although his propositions have been proved by countless new facts and arguments over subsequent decades, the bourgeoisie continues systematically to sow and nourish opportunist illusions that the transition from monopoly capitalism to socialism can be effected gradually, without revolution.

In the revolutionary movement views have lately been spread to the effect that Leninism has been 'transcended' and that something new has appeared in the world. They link this 'new' to national specifics distinguishing the revolutionary struggle in different countries, separating these specifics from the general, and giving them out not as a particular manifestation of a regularity but as an exception to the rule.

Needless to say, new facts and political phenomena, peculiar situations and problems that must be studied and resolved spring up everywhere and every day. Social dynamics, the development of the revolutionary movement itself and the growth of its ranks and potential influence life, generating unique circumstances that must be constantly analyzed. This is also necessitated by the actions of the class adversary, who has learned the lessons of his defeats and is having recourse to the most subtle methods to oppose the popular movements and suppress or mislead them by means of demagoguery, deceit and ideological subversion.

However, it is absurd to reject Lenin's teaching for the sake of the 'new.' The fact is that one of Leninism's most characteristic features is precisely that it is always open to the new. For Lenin as for the founders of scientific socialism, revolutionary theory was the guide to action, never a dogma. All of Lenin's work was incisive, permeated with a constant striving to get to the essence of changing reality. But in all cases he relied on the principles substantiated scientifically by Marx and Engels. For him revolutionary action was inconceivable without revolutionary theory. When new problems are tackled, rejection of the class approach and disregard for the historic mission of the working class as the grave-digger of capitalism and the leading force in the building of socialism and communism,

spell out abandonment of Marxist-Leninist theory, the rejection of Lenin.

What was in many respects a unique revolutionary process developed in Chile in the period from 1970 to 1973, but after the fascist coup of 1973 some people began to assert that Leninism had harmed the Chilean revolution and that therefore it had to be rejected. Our party categorically rebutted these assertions. It stressed with good reason that all the successes of the Chilean proletariat, especially under the Popular Unity government of Salvador Allende, were indissolubly linked to the creative application of Leninism by the communists to the concrete conditions obtaining in our country. More, the temporary reverse of the Chilean revolution was due to, among other reasons, a misconceived approach to the problem of mastering and using all forms of struggle, about which Lenin spoke.

Furthermore, in Chile some democratic elements wrongly made a departure from Leninism the condition for joint action against Pinochet and the formation of an alliance with the communists. Our party unambiguously declared that it would never go along with this demand, in the same way that it does not make the abandonment of political affiliation and principles a condition for joint action with it. 'We are and will remain pupils of Lenin,' Luis Corvalan said. 'That is how our party has educated us. And that is how it is educating its new members.'*

The experience of the bitter years of anti-fascist struggle has convinced us of the correctness of this stand, which has been and is immutable for our party.

The significance of Lenin's teaching on the party of the working class in the struggle for general democratic and socialist aims was underscored by *Josef Schleifstein, Director, Institute of Marxist Studies in Frankfurt on Main (FRG).*

Of great moment for the communists of the FRG is Lenin's thesis that to 'develop democracy *to the utmost*, to find the *forms* for this development, to test them *by practice*, and so forth — all this is one of the component tasks of the struggle for the social revolution' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 452). The question of the link of the struggle for democracy to the struggle for socialism figures prominently in the new Program of the German Communist Party, adopted in October 1978.

The working class can achieve its democratic and socialist aims if it is led by a Marxist party that applies revolutionary theory creatively and is free of social-reformist opportunism. This conclusion by Lenin is based on a generalization of the working-class movement's experience and has been confirmed by the practice of socialist revolutions. On the other hand, in West and North European nations social democratic parties have been in the government for many years, sometimes for decades, in many cases heading them, but they made not even the smallest advance toward socialism.

Of course, as Lenin always stressed, the role of the revolutionary party depends not only on the fact that it is guided by Marxist theory and pursues a correct policy but also, and to a decisive extent, on its influence among the masses. It takes a long time for the communist party to win prestige among the masses, especially in countries where reformist traditions are strong in the working-class movement. However, difficulties do not lessen the fundamental truth of Lenin's thesis. From Lenin's propositions on the role of the Marxist party of the working class it does not follow that the communists intend to move toward socialism alone, that they reject joint action with social democrats and other anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces. Neither do these propositions imply that the communists lay exclusive claim to leadership of the working-class movement, for the vanguard role of the communist party is always the result of the actual class struggle.

II. *Theory of building the socialist economy*

With Poland as his example, *Jan Szydlak, Political Bureau member of the PUWP Central Committee and Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic*, discusses the role of Lenin's economic legacy in developing the strategy of social transformations and the building of socialism.

Lenin dealt with the entire spectrum of problems linked with the phase of capitalism's development contemporary to him and with the prerequisites for a socialist revolution that had been maturing in that system, with the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of that revolution and with questions related to the fulfillment of the immense, innovative and exceedingly difficult tasks of building a socialist state and a socialist society. His studies, conclusions and generalizations concerned Russia and the whole of international development.

It is futile to try to counterpose any part of Lenin's theoretical legacy to another, to identify fields in which Lenin 'specialized' and fields that were allegedly secondary in his work. This must also be noted when we speak of the significance and topicality of Lenin's contribution to the economic thought of the communist and working-class movement, to economic theory generally, to everything that has become part and parcel of the practice of existing socialism and beneficially influences its development.

For reasons that can be appreciated, the communists in countries of existing socialism are particularly interested in that part of Lenin's huge economic legacy that concerns the period 1917-1923. In that period Lenin, creator and leader of the Soviet state, concentrated mainly on the problems of the economic theory of socialism, on the principles and orientations of the economic policy of the party directing the building of the new society.

---

* *Boletin del Exterior del Partido Comunista de Chile*, No. 22, March-April 1977, p.3.

This involved wide-ranging theoretical studies and practical work and here we can only briefly characterize Lenin's most important and, it would be safe to say, innovative ideas and concepts.

One of them concerns the socialization of the means of production. It will be recalled that the Paris Commune 'remained standing respectfully outside the gates of the Bank of France.'* Lenin learned that lesson and worked out, beginning with the historic April Theses, a plan for placing the banks, mines, metallurgical plants, big and medium factories and transport under the control of the workers. The implementation of Lenin's program for concentrating the main elements of the economy in the hands of the working people and forming public property under the socialist state system was a turning point, a step that inaugurated a new chapter in history — the epoch of public property in the implements and means of production and socially just distribution of the goods produced by millions of working people. By consistently applying this Leninist principle, People's Poland, once a backward agrarian-industrial country, has rapidly become a nation with a developed industry and taken its place among the ten leading industrial states of the world.

Another key idea of Lenin's economic legacy is the need for centralized planning as the vehicle for economic development and a means of guiding that development. This is consonant with the principle of democratic centralism that underlies socialism as a social system. Centralized planning guarantees the integrity of socio-economic processes, makes it possible to concentrate material and financial resources on key tasks of building the material basis of the new society and to improve the population's living standards and eliminates the dangers springing from disorganization, spontaneity, disintegration and centrifugal tendencies. The principle of centralized planning has justified itself completely in Poland's development and our party gives its constant attention to strengthening and improving that principle.

In working out the concept of centralized planning Lenin rejected variants of bureaucratic superconcentration and condemned technocratic tendencies in management. He identified the condition for genuine socialization of production and constantly looked for effective ways of ensuring worker participation in economic management, for efficient methods of public control and attached great significance to the trade unions playing an active part in economic management. Universal participation of the Polish people in managing socialist enterprises through worker self-management conferences and the promotion and strengthening of worker control in management, to which we attach considerable significance, are an expression of the practical implementation of this Leninist principle in Poland.

Lenin's analysis of the agrarian question is extremely important today. The question of the working peasants as an ally of the revolutionary proletariat was raised in a qualitatively new way by him. His works on this question are now the foundation of the development of the communist movement's program thinking, of the principles of relations between socialist states and the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America, in exactly the same way that these works played an inestimable role in resolving the problems of revolutionary transformations in the People's Democracies after the Second World War. The approach to the peasants as an ally of the working class in accomplishing the socialist revolution underlay the socialist social transformations in Poland; the alliance between the working class and the peasantry is a cardinal principle of our party's policy. Lenin's cooperative plan is also of paramount importance. It paved the way to higher forms of the worker-peasant alliance and the establishment of economic links between town and country by gradual socialist transformations of the structure of agriculture in all countries of existing socialism.

In accordance with the place and time, Lenin developed the main lines of the socialist strategy of economic development, which in Russia — a huge, but in those days backward and devastated country — was aimed at carrying out tasks such as electrification, the building of the foundation of heavy industry, of the 'A' group of industries, with account of the fact that this foundation had to be the basis for the expanding potential of the 'B' group of industries ensuring the ever fuller satisfaction of society's diverse requirements.

The chief elements of Lenin's economic legacy also include the concept of the socialist state's monopoly of foreign trade; the development of the principles of the policy of economic relations with capitalist countries; the charting of the directions of scientific research and recommendations on problems of the socialist economy. Mention must also be made of Lenin's principles for building up a new type of international relations embodied in cooperation among the economically integrating fraternal socialist countries and in the promotion of specialization and cooperation between them.

The Polish United Workers' Party, the government and the people of Poland appreciate the immense role that Lenin's ideas have played in socialist Poland's successful development over the past 35 years. His behests and propositions are the compass in our work of strengthening the national economy, developing the country, ensuring the welfare of the people and expanding fraternal economic cooperation with socialist countries. Having become the principles underlying socialist Poland's socio-economic development, his ideas are changing the country's makeup and directing our people along the road of a developed socialist society. The times we are living in, the cause we are fighting for and the tasks we are working on have their source in Lenin's ideas. Our best tribute to him is by creatively applying his ideas.

---

* Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2; p. 186.

The international significance of the theory and policy of socialist construction evolved by Lenin and of the principles worked out by him for socialist economic management are discussed by *Aldar Sipos, Pro-Rector of the Higher Party School of the HSWP Central Committee and Corresponding Member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.*

One of Lenin's unfading achievements is that in the extremely complex situation of the first years of Soviet power in Russia he evolved the theory of socialist construction. With this theory as their guide, communist parties have led the peoples of their countries to existing socialism. When Lenin began working on his program of socialist construction, a major theoretico-methodological difficulty was that the general notions about socialism did not indicate how, in what socio-economic and organizational forms the new system could be built. It was necessary to amplify the theory of socialism by analyzing available practical experience. On the basis of the Marxist teaching and of the facts about Soviet Russia's economic and political condition, Lenin defined the laws of its advance toward socialism and worked out the theoretical foundations of the socialist economy. The Marxist teaching on socialism acquired its basic features thanks to Lenin's work.

A concrete program for building socialism was expressed chiefly in the *New Economic Policy* mapped out by Lenin and adopted by the 10th Congress of the RCP(B). Lenin's teaching on this New Economic Policy is extremely important from the standpoint of building the foundations of the socialist economy. It provided the theoretical substantiation for the economy of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. It would therefore be wrong to regard the New Economic Policy solely as a concession to the peasants with the purpose of regrouping forces and ensuring an upswing of production for a further offensive on capitalism. The New Economic Policy owes its international significance not to these features but to the idea underlying it, namely the involvement of non-proletarian strata in the building of socialism. The laws of socialist transformation expressed in it are valid not only for the economy of countries with a medium or low level of development, but also in many respects for industrialized capitalist countries. Lenin's teaching on the economy of the period of transition, borne out entirely by the practice of socialist construction, was a further amplification of Marxism, the direct continuation of the theory that socialism can triumph initially in one country.

Lenin rejected the view mooted at the time, that commodity production ends with the creation of socialist public property in the means of production. He proved that socialism could be built and economic growth promoted on the basis of the multi-structural economy of the transition period, provided market relations were preserved and used. Moreover, market categories are also used for organizing efficient management of state enterprises, for developing small-commodity, chiefly peasant production and for creating the conditions for uniting peasant households in cooperatives. Socialism cannot be built without an alliance of the two basic forces — the working class and the peasants. The New Economic Policy helped to strengthen this alliance.

Lenin made an inestimable contribution to Marxist political economy. The principles evolved by him for organizing the socialist economy retain all their significance to this day. From the standpoint of the research conducted in our country in the political economy of socialism we regard the following elements of Lenin's economic legacy as especially important:

— the general theoretical and methodological principles of the socialist planned economy and of socialist planning. Lenin regarded the economic development plan as a program worked out by the party and the government, and whose implementation required initiative, a sense of responsibility and a sense of commitment on the part of enterprises and the working people. The ways and means of ensuring and encouraging the attainment of its assignments are part and parcel of the plan and help to mobilize the masses for its fulfillment. As Lenin saw it, a plan was not merely a rational element of economic activity but a factor concentrating society's efforts on definite tasks of socio-economic development;

— the principles of combining planned management and commodity-monetary relations, the link between the plan and the market and the elaboration of categories of cost accounting that are today universally recognized are likewise associated with Lenin. In defining the New Economic Policy, he wrote that the use of market relations and the growing independence of enterprises did not mean a rejection of the principles of centralized planning: 'The New Economic Policy *does not change* the single state economic plan, and *does not go beyond* its framework, but alters the *approach* to its realization' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 35, p. 530);

— Lenin's teachings on socialist industrialization and on cooperation and the socialist transformation of agriculture are key elements of the political economy of socialism. His study of the principles underlying the formation of the balance between the 'A' and 'B' groups of industries under socialism is vital to showing the laws of extended reproduction in a socialist society. Moreover, he showed that it was necessary to introduce the technical conditions and forms of organization of large-scale machine production into agriculture.

An important point is that in addition to theoretical elaborations Lenin defined the practical measures needed to enable the party to implement its policy.

The value of Lenin's ideas is of course, not that they allegedly offer recipes appropriate for any time and in any situation. Leninism embodies the method of theoretically and practically resolving socio-economic problems. Today, when the external and internal factors of economic development have undergone significant changes and the condi-

tions of building up the economy have been compounded, it is of special importance to apply Lenin's theoretical legacy when tackling economic tasks and improving the system of economic planning, management and organization, to apply it in the Leninist spirit and with account of the specific features of individual socialist countries.

III. *Problems of world outlook and methodology*

Academician Pyotr Fedoseyev, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, characterizes the new phase of the development of Marxist philosophy associated with the name of Lenin.

The social significance of philosophical ideas and the extent they influence historical development and the behavior and consciousness of people depend directly on the extent these are consonant with the requirements of practice and are capable of gradually expanding the potential of knowledge. The insuperable strength of Lenin's ideas lies in their living bond with practice, in the steady development of the notions reflecting changing reality. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee 'On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin' states: 'The unfading significance of Leninism is that it profoundly and accurately enunciates the interests of the working class and all working people and the requirements of worldwide social progress, makes it possible to work out the correct answers to pressing, vitally important questions of our time, to adopt a bold and creative approach to current problems and gives a scientific understanding of the prospects for social development. The extensive ideological legacy left by Lenin, the revolutionary-critical spirit of his teachings, his consistency and firmness in safeguarding the fundamental principles of Marxism against all opportunistic distortions and his entire life are an inexhaustible fountain of revolutionary thought and revolutionary action for the present-day international communist, working-class and national liberation movement.'*

An important stage in the development of Marxist philosophy is associated with Lenin. The substance of that stage is that Lenin used philosophical concepts in his replies to the important problems facing mankind in the epoch of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, an epoch that witnesses dramatic scientific development. The ability to direct philosophy toward understanding the deep-lying laws of social, scientific and technological progress, toward generalizing the latest achievements in science, the ability to use materialist dialectics broadly and flexibly to explain the dynamics of concrete, historical processes, the ability to develop the ways and means of translating theoretical discoveries into revolutionary practice, fidelity to the principles of Marxism, the creative development of Marxism, consistent commitment to party principles and an uncompromising stand in the ideological struggle are what raised Leninism above all other philosophical schools of the 20th century and explain the lasting vitality and topicality of Lenin's philosophical ideas.

Lenin always said that a correct theory could not be simply invented. It is deduced from life, is brought into being by the conditions and experience of struggle and reflects the objective processes of social development. Lenin's outstanding role in developing Marxist teaching and the CPSU's contribution to the common fund of theoretical experience of the communist and workers' parties spring from the objective circumstance that the world's first socialist revolution was accomplished in our country under the leadership of Lenin and the party and a socialist society has been built, a society that has now achieved a high level of maturity.

The range of Lenin's philosophical interests was unusually broad and diversified: they included problems of social philosophy and the theory of cognition, methodological problems of special sciences and the problems of historical philosophy. Into the orbit of Marxist study he brought new problems posed by social development, by progress in the natural sciences and technology and creatively analyzed everything of value that the development of society, science and culture produced after Marx. On that basis he enriched social thought with methodological conclusions that have been borne out in social practice, in the dramatic advances of modern science.

It is not difficult to define the focal point of Lenin's interests, the group of problems to which he always attached paramount significance when studying questions of methodology. These are problems of materialist dialectics.

Lenin regarded dialectics chiefly as a scientific method of understanding the laws of the development of nature and of society's progress. While giving his attention to questions of the dialectics of nature, he concentrated his philosophical interests on the dialectics of social processes, creatively applying the method and theoretical propositions of dialectical materialism when researching social reality. In his early polemical works in which he attacked the subjectivistic sociological theories of the Populists, he applied materialist dialectics brilliantly to an analysis of social reality. On that basis he developed the Marxist proposition on social evolution as a natural, historical process. Further, he showed the untenability of vulgar-economic interpretations of social development which ignored non-economic factors of historical progress, coarsened the actual picture and squeezed progress into the Procrustean bed of gaunt abstractions and schemes.

He counterposed notions that the historical process was automatic with an analysis of the dialectics of the objective and the subjective in social development, with a teaching on the significance of the subjective factor for society's revolutionary transformation. He exposed fatalism as the ideology

---

* *Pravda*, December 16, 1979.

of adaptation to existing bourgeois relations and as a renunciation of revolutionary methods of struggle and demonstrated that historical need was not a fatal inevitability, that it manifested itself at every historical moment in the struggle between different currents in the form of the natural possibility of development along this historically necessary road. However, development of a different kind could not be excluded at each given moment of history, particularly at crucial moments. The concrete course of history depends on the class struggle.

Applying the methodological principles of materialist dialectics, Lenin exhaustively studied the imperialist stage of capitalism. His scientific analysis of new social reality enabled him to characterize imperialism not only as the highest but also as the last stage of capitalism, the eve of the socialist revolution; his study of the laws and contradictions of imperialism's development led him to the conclusion that the triumph of socialism was possible and inevitable initially in a few or even one capitalist country, and this became the foundation of the theory of socialist revolution which we rightly call Leninism.

Dialectics enabled Lenin to make an incomparably profound and unique philosophical analysis of the revolution that began in natural science at the close of the 19th and early 20th century, a revolution that gave the impetus to the rapid development of scientific knowledge in our day.

One of the cardinal results of his study of the revolution in natural science is the conclusion that scientific progress is governed by general dialectical laws, as a result of which the development of scientific knowledge is seen as unity between continuity and discontinuity, between successiveness and novelty. In the historical movement of knowledge we can quite distinctly identify stages of a relatively slow, evolutionary accumulation of knowledge, generalizations of known notions and periods of sudden revolutionary breakdowns of established views and traditions. Lenin showed the character of the complex relationship between these two forms of development, owing to which evolution paves the way for revolution, leads to and is consummated by it, while in its turn revolution inaugurates the commencement of a new, higher stage of the accumulation of knowledge.

Of fundamental philosophical and methodological significance is, in particular, Lenin's conclusion that there is a cardinal distinction between materialist dialectics and philosophical relativism, that there is a relationship between relative and absolute truth. This conclusion enables us to understand the laws and mechanism of the growth of scientific knowledge, especially in periods of radical, revolutionary destruction of the system of knowledge that had taken shape in one or another epoch. The need for a scientific settlement of this problem was very great 70 years ago because some philosophers and naturalists, referring to facts about the relativity of all natural science notions that came to light in the course of the scientific revolution, began to regard the relativity of knowledge as evidence of the subjectivism of scientific truths and denied the possibility of understanding objective reality.

Lenin's conclusion is perhaps even more topical today than at the turn of the century. The proponents of absolute relativism usually linked that relativism to the incompleteness of scientific knowledge. Today, alongside this element, relativism is more and more frequently substantiated with the argument that theoretical thought and its results depend on cultural-historical conditions. For instance, exponents of 'post-positivist' theories propound the thesis that theories relating to one and the same field of knowledge but having diverse cultural-philosophical contexts are incommensurate. They contend that scientific revolutions constitute profound upheavals in the views of scientists to the extent that it is senseless to speak of continuity between old and new theories. Although these concepts differ radically from single-plane evolutionary concepts of development, they nonetheless absolutize spasmodic explosions, qualitative conversions and deny the internal unity and law-governed continuity of development.

In our day absolute relativism has spread from natural science to political science and is the epistemological foundation of so-called pluralist concepts that have become popular in bourgeois ideology. Attempts are made to give pluralism out as the only philosophical principle and methodology conforming to the spirit of modern science. Besides, it is acquiring an increasingly more pronounced anti-Marxist and anti-socialist orientation.

Lenin's teaching remains a powerful instrument in the ideological battle with the 'pluralist' schools of modern bourgeois philosophy. Lenin used the dialectico-materialist teaching on development to show that although scientific truths are only an approximate reflection of reality, the objectivity of our knowledge should not be confused with their fullness, that only exhaustive, consummate knowledge should be regarded as objective. He deepened and broadened the Marxist proposition that relative truth is also an objective truth and contains a grain of absolute truth. It differs from absolute truth only in that it is part of the latter, in other words, expresses its content incompletely and one-sidedly.

In summing up his study of the dialectics of the relative and the absolute in the process of cognition, Lenin wrote: 'Dialectics — as Hegel in his time explained — *contains* an element of relativism, of negation, of scepticism, but *is not reducible* to relativism. The materialist dialectics of Marx and Engels certainly does contain relativism, but is not reducible to relativism, that is, it recognizes the relativity of all our knowledge, not in the sense of denying objective truth, but in the sense that the limits of approximation of our knowledge to this truth are historically conditional' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 14, p. 137).

From this standpoint an absolute truth is the sum of relative truths and because here we have to do with developing and qualitatively inexhaustible ob-

jects, the process of the formation of an absolute truth is never fully consummated.

Similarly, Lenin's definition of matter is an important element of scientific philosophy and allowed showing the untenability of identifying matter as a philosophical category with concrete natural science notions about the structure and properties of the material world around us. This was thereby yet another cornerstone in the foundation of the materialist world outlook.

Also, Lenin formulated another methodologically important thesis — that matter is inexhaustible, a thesis expressed in the following famous words: 'The electron is as *inexhaustible* as the atom, nature is infinite' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 14, p. 262). The heuristic and methodological significance of this proposition is that it warns the researcher against the misconceived conclusions that it is possible to find the 'last elements' of matter and attain absolute, final knowledge of deep-lying properties and relationships, that is directs scientific knowledge toward unceasing quests for new phenomena and laws, and brings to light infinite prospects for the further development of the theory and practice of scientific study.

The dialectics that asserted the concrete-historical approach to social phenomena is itself in continuous development. Philosophical views acquire a new form with every discovery that ushers in a new epoch in natural science, with every new epoch in the history of the human race.

This applies fully to dialectics as well. Each epoch influences the range of its problems, accentuating them in their specific, historically conditioned form. Lenin strongly underscored this aspect, insisting that the dialectical method should not be viewed as an immutable canon. He not only applied the dialectico-materialist approach creatively to his analysis of the substance of the new epoch in world history, but also made an outstanding contribution to the elaboration of the theory of dialectics, of its laws and categories.

He developed dialectics not only as a teaching on knowledge or as logic, but also as a philosophical teaching on being. In particular, he made a comprehensive study of the objective dialectics of the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, identifying some new, essential elements expressing the substance of this epoch. While noting the fundamental philosophical and general methodological significance of the dialectics evolved by Marx on the example of bourgeois society, he showed that the dialectics of bourgeois society was only a particular case of dialectics. The special, he said, should not be elevated to a general law, and the social contradiction implicit in capitalism should not be seen as implicit in socialism as well, in the same way as the special should not be regarded as something exceptional, as not expressing the general.

Like Marx and Engels, Lenin concentrated on problems of a fundamental, revolutionary transformation of the capitalist, antagonistic social system and of the transition to socialism. This transition is being accomplished in our epoch on a worldwide scale and therefore the fundamental methodological principles of a theoretical and practical understanding of social reality, principles developed by the classics of Marxism-Leninism, retain their significance in the quest for the ways and means of transition from capitalism to socialism.

However, modern social reality is characterized not only by the extended sphere of revolutionary struggle against capitalism, but also by the emergence of a fundamentally new social reality — the reality of completed socialism developing on its own foundation and the gradual transition from developed socialism to the highest stage of the communist social formation. Of course, the central problem of this transition is that of a steady improvement of society's socialist organization, of its social structures and the steady transformation of all aspects of socialism into new and higher forms of communist civilization.

The credit for formulating this new task of dialectics belongs entirely to Lenin. It was he who brought to light the cardinal feature of the dialectics of socialist society — the antagonism disappears, but the contradictions remain. He formulated and all-sidedly substantiated the law of transition from antagonistic to non-antagonistic contradictions, thereby giving the key to understanding the dialectics of socialist society's development.

The credit for elaborating the dialectics of the relationship between capitalism and socialism in our epoch likewise belongs to Lenin. He noted the significance of international factors in the working-class struggle for socialism and the impact of the international situation on the actual course of socialist construction, and substantiated the scientific principles of the foreign policy of the socialist state. The Soviet Union and all other countries of the socialist community use these principles as the guide for their relations with capitalist countries.

Lenin took into account the contradictions between the two opposing social systems and the inevitability of 'areas of tension' linked to the manifestation of the antagonism between labor and capital in international relations appearing in world politics. At the same time, he foresaw that despite the unremitting global class struggle, the contradictions between the two social systems did not necessarily have to be resolved by a military confrontation. His analysis of the dialectics of the national and international factors of the class struggle led him to the conclusion that peaceful coexistence was possible between countries with different social systems. This principle of international relations most fully conforms to the interests of the revolutionary process.

Lenin made an inestimable contribution to Marxist philosophical teaching. Abiding by the behests of Marx and Engels, he developed philosophy as an active social and spiritual force. His philosophical ideas are, as they have been, of immense significance for the development of the revolutionary

movement, for the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

As the Marxism of the modern epoch, Leninism remains the theoretical foundation of the CPSU's political work. For that reason a key task of our party has been and remains to safeguard Lenin's legacy against attempts to belittle its significance and role and to distort its content. In continuing the Leninist tradition of treating theory creatively and in enriching Marxism-Leninism with new propositions and conclusions, the CPSU and other fraternal parties strive to ensure continuity in the development of revolutionary thought and wage a determined struggle against anti-Leninist theoretical and political trends.

Constant reference to Lenin's philosophical legacy, assimilation of Lenin's creative method and study of his approach to problems and style of researching them help communists to carry out the practical tasks of the struggle for socialism and the building of the new society.

Academician Herbert Hörz, Presidium Member of the GDR Academy of Sciences, discusses the present-day significance of Lenin's philosophical analysis of problems of the materialist world outlook and scientific development.

Lenin's philosophical legacy is important for the following reasons. He evolved the key theoretico-philosophical foundations of the world outlook of the working class and its allies in our epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. By applying materialist dialectics and the Marxist theory of social development to an analysis of the dynamics of class forces and the basic laws of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the period of preparation for the socialist revolution and the consolidation of the socialist power, he enriched Marxism with new methodological and theoretical conclusions. His theoretical legacy is a treasure-trove of dialectico-materialist thought and scientific analysis of society. It can hardly be said that all the theoretical wealth contained in his works has been mastered.

In view of the rapid advance of the natural sciences and, in particular, in view of the practical need for theoretical principles of socialist policy in science, Lenin undertook a philosophical analysis of scientific progress. By offering a constructive solution of gnostic and methodological problems (the dialectics of relative, objective and absolute truth, the inexhaustibility of nature as the foundation of the progress of knowledge and so forth), he defended philosophical materialism against attacks from positivism and idealism. In a polemic with mechanistic and idealistic interpretations of new scientific discoveries, he asserted the principles of a concrete analysis of philosophical, theoretico-cognitive and methodological problems of scientific development, and the demarcation of scientific achievements and their philosophical interpretation and also the principle of the alliance of militant materialists against mysticism and irrationalism. Moreover, he substantiated the politico-economic, philosophical and moral foundations of the alliance between the working class and the intelligentsia under socialism. He showed the significance of natural science studies for the development of the material and technical basis of socialism. The elaboration of the GOELRO plan, which created the prerequisites for socialist planning, provided a fundamental solution of the problem of linking up scientific-technical and social progress.

Lenin's philosophical ideas productively influence the development of modern science. By his support for scientific progress and scientists and by his pronouncements on disputed scientific and political issues Lenin set an example of a revolutionary scientist acting in accordance with the principles of his policy in science, encouraging a contest of views in science and consistently upholding the Marxist viewpoint.

The topicality of Leninism as the Marxism of our day, ranges far beyond philosophy proper. Some bourgeois ideologues speak of Lenin as a politician, ignoring him as a philosopher. Needless to say, Lenin did not belong to the philosophical Establishment in the bourgeois sense of the word. However, his activities as a political leader and his works in the social sciences and philosophy decisively influence scientific research.

A characteristic of Lenin's work in philosophy is that he scrutinized new empirical and theoretical material creatively. He drew a principled distinction between a necessary reassessment of outdated philosophical tenets and philosophical revisionism, which renounces the principles of dialectical and historical materialism. The differentiation that Lenin drew between the question of the source of our knowledge, the answer to which lies in recognition of objective reality (the philosophical concept of matter), and the question of the structure of matter relative to which no final truth exists, is of immense significance for philosophy. A scrupulous analysis of the level of scientific progress is therefore needed to explore philosophical problems and heuristic activity.

Lenin's creative conclusions about the theory of development, the dialectics of knowledge and the principles of scientific work provide the prerequisites for our philosophical activity. His study of the core of dialectics — of dialectical contradictions, the diverse forms of these contradictions (basic and derivative, fundamental and non-fundamental, antagonistic and non-antagonistic), and also of the ways and means of settling them — is of paramount importance.

By his inestimable elaborations and heuristic precepts Lenin stimulated research programs for the further development of the system of relations and laws of materialist dialectics, for the use of the history of science in the theory of knowledge. Guided by Lenin's ideas, Marxist philosophy takes an active part in topical studies and specifies philosophical propositions by analyzing new material. It thereby stimulates exchange of views instead of remaining merely an observer of theoretical de-

velopment and giving that development a belated philosophical interpretation. Much still remains to be done. And in this work too, Lenin's injunctions about politics in science, his experience of cooperation between philosophers and scientists of other disciplines and the fundamental features of his style in philosophical work, namely his commitment to party principles, his concreteness and his link with practice serve as the guide for research and action.

Robert Steigerwald, Doctor of Philosophy, member of the GCP Board, speaks of the topicality of fundamental questions related to the materialist outlook, which were elaborated by Lenin in his book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.*

The reason why this fundamental philosophical book by Lenin is of lasting value should be sought not only in philosophy itself. It is recognized today, even by bourgeois authors, that in the final analysis the polemics conducted by Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* concerned 'the question of a *generally binding theory,* which . . . would allow no subjectivism and no undetermined intellectual freedom of decision.'* The central problem in Lenin's book is that of truth. It deals with knowledge of the laws of nature, society and thinking, the scientific character of socialism and the legitimacy of the existence of Marxism itself. If our knowledge was unable to reveal the laws governing the life of society, there would be no science of socialism; we would be unable to say what socialism is, that it implies the political power of the working class, the socialization of the basic means of production and planned economic development in the interests of the people. We would remain ignorant about a way to socialism: the purposeless Bernsteinian reformist 'movement' would be as justified as putschism.

We have to turn recurrently to these general, basic questions of our outlook to which Lenin gave a scientifically grounded answer, especially in our ideological disputes with reformists and ultra-leftists. I shall cite two examples.

The 'pluralism of outlook' concept, advocated by modern bourgeois philosophy, is based on agnosticism; in other words this stance is defended only by those who deny the possibility of objective knowledge. The philosophical materialism of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the other hand, proceeds from the recognition that in the course of unending progress the human intellect is able to come ever nearer to the objective truth. 'From the standpoint of modern materialism, Marxism,' Lenin wrote, 'the *limits* of approximation of our knowledge to objective, absolute truth are historically conditional, but the existence of such truth is *unconditional,* and the fact that we are approaching nearer to it is also unconditional . . . In a word, every ideology is historically conditional, but it is unconditionally true that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology) there corresponds an objective truth, absolute nature' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 14, p. 136). In view of this approach to cognitive optimism, the concept of a 'pluralism of truth' was and remains unscientific. The question whether there is objective truth cannot be answered in a 'pluralistic' way. The answer should be 'yes' or 'no.' Similarly, the question of whether there are laws of the development of nature, society and thinking demands a clear and simple answer. Of course, there will always be something unknown, something disputable. But the process of cognition leads to accumulation of knowledge, to progress with the help of the relative truths that have been learned, to augmentation of reliable knowledge. This conclusion applies not only to the natural but also to the social sciences. The current discussion on the 'pluralism of outlook' continues an old dispute between materialism and idealism on the cardinal questions of world outlook and is inseparable from the struggle between the proletarian and bourgeois ideologies. Those who advocate a 'pluralism of outlook,' in fact, not only deny the possibility of knowing the world, but also break with partisanship in philosophy.

The other example. Today, in the discussions in our country on the peaceful use of nuclear energy and modern chemistry, some members of the middle strata and intellectuals are inclined to adopt a position of scepticism and agnosticism in questions of world outlook. Some champions of what we call the movement for ecological reforms assert that science and technology have achieved such a high level and have grown so complex that society can no longer control them. Such views are based on the misconceived idea that since an individual is incapable of controlling the development of science and technology, the whole of mankind cannot control it even over a fairly long historical period. Those who think so ignore the fact that not only has technology become so sophisticated, but our knowledge too, has reached a higher level. Indeed, the new techniques have been created by people and there is no reason whatsoever to think that our knowledge will retreat before what has been achieved by the social man. The history of the material and intellectual assimilation of objective reality shows that in the end, often in a long process, the very science which advances the development of new productive forces also produces the means with which we can guard ourselves against possible damage by these forces. It does not produce these means automatically, often not simultaneously with the application of latest technology and not independently of social conditions. But if people had given up the search for proper solutions and shirked new problems, these problems would have never been solved.

These examples show that the propositions elaborated by Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* are no less important in the present-day battle of ideas than at the time they were formulated. This is explained not only by the fact that Lenin wrote this book just before the revolution in

---

* *Debatte um Engels,* Vol. I. Hamburg, Rowohlt, 1973, p. 154.

science and technology, which has led to the modern scientific and technological revolution. Another, similarly important reason is the growing role of philosophical problems in the ideological struggle in the period of the mounting general crisis of capitalism, in the conditions of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The significance of Lenin's theory for problems of communist morality is dealt with by *Professor Stefan Angelov, Doctor of Philosophy, Director, United Center of Philosophy and Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.*

Lenin showed that the socialist revolution cannot confine itself to problems of power, of changing the social and economic structure, that it inevitably extends to the sphere of social consciousness, philosophy, mass psychology, morals and culture. Hence Lenin's great attention to problems of communist upbringing, to shaping proletarian, socialist morals. He regarded the moral factor as a decisive motive force in the proletarian struggle against capitalism, in the triumph of the socialist revolution, the consolidation of this victory and the building of a new society. Having dealt with the excesses of moral authoritarianism on the one hand, and subjectivism on the other, he discovered the relationship between the norms and principles of proletarian morals and the objective laws of historical development: underlying the essence of communist morality is faithfulness to the cause of the working class, to its great goal and participation in the effort to attain that goal.

Lenin made an immense contribution to the study of questions of Marxist ethics. I shall dwell on only a few such questions as elaborated by Bulgarian scholars on the basis of Lenin's legacy. One of them is the category of moral duty which, as Lenin showed, stems from the objective requirements of mass struggle, reflects its interests and should become an inner conviction of every participant in the great cause of the revolutionary transformation of society. These are the ethics of a revolutionary who must be able to place the interests of the common cause above his own, to place class interests above the interests of a group, the vital interests of the working class above transient ones and international interests above local interests. This also includes the moral and ethical aspects of the principles of the working-class struggle: solidarity and collectivism, rejecting bourgeois individualism and egoism. I am referring to solidarity and collective effort of the working people not only in a given country but also on an international scale.

Our researchers concentrate on problems of internationalist education on the basis of a proper combination of proletarian internationalism and patriotism. The unity of the national and the international is not absolute. It is not achieved spontaneously and at once. Contradictions may emerge that are to be overcome by a purposeful effort of a communist party in, among other spheres, education.

The norms of morality propounded by the communists are permeated with consistent humanitarianism. Lenin stressed that the true humanitarianism of the working class is inseparable from its struggle for liberation, from the struggle to end the humiliating conditions that turn man into a slave, a lackey, and give rise to cynicism, to hypocrisy in relations between people, that this humanitarianism is part and parcel of the struggle for the individual's free development in a free society.

Bulgarian communists find in Lenin's study of moral and ethical problems the guidelines for educating the new man in the period of building mature socialism. The Marxist ideal specified by Lenin — a harmoniously-developed individual with lofty morals — is in our conditions becoming the problem being solved in practice by the communist party with the help of the state and of political and public organizations. Marxist-Leninist ethics see the way to the all-round development of the individual not in moralizing, not in people's simple self-improvement, but in their joint work, in a planned organization of the effort to develop the economy and perfect social relations, culture and all other aspects of socialist society. Without the communist education of the working people, which is a major goal of the ruling communist and workers' parties, socialist society can make no progress.

THE BATTLE OF IDEAS IN THE MODERN WORLD

V. Kortunov

Anti-communism from Marx and Engels' time, the Fifties Cold War, to today.

A masterful exposition of the relationship of ideological climate to the politics of the day.

Cloth 364 pp $6.50

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

New stage of revolution

REVIEW OF REPORTS BY AFGHANISTAN'S MASS MEDIA

Important events took place in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in the last days of 1979. On December 27, Kabul Radio announced that the patriotic forces in the united People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) and in Afghan society expressing the will of broad masses of people and relying on the support of the national army, eliminated the regime of Amin and his clique set up after the overthrow and assassination of Noor Mohammad Taraki, the first President of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. State power passed again and now definitely into the hands of the DRA Revolutionary Council. The subsequent meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the PDPA unanimously elected as the CC General Secretary Babrak Karmal, an active participant in the April 1978 Revolution. He has also become President of the Revolutionary Council, Prime Minister and Commander in Chief of the DRA's armed forces. 'The great national democratic Saur revolution has entered a new stage,' Babrak Karmal declared in a message of greetings to the Afghan people (*Kabul New Times*, January 1, 1980).

The Afghan press reported that as a result of Amin's criminal acts, the state apparatus had been completely disrupted, the people had a growing sense of uncertainty in the future and it was seen that the Republic was being weakened. This facilitated the task of the external enemies, who had fought the people's system ever since the establishment of the DRA. The imperialist West and its allies in the region did their utmost to return the country to its feudal past, to re-establish the power of the urban and rural exploiters and to consolidate their influence in the country.

The Great Saur Revolution was staged, *Kabul New Times* wrote editorially, to do away with the corruption and crimes committed during the Nader-Zahir-Daoud reign and thus led the country toward the prosperity and happiness of the industrious and oppressed people of Afghanistan. But the traitor Amin was hatching totally different plans and goals. 'He ruled the country cruelly and oppressively and put thousands of innocent people into jail without any trial. He led the country to the threshold of civil strife, opening the way for the intervention of imperialists and the enemies of our revolution in our internal affairs' (*KNT*, January 1, 1980).

A statement by Babrak Karmal, carried on January 1, 1980, by *Haqiqati Enqelabi Saur* (The Truth About the April Revolution), the DRA's central organ, emphasized that had the genuine revolutionary and patriotic forces not taken the creative revolutionary initiative in pursuance of the progressive ideas of the glorious Saur Revolution, the national sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of our glorious homeland, Afghanistan, and peace in the region would have been seriously endangered.

Back in May 1979, *Newsweek* reported a debate in Washington over covert U.S. intervention in Afghanistan's affairs, a course of action advocated by National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and some mid-level CIA officials. By then, the Afghan press reports, extensive anti-Afghan activity had already been mounted under CIA control along the Afghan-Pakistan border, where a network of military camps and special training centers had been set up to train members of various Afghan counter-revolutionary outfits. They were trained in subversion and sabotage by experienced U.S., Chinese, Egyptian and Pakistani instructors. Gangs of cut-throats were being smuggled into DRA territory, where they massacred civilians, burned down entire villages, killed old people, women and children and tried to terrorize the local population into joining the ranks of the counter-revolution.

At the end of last year, the interventionist activity of the young Republic's external enemies assumed extremely threatening proportions. On December 28, Kabul Radio announced that due to the persistent and expanding aggression, provocations and interventions by foreign enemies of Afghanistan, and with the purpose of defending the objectives of the Great Saur Revolution, territorial integrity, national independence and ensuring peace and security, the Afghan government made an insistent request to the Soviet Union, on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness and Cooperation of December 5, 1978, for immediate political, economic and moral help, including military aid. It was noted that in the past the state of Afghanistan had several times sought such aid from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union decided to grant this request, the report said. Its text was subsequently carried by the Afghan newspapers *Haqiqati Enqelabi Saur* and *Kabul New Times*.

The Afghan mass media have emphasized that the legality and legitimacy of Afghanistan's request for Soviet assistance, including the temporary dispatch of a limited Soviet military contingent, stem above all from the fact that it is completely in accord with the traditional spirit of Afghan-Soviet relations and the Afghan-Soviet Treaty of 1978. Its Article Four says: 'Acting in the spirit of traditions of friendship and good-neighborliness, as well as the United Nations Charter, the parties to the Treaty will be consulting each other and with mutual consent will be taking appropriate measures to ensure security, independence and territorial integrity of both countries. In the interests of reinforcing de-

fense potentials of the parties, they will continue developing cooperation in the military sphere.'

The Afghan people saw the USSR's positive response as an expression of its loyalty to its Treaty obligations, and as recognition of the fact that only the Afghan people — and no one else — has the right to determine both the ways of its internal development and the ways of arranging its relations with other states. The Afghan press has noted that the Soviet troops which have entered the country to help beat back the external aggression have not interfered — and have no intention of interfering — in the DRA's internal affairs. The DRA government, *Kabul New Times* wrote, appreciates the Soviet Union's positive response to its request for assistance. The USSR's friendly act serves the interests of peace and of the security and independence of Afghanistan (*KNT*, January 2, 1980).

Another Afghan paper, *Haqiqati Enqelabi Saur*, has stressed that part of Babrak Karmal's statement on the occasion of the PDPA's 15th anniversary on January 1, in which the leader of the Party and the Afghan state emphasized that the Soviet Union's military assistance has been made available for defense against aggressive acts by Afghanistan's external enemies. At any time, he said, whenever the DRA government so desires, when the problem of foreign aggression against Afghanistan disappears and when peace and security in the region are ensured, the limited and small contingents of Soviet troops will leave the territory of Afghanistan (*HES*, January 3, 1980).

Afghan public opinion has noted that the DRA government's appeal to the USSR is also in complete accord with the rules of international law. Addressing the UN Security Council, DRA Foreign Minister Shah Mohammad Dost declared that the Soviet assistance had been given to his country in accordance with an official request. The government of Afghanistan, like that of any other country, he said, had a legitimate right to appeal for the purposes of self-defense for help to any friendly country, in the event of an armed threat from outside. This right, an inalienable right of states to individual and collective self-defense for the purposes of rebuffing aggression and re-establishing peace, the Afghan Minister emphasized, is provided for by Article 51 of the UN Charter (*HES*, January 7, 1980).

The DRA press has categorically rejected the provocative attempts to accuse the Soviet Union of 'exporting revolution.' A statement by the Afghan government carried by the Bakhtar Agency on January 1, 1980, concerning the large-scale slanderous propaganda campaign started by the imperialist, colonialist and reactionary forces over the recent events in the country, stressed that what was actually at issue was assistance to the existing revolution, whose gains were threatened by these forces. In extending such assistance, the Soviet Union has fulfilled its internationalist duty in accordance with its long-standing tradition of supporting movements for national liberation and social emancipation. The DRA government reiterated that when the foreign intervention and aggression ended, there would no longer be any need for such assistance.

The measures jointly taken by the USSR and the DRA for defending Afghanistan against external aggression, the Afghan mass media say, do not pose any threat to the interests or security of third countries. The Soviet Union, as it has repeatedly declared and confirmed in practice, is sincerely concerned to maintain with all countries, including its neighbors, genuinely friendly relations based on the principles of equality, mutual respect and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs.

For its part, democratic Afghanistan also wants to develop ties with all the nations of the world. A statement by the President of the DRA Revolutionary Council, carried by *Kabul New Times*, says that Afghanistan will develop friendly relations with all states, its neighbors in the first place. Babrak Karmal welcomed the national, Islamic, anti-imperialist and anti-monarchical revolution of the Iranian people, and said that the DRA would take the initiative to bring closer and strengthen the friendship between the two friendly countries bound by common historical ties. He said that the DRA wanted to remove any kind of differences or misunderstandings between it and Pakistan through peaceful negotiations and is desirous of friendship with China, which is another neighboring country (*KNT*, January 1, 1980).

Evidence of the peace-loving foreign policy pursued by Afghanistan and the Soviet Union with respect to the Asian countries also comes from the Afghan-Soviet Treaty, whose Article Eight says: 'The High Contracting Parties will promote the development of cooperation between Asian states, establishment between them of relations of peace, good-neighborliness and mutual trust, and establishment of an effective security system in Asia on the basis of joint efforts by the states of the continent.'

Afghanistan's mass media have resolutely condemned the slanderous campaign over the recent events in the DRA, which is being orchestrated by imperialist forces and their allies in the region and the attempts to artificially create some kind of 'Afghanistan issue' by imposing its discussion on the UN Security Council and and the General Assembly.

U.S. imperialists spend millions of dollars to organize banditry, *Kabul New Times* wrote. They have infiltrated counter-revolutionary groups trained by foreign instructors into the territory of an independent, sovereign country, while hypocritically appealing to the UN Security Council. The paper asks: Who is ignorant of the fact that behind all these actions the stage has been set by the CIA? Who doesn't know that CIA instructors penetrated into our country?

Behind the barrage of loud noise about the USSR's assistance in the defense of the DRA against external aggression, the imperialists together with China's rulers, seek to divert the attention of international public opinion from the real threat to peace

which is posed by U.S. claims to act as the world's gendarme, especially in Asia and the Middle East, and also by Peking's hegemonistic aspirations which many of its neighbors have experienced at first hand, the Afghan press says.

Long before the recent events in Afghanistan, the United States worked out and began to put into practice a policy of 'extreme measures' providing for the use of armed force against young states whose independent line jeopardized the interests of the monopolies. Within the framework of this policy it is setting up a rapid deployment force, new fleets for moving it and providing it with combat security and support, enlarging old bases and looking around for new ones, above all in the Indian Ocean and Middle East. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Israel and certain other countries provide bridgeheads for Washington's aggressive schemes. Instead of using its influence in Pakistan to prevent anti-Afghan subversive acts from its territory, the United States has decided on large-scale deliveries of weapons and economic aid to Islamabad, worth hundreds of millions of dollars. This is fresh evidence that the external threat to the Saur Revolution remains, the Kabul mass media emphasize.

What is more, *Kabul New Times* says in an editorial on January 6, some organizations highly dominated by the imperialists shamelessly try to use provision of food aid as a political means to get the Afghan leadership subjected to their will, desire and political drive. Among others, the EEC intends to suspend food aid to Afghanistan. The reason for this decision appears to be the assistance the Afghan government and people have been given by the Soviet Union at a time when Afghanistan's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity were jeopardized by the provocative acts of imperialism and reaction. The paper notes that the Common Market's intention to suspend food aid to the DRA reveals an obvious parallel with the economic sanctions against Iran proposed by the United States. There is clear evidence of an urge to use food aid as an instrument of political pressure against Afghanistan. The DRA government, *Kabul New Times* says in conclusion, condemns any aid with political strings. We shall never agree to a deal that affects our independence and freedom.

Amin's removal and the Soviet Union's assistance to Afghanistan in warding off external aggression have created favorable conditions in the country for strengthening legality and revolutionary gains, the Afghan mass media emphasize.

On January 2, *Haqiqati Enqelabi Saur* carried the text of a statement concerning a general amnesty for political prisoners, 'irrespective of consideration of class, faith, language, tribe, nationality, ideology and political and organizational differences,' issued by Babrak Karmal on the PDPA's 15th anniversary. He said that the DRA government will inform Afghan citizens and world opinion through the mass media of the names of the many thousands of people who were imprisoned and shot on Amin's orders and will give the facts exposing the atrocities of Amin and his clique and the torture methods they used. According to the Afghan press, by January 11 more than 10,000 political prisoners had been released.

The DRA Revolutionary Council announced that it would 'create favorable and secure conditions for the return of those compatriots who were forced to emigrate under the tyranny and despotism of Amin's regime and settle through a political solution the issue of those fighting against the government' (*KNT*, January 1, 1980). At the same time, in accordance with the recommendations of the Plenary Meeting of the PDPA Central Committee, the government will take the necessary steps to eliminate the bands of terrorists, murderers and plunderers, who are agents of international imperialism and reaction.

The DRA press has acquainted the people with the new leadership's program of socio-economic and social transformations. It provides for implementation within the shortest possible period, of the following tasks: to execute the later stages of democratic land reforms, abolish the remnants of the obsolete feudal relationships, end the domination of foreign traders and imperialistic monopoly agencies, expand the public sector in various economic spheres, guide, encourage and protect the artisans, landowners, small and medium traders and national men of capital, democratize the foundation of political and social life and the government apparatus, cultivate and develop various dialects and cultures of all fraternal nationalities and tribes in Afghanistan, carry out the cultural revolution, banish the influence of the remnants of old and neo-colonialism and of imperialism in all spheres (*KNT*, January 1, 1980).

The DRA press has given special attention to the tasks of democratizing social life, as set forth in the program, among them the adoption of effective measures to prevent the abuse of power, including unlawful arrest, house searches and inquisitions, respect for the sacred principles of Islam, freedom of conscience, belief and religious practice, revival of individual security and immunity, provision of healthy conditions conducive to democratic freedoms, such as the freedom to form progressive and patriotic parties, mass or social organizations, freedom of the press, of demonstrations and street manifestations, and the right to work and education. A national front is to be set up in the country (*HES*, January 1, 1980).

The tasks put forward by the new leadership in the field of foreign policy have also been reflected on the pages of the Afghan press. The DRA will firmly pursue a policy based on the principles of positive and active non-alignment and peaceful coexistence, a policy of peace and détente, limitation of strategic nuclear arms, general and complete disarmament and protection of human rights. Afghanistan will also remain a loyal member of the United Nations and the non-aligned movement. It will strengthen and develop its international solidarity with the world socialist system, the international working-class movement and the movement for national liberation and social emancipation of

the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (*KNT*, January 1, 1980).

In the new conditions of the improved atmosphere, the people of Afghanistan are engaged in peaceful creative endeavor and look boldly to the future. We are sure, *Kabul New Times* said on January 3, that final victory will be ours, that the imperialists and reactionaries will fail to thwart the establishment in our country of a society void of exploitation of man by man.

Survey prepared by the *WMR* Department of the Party Press, Reviews and Bibliography.

---

viewpoints

Existing socialism and its impotent bourgeois critics

Jan Fojtik
Secretary, CC CPCz

In a debate one and the same notion is frequently given different interpretations. From the outset the reservation must be made that when I chose the subject of this article, I had no intention of giving the impression that in principle we communists are against all criticism of actual shortcomings in a society of existing socialism. Is there in any socialist country a fraternal party that does not practise this kind of criticism and does not seek solutions to problems without a frank and productive discussion of these problems? But here I mean criticism of a totally different brand. It comes from people who claim they are prompted by the noblest considerations or even by 'apprehensions for the destiny of socialism.' Actually they are either rabid anti-communists speaking for the blackest reaction or people whose opinions of and attitude to the socialist countries are shaped not on the basis of a study of reality but under the influence of the gigantic anti-socialist propaganda machine.

It is this variety of slanderous and misleading criticism from anti-communist centers that is gaining currency. In an effort to nullify or complicate détente and at the same time, disguise as far as possible the evils of capitalism accentuated by its crisis, anti-communism has lately been stepping up its attacks on existing socialism, primarily the Soviet Union. This is undoubtedly a new upsurge in imperialism's psychological war.

We Czechoslovak communists can say without exaggeration that imperialist reaction, the media controlled by it and its various agencies and committees do not lose sight of our country for a single day. Their participation in this crusade against existing socialism and all progressive forces is carefully coordinated.

We know the reason for this 'solicitude.' In the West, apparently convinced that they had once 'presented freedom' to Czechoslovakia,[1] they continue to regard our country as part of the imperialist 'Eurozone,' never wincing even at the mention of Munich. What stings them is the consequences of the Munich betrayal and not the Munich decisions which concerned Czechoslovakia and were made without and despite our people. However, the Czechoslovaks drew proper conclusions and did not miss a unique opportunity offered by the defeat of fascism to choose socialism of their own free will and irrevocably. They were backed by the real friends they had won in the struggle for their right to national existence.[2] This is what the West cannot forgive. The new social system, under which our people have become sovereign masters of their country and which we not only develop and strengthen but guard vigilantly together with fraternal countries, protecting the achievements of the revolution and socialism won at a high cost, is an eyesore to all anti-communists. They cannot forgive us the inseparable bonds of friendship and international solidarity linking us to all socialist, revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces.

For the working class, for the majority of the Czechoslovak people the lessons of the crisis period of the late 1960s are still vivid and are a warning. This is expressed in their effort to build a developed socialist society and reinforce the unity of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and in the principled policy of the CPCz, which gives the party determination in the face of formidable problems, earns it the requisite prestige and guarantees its close bond with the people.

All this understandably makes our enemies nervous and even blinds them. Their criticism of existing socialism is becoming crude and vicious. But before going on to examples, I would like to point out what is generally typical of all the attacks on existing socialism and underlies them.

'Imperialism,' says the main document of the 1969 meeting of communist and workers' parties, 'can neither regain its lost historical initiative nor reverse world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces.' The meeting drew the con-

clusion that 'the world socialist system is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle.'[3] The 25th Congress of the CPSU noted with good reason that 'development of the socialist countries, their greater might and the greater beneficial influence of their international policy — this is now the main direction in mankind's social progress. Socialism's power of attraction has become still greater against the background of the crisis that has erupted in the capitalist countries.'[4]

The appeal of existing socialism and the basis of its growing influence lie in the fact that it epitomizes the vitality and creative power of Marxism-Leninism. The example of our countries shows that exploiting systems existing for centuries are not everlasting and are neither God-given, nor natural. It shows that they can be overthrown and replaced by a higher form of organization of social relations and that this comes about when the working class allied with other working people follows the Leninist theory, strategy and tactics in its struggle for a new society. The new system has freed man from exploitation and from social and national oppression and put society's material and spiritual resources in his service. In this age of nuclear missiles, it is socialism that has assumed the historic mission of preserving civilization and saving life on the planet, which is endangered by imperialism, the greatest obstacle to the solution of the fundamental problems of mankind.

This is why today's ideological battles and the activity of the advocates of anti-communism should only be appraised in terms of the contest between the two opposing social systems — socialism and capitalism. Wherever imperialism wields power and holds a dominant or exclusive position in the ideological sphere, it is accompanied by anti-communism, which not only enjoys government support but is subsidized on an immense scale by many organizations, including subversive and intelligence agencies. The principal motor of this activity is imperialism's bid to exact retribution for the revolutionary and progressive changes that have occurred in the world since the Great October Socialist Revolution. Anything likely to alter the balance of world strength in favor of the capitalist system, if only outwardly, is extolled. Imperialist spokesmen try desperately to prove that black is white, that lies are not lies and that the future belongs to capitalism in spite of its deep crisis. As for socialism, they call it a transient aberration, a mistake of history that can and must be corrected. They try to scare the people of capitalist countries with the bogey of communism, existing socialism and above all, alleged Soviet aggressiveness. The high priests of anti-communism see this 'aggressiveness' in every action by revolutionary and democratic forces in defense of the people's freedom and independence.

However, this puts the defenders of the old world in an unenviable situation. They have to idealize the capitalist way of life, although bourgeois society has long since jettisoned the standards and principles it proclaimed when it came into being. It is also part of their mission to discredit the new social system, whereas this system is ridding itself of various 'infantile disorders' and the legacy of the old society as it advances, and is solving its problems ever more effectively (if not without difficulties and quests) as it translates the noble ideals of the revolutionary working-class and communist movement into reality. In this way, it demonstrates its historical advantages as regards the conception and implementation of democracy, the capacity for dynamic progress through proper management, Marxist-Leninist analysis of reality and scientific prognostication and in other respects. One expression of the advantages of socialism is that for the first time ever, society uses power not as a means of perpetuating or aggravating social inequality, relations based on domination and subordination, nor as a means of making acquisitions at the expense of other nations, but as a means of providing a peaceful life for people and promoting their well-being.

A paradoxical task, that of defending the indefensible, preventing the development of the new and claiming that the future belongs to capitalism, has faced the ideologists of the bourgeoisie ever since its class interests ceased to meet the requirements of social development and capitalism entered the stage of its general crisis. This has given rise to various kinds of reformism. Reformist ideas are gaining ground in bourgeois apologias as the contradictions of capitalism go deeper and intensify, the revolutionary working-class movement grows stronger, resistance to imperialism widens and a revolutionary situation takes shape in one country or another. Reformism generally makes common cause with anti-communism and even uses the latter's arguments, merely giving them more streamlined forms.

Previously, the reformists countered the ideals of scientific socialism with 'reformed capitalism.' But now, more and more often, they counter existing socialism with 'democratic socialism,' which they expect to change society's social structure without affecting its sacred pillars — private property and capitalist power. Yet reformism has always been one of the bourgeoisie's methods holding its positions, paralyzing the revolutionary movement of the masses, blunting their class consciousness, curbing them and bringing them under the control of the bourgeois state and the capitalist system. The reformists like to stress their 'positive' quality while assailing communist 'levity' and 'irresponsibility.' Actually their 'positive' quality serves capitalist interests. They invariably champion capital and when they play any part in a revolutionary movement they only do so as apostates, which anti-communism greatly appreciates.

Renegades from socialist countries are in high demand in the West. How touchingly it cares for, say, Czechoslovak ex-communists who were active during the 'Prague spring!' Take, for example, Zdenek Mlynar and Jiri Pelikan, who collaborate closely with both the social democrats and the most frankly anti-communist centers and join in every campaign or other action whose sole purpose is to discredit existing socialism, the Soviet Union and

our socialist country. They hardly miss any opportunity. What, then, is new about their villifying criticism?

Anyone who follows the activities of these renegades is struck by their zeal to find 'trustworthy' people who have watched the socialist countries' power mechanism 'from within.' The aim is to support the allegation that far from drawing near its primordial ideals, existing socialism grossly deforms them. Hence the conclusion that existing socialism cannot serve as an example and indeed, must be condemned. Occasionally their zeal pushes renegades to the extreme of equating socialism with fascism.

Anti-communism has long followed the principle that 'what is of socialism is of Satan.' But this primitive formula is refuted by reality again and again. The new world has created its own solid socio-economic basis and is developing on it. The demagogical nature of allegations about 'contradictions' between the goals of the socialist program and the methods of achieving them is seen more and more distinctly. Anti-communist concepts are in crisis. In these circumstances, their proponents welcome anyone who is 'disillusioned' with socialism. They welcome renegades, who can moreover be used for organizing an 'opposition movement' in the countries they have left or from which they have been expelled.

No wonder the ideologists of the Prague counter-revolution are now active in Radio Free Europe and other anti-communist propaganda centers, Sudeten German revanchist associations, or 'research' institutes 'working' on anti-socialist concepts. These ex-communist gentlemen are at one with their charitable hosts in hating socialism and Leninism. The crudely eclectic ideological platform of anti-communist 'theorists' is steeped in this hatred. Nor do they make any attempt to achieve a more organic symbiosis of diverse views. They accept and assimilate anything that is likely to help smear our community. One of their characteristics is absolute negativism. Their pronouncements can be defined best of all by using the prefix 'anti,' which sounds particularly emphatic when they talk of the October Revolution and the Soviet Union.

The 'concern' these people show for the purity of the socialist ideal and for the preservation of its essence is truly remarkable. The uninitiated might mistake them for champions of socialism whose only desire is that its principles are applied as perfectly as possible. They hold forth indignantly about 'glaring deformations' of socialism, attributing them to the borrowing of 'Bolshevik experience.' They affirm that at best this experience was beneficial in tsarist Russia.

Take Mlynar, for example. In 1968 he was even on the Presidium of the CPCz Central Committee for a while, but is now a 'dissident' and in his 'works' tries to give substance to the above affirmation, accusing the CPSU and the Soviet Union of every mortal sin. He sees one of these sins in the very founding of the Bolshevik Party. There certainly can be no question of 'freedom,' he argues, since this party was formed with a view to carrying on a revolutionary struggle, overthrowing bourgeois rule and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, not a 'democratic' regime. He must feel certain that this argument strikes existing socialism a crippling blow, for he accuses it of anti-democratism if only because the leading role in the political system of the new society is played by the communist party. This brings him to a conclusion which he considers to be particularly important and to follow from his own experience in 1968. Existing socialism, he asserts, can only be 'democratized' if power is in the hands of a party of the social-democratic type; it was a bad mistake in Czechoslovakia to hope for more or less substantial changes through an evolution of the communist party. Well, let this be heard by those who still wonder what the Czechoslovak events of the late 1960s were all about.

Incidentally, arguments of this kind about Bolshevism and democracy and what Tomas Masaryk, President of the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic, said long ago are as similar as two peas (it is amazing how little today's reformists have added to his pronouncements). Masaryk was afraid of Bolshevism and pitted the Czechoslovak Corps against Soviet Russia shortly after the rise of the new state. But then this outspoken anti-communist and partisan of bourgeois democracy never concealed his class position. As for socialism, all he was willing to recognize in it was what could lead to 'reasonable reforms' without affecting the foundations of capitalist power. Masaryk deliberately tied the Czechoslovak Republic to the imperialist powers — a dependence which ended only when, led by the communists, the working class and other working people of our republic accomplished a revolution.

Whatever the modifications of the revolutionary process in Czechoslovakia due to the concrete historical situation and the traditions and peculiarities of our country, its goal was the same as that of any other socialist revolution: the abolition of bourgeois rule and the establishment of rule by the people, or real democracy. This fundamental political restructuring of society was the chief prerequisite of eliminating the exploiting classes and making socialism a reality.

To reduce these objectives to the demand for 'pluralist democracy,' which has become something of an incantation with our critics, is to caricature history. To insist in earnest, as if directing a message to the Czechoslovak people, that the new society should allow anti-socialist elements freedom of 'constructive' political activity as an opposition means distorting the substance and objectives of our socialist revolution.

Those who believe that in February 1948 the Czechoslovak people wanted nothing else but 'pluralist democracy' are very wrong. Our people came to know bourgeois democracy only too well in the pre-Munich republic; they saw for themselves that it was a cover for capitalist power and had nothing to do with true democracy. They realized in time that the slogan of 'pluralist democracy' was a camouflage for attempts to nullify our revolution and conceal the bourgeoisie's eagerness to regain power. This was not the change sought by our

people, who wanted to pave the way for a society without exploiters, for socialism. And this goal could only be achieved by forming a national front led by the communists to unite all who adhered to the position of the working class and the majority of the people in struggle against the bourgeoisie. Those who had led the republic to Munich and betrayed it in the war years were expelled from the National Front by the very logic of history. So were those who afterwards tried to maintain capitalist rule on our soil at all costs and to make the country a dependency of the Western powers once again. This is one of the reasons why the political parties representing capitalist reaction in or outside Czechoslovakia disappeared from our political scene for good and why the parties really serving the people remained on it.

Proponents of 'pluralist democracy' cherished the illusory hope that the political and ideological superstructure of bourgeois society with its key criteria of nominal democracy could be transplanted onto socialist soil. Yet the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism never depends on the volition of politicians or ideologists. It is the result of an uncompromising class struggle, which cannot be eliminated through a 'supraclass,' abstract kind of democracy. The right to lead the new society in this struggle can only be won and maintained by political forces consistently upholding the fundamental interests of the working class and other working people, not merely declaring democratic principles but leading the implementation of democratic and revolutionary changes.

We have also discovered that the bourgeoisie's use of such terms as 'pluralism' or 'pluralist democracy' has a definite purpose. In addition to what has been said, it is designed to present existing socialism as a regimented, drab and repellent society in which everyone must submit unquestioningly to a monstrous whole and keep pace with everyone else; woe betide him who lags behind or overtakes this society. We can now see how greatly our ill-wishers exaggerate and dramatize the grimness and inexorability of revolutionary struggle, which they make out to be a cult of violence allegedly typical of existing socialism. They update every past excess or mistake whenever we come out in defense of socialist legality and order. They also see 'violence' in the struggle for socialist morality, in the effort to relieve man of the burden of selfishness and individualism and various forms of spiritual oppression used by the ruling classes over the centuries to stupefy the working people and keep them in bondage.

This view of socialism — a view thoroughly distorting the humanism of the new system — is apparently meant to comfort those who follow with displeasure and apprehension the moral decay of contemporary bourgeois society, the decline of its values, nihilism and relativism, and growing violence and arbitrariness, whose roots lie in imperialism's legalized criminal world protected by police. This is one of the reasons why bourgeois critics of existing socialism so zealously whitewash various asocial elements in socialist countries who say their anti-social or even criminal conduct is prompted by a 'thirst for freedom' and 'abhorrence of totalitarianism.'

These elements are the only real hinterland of the so-called Charter 77, a lampoon penned by a group speaking for a very narrow circle of people who aspire, however, to play the role of an 'opposition movement' on behalf of the Czechoslovak people, said to be denied all opportunity to express themselves democratically or engage in civic activity. Those who have brought this 'movement' into existence keep it on the political scene. First it was the U.S. administration that took up the defense of Charter 77 and now it is spokesmen of other bourgeois governments and diplomats. Western news agencies describe the 'heroism' of its members in the face of 'repression' and 'suffering.' In this way they would like to talk official representatives of our state into accepting a 'dialogue' with this 'political opposition.' Moreover, Czechoslovakia's willingness or unwillingness to engage in this 'dialogue' will indicate, as they see it, how faithfully our country complies with the terms of the Helsinki Final Act. It is perfectly clear that these extraordinary but useless efforts constitute interference in Czechoslovak affairs and are aimed at destabilizing the situation in our country. This is precisely what runs counter to the Helsinki accords.

Experience has shown that it is dangerous to treat such attempts lightly, let alone meet them halfway. We have satisfied ourselves that the anti-socialists regard every concession on our part as a sign of weakness of our system and proceed accordingly. To look on these people as exponents of public opinion is a bad joke indeed.

The Czechoslovak political system is embodied in the National Front with its political parties and mass organizations, the people's representative bodies and their commissions, in which citizens work on a voluntary basis. It creates an appropriate platform for the satisfaction of the manifold interests and requirements of every social group. Democracy on a vast scale finds expression in commitment and initiative on the part of the working people, irrespective of political views, religion, sex or nationality. If the socialist democratic system sets certain limits to what is permissible, this means restricting not 'pluralism' but activities aimed at undermining the foundations of socialism. In our society no one may sow discord between nations or ethnic groups and foment hatred for members of a different race with impunity; no one is allowed to advocate war or fascism or sling mud at those who help safeguard national security and sovereignty. Socialist legality is a solid component of the new social system which has a right to defend itself.

These are obvious facts attesting to the superiority of socialist over bourgeois democracy. We are convinced that to be lenient to capitalism on key issues of contemporary development and spearhead criticism against existing socialism is to play into the hands of reactionary imperialist forces and mislead decent people looking for a solution to the big problems of today.

The new, socialist conception of freedom and democracy also materializes in relations between the peoples of the socialist community. The enemies of socialism would like to obscure or discredit above all, two aspects of these relations. One, complete equality has been achieved for the first time in history: subordination, exploitation and the privileged position of one country in regard to another are a thing of the past. But relations between socialist countries go beyond the principles of equal rights and mutual benefit. Two, these relations are marked by disinterested mutual assistance, common interests coming first. There is mutual assistance in economic, scientific, technological and cultural development and in joint defense against military threats from imperialism. The new character of these relations, which helps unite the socialist community more and more closely, is based on the principle of proletarian internationalism, which is becoming socialist internationalism as it spreads to the life of society as a whole and to state policy.

The logical trend toward closer relations between countries of existing socialism is under fierce enemy attack. This is not surprising, for unity and cohesion are the main source of power of our fraternal community. Its soul and its guiding, organizing force, Leonid Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress, are the indissoluble militant alliance of the communist parties of socialist countries, the identity of their world outlook, their aims and will. Relations between the communist parties and the communists' internationalist unity are the backbone of cooperation among all revolutionary anti-imperialist forces.

Imperialism tries in various ways to loosen this unity. It uses that old formula 'divide and rule,' to foment nationalist tendencies, which it regards with reason as an important means of weakening our ranks. This explains the bourgeois ideologists' sympathy for 'national communism,' which betrays the principle of internationalism. They, too, see the attitude of this or that socialist country toward the Soviet Union and our community as the touchstone of its policy. And so they consider the Maoists' anti-Sovietism a sufficient reason for ignoring the crying deformations of socialist ideals in China, now reported by the Chinese press itself. Speaking generally, our opponents are ready to desist from criticizing communist parties which contribute to anti-Sovietism (precisely anti-Sovietism and not national distinctions, which every Marxist-Leninist party certainly must take into account). But, of course, this is a price no one in the socialist community will accept.

'A living example, tackling the job somewhere in one country,' Lenin wrote, pointing out the historic significance of the October Revolution, 'is more effective than any proclamations and conferences; this is what inspires the working people in all countries' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 471). In those years, international reaction tried not only to destroy the first worker-peasant state but to disprove the universal validity of the Russian Bolsheviks' revolutionary experience, smear the Soviet example and portray it as accidental and unique. Present-day bourgeois propaganda says as much, though in subtler form.

The banner of the new world flies over different continents. Some new developing states have opted for a socialist orientation. To be sure, historical traditions and socio-economic conditions vary from one socialist country to another as do these countries' potentialities, difficulties and plans for the immediate and distant future. It is impossible to follow one universal pattern in building a new life, in, say, Mongolia, Cuba, Vietnam, the GDR and Czechoslovakia. Nor is anyone going to do this, contrary to our enemies' allegations. What is far more important is what unites the peoples building socialism and communism, namely, the identity of social and economic tasks, Marxist-Leninist ideology and the struggle for peace and social progress on earth. The achievements of one socialist country benefit the socialist community as a whole. By the same token, the growing strength of our community serves the vital interests of each fraternal nation.

The truth about existing socialism is a powerful weapon in today's ideological struggle over fundamental issues. It telescopes the historic advantages of the new social system with its inexhaustible potentialities, humanism and orientation to the future. It reveals the antithesis between the policy for peace and militarist policy, national self-determination and neo-colonialism, real democracy and the bourgeoisie's flouting of human rights. The superiority of socialism over capitalism manifests itself both in achievements and in development problems conditioning the future. Czechoslovakia, like other fraternal countries, is raising production efficiency, improving the quality of output, quickening the pace of scientific and technological progress and making leadership more efficient at every level. It looks for ways of bringing more working people into the management of public affairs and making everyone's life happier and more fruitful. I would say that the nature of these problems and the manner of solving them reveal the historical potentialities of socialism as much as the progress that has been made.

Socialist society is a young society whose main advantage lies in its dynamism and growing potential, in the creative capacity of the millions who truly shape their destiny. Socialism and communism have unlimited propects. This makes it more and more evident that the ideological defenders of the old world are utterly impotent.

1. Only because the Versailles (1919), Saint-Germain (1919), and Trianon (1920) treaties established the state frontiers of the Czechoslovak Republic, which proclaimed its independence in 1918.

2. As a matter of fact, even in 1918, the independence of the Czechoslovak Republic as a sovereign state was not an indication of imperialist 'goodwill' but a direct result of the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

3. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*. Prague, 1969, pp. 13 and 21.

4. L.I. Brezhnev, *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*. 1976, p. 47.

Choice of way

Anis Hassan Yahya
CC Political Bureau member, Yemen Socialist Party

Under the new balance of forces in the international arena, which has radically changed in favor of socialism, the peoples of the newly liberated countries have a real possibility to make their own choice of way of development.

When as a result of persevering and protracted struggle, South Yemen won its national independence on November 30, 1967, our people also had to make a choice of way. The democratic forces in the liberation movement, both within the National Front Organization and outside it, advocated from the outset a policy aimed to consolidate the political independence and effect deep-going progressive transformations with a socialist perspective.

However, rightist elements then at the head of the National Front and in the military and civilian organs of the state apparatus denied the imperative need to deepen the ongoing transformations along the line leading to socialism, and actually slowed down the revolutionary process. The rightists' vacillation and indecision on the attitude to foreign capital, which had full control of the national economy, and also to the feudals and comprador bourgeoisie sprang from their ideology which was shaped under the influence of the bourgeois-nationalistic conception of social reforms. On the other hand, this stand reflected the interests of the senior officers, most of whom were of semi-feudal class origin, and also of some middle social strata connected with certain circles in the state apparatus and the National Front. One should also take into account the fact that some members of the Army Command still maintained close ties with British colonialism and Arab reaction. What is more, rightists carried out fierce and sanguinary reprisals against the progressive wing of the National Front and other democratic forces.

In those conditions it was, naturally, impossible to take the road of development oriented upon socialism. The democratic forces and the progressive wing of the National Front in particular, had to make a fresh start on solving the question of political power in the working people's interests. The start of the genuinely revolutionary change in South Yemen was marked by the 'corrective action' on June 22, 1969,[1] which was the starting point for democratic transformations that have been and are still being broadly effected in every sphere of life. Since then, our country has been travelling along a road of development with the socialist perspective.

This choice has not at all been determined by any subjective aspirations. It naturally met the interests of broad masses of people and was a genuine expression of the urge of workers, peasants and all the other working people to do away with the legacy of the colonial regime and to set up on its ruins, a social system aimed to put an end to man's exploitation of man in any form.

Life itself showed that for newly-liberated states which have to overcome the socio-economic backwardness produced by colonial rule and to catch up with modern civilization in the shortest historical period, the capitalist way of development is futile. Countries taking it under the rule of the capitalist class find themselves under the heel of neo-colonialism. Remaining an appendage of the world capitalist economy, they are subject to all the crises and upheavals of world imperialism and to all the devastating contradictions produced and aggravated on a world scale by capitalist relations of production. One could even say that they have to suffer more from these insoluble contradictions than the developed capitalist countries, whose ruling class is in a position to use the transnationals in order to shift a large part of the burden produced by the crisis phenomena on the shoulders of the developing nations. This tends to conserve and deepen the backwardness of newly-liberated countries and to widen the gap between them and the developed capitalist countries.

The peoples of many young states have learned from their own experience that it is also wrong and dangerous to act on the recipes of those who advocate a 'third way' which differs from the capitalist and the socialist orientation. Life shows that the application of this pseudo-theory in practice results in the waste of material and manpower resources and far from helping a country to advance, in effect leads to its growing dependence on imperialism and neo-colonial subjugation. The notorious 'third way' is no more than a petty-bourgeois illusion and the attempts to follow it merely serve to prolong the life of the social system which is based on exploitation and social oppression.

In this respect, Gamal Abdel Nasser's evolution is instructive. In the initial period after the 1952 revolution, having adopted such basically erroneous ideas, he began to experiment with diverse 'models' in search of an imaginary 'third way' of development. These experiments, which had no clear-cut conceptual basis and which were far from painless, almost led him into a dead end. Having realized the danger of experiments that did not accord with the Egyptian people's interests, Nasser announced his adoption of the theory of scientific socialism. But being incomplete and inconsistent, his adoption of the theory of scientific

socialism was also much too late, because by then a new parasitic bourgeoisie had managed to grow up and spread its influence in the Egyptian society and to establish its control over the state apparatus and the Arab Socialist Union.[2]

Although the advocates of the 'third way' theory do accept the need to fight world imperialism, in practice the anti-imperialist elements of their policy tend increasingly to disappear under the impact of the patently nationalistic character of the theory, which is informed by ideas of national exclusiveness and which regards the essentially international ideology of the working class as an aggregation of ideas that are injected from outside and that are alien to that society. In some instances, its advocates do not confine themselves to such untenable pronouncements about the theory of scientific socialism. They start to persecute the working-class parties, resorting to various forms of violence, repression, including physical violence. Now and again such repression even goes beyond the country's national borders. In such circumstances, this theory and its supporters lose all their anti-imperialism, which is replaced by hostility for the socialist-community countries and the Soviet Union.

When flatly rejecting both the capitalist way of development and the illusory 'third way' we do not assert that the orientation upon socialism is a bed of roses and that it is free from any difficulties and problems. Such an assertion would not only be at variance with the theory of scientific socialism, but it would also evidence a lack of understanding of these problems and of the objective situation from which they spring.

Democratic Yemen has a wealth of experience which is original in many respects, especially in view of the successful results achieved in a country with very limited potentialities and resources and extreme socio-economic backwardness inherited from the colonial epoch.

The theory of scientific socialism shows — and the practice of the peoples' struggle for a better life and social progress confirms — that the revolutionary transformation of society toward socialism is a highly complicated process. It does not run spontaneously or automatically, but in accordance with the objective uniformities of social development and does not in any sense follow the will or desires of individuals and leaders. Only a working-class party, relying on the theory of scientific socialism, having a developed and sound internal structure and maintaining constant and close ties with the masses, is capable of guiding this process. The Yemen Socialist Party is just such a party. It was set up at its Constituent Congress, which was held in Aden from October 11 to 13, 1978.[3] The YSP, its program says, acting as the 'vanguard of the Yemeni working class, in alliance with the peasantry, the revolutionary intelligentsia and other sections of the working people,' as a true defender of the working people's material and spiritual interests, as an organization equipped with the ideology of the working class, by rights assumes the leadership of the revolutionary transformations in society, setting the goal of completing the task of the national-democratic revolution and going on to socialist construction.

State power is known to be a key instrument for implementing progressive democratic transformations in the political, socio-economic and cultural spheres, and in Democratic Yemen its character has changed with the development and deepening of our revolution. The national-democratic power, which emerged on the ruins of the old regime, was an expression of the alliance of the various socio-political forces united in their struggle against the colonialists, imperialists and their henchmen in the country: the comprador bourgeoisie, the feudals and the semi-feudals. As the transformations were radicalized, especially after the June 1969 act, the national-democratic power developed into a revolutionary-democratic power relying on an alliance of workers, peasants and other sections of the working people. Its social base became more homogeneous than it was at the preceding stage.

The establishment of a Supreme People's Council through universal, free and equal suffrage was another important step in the development of democracy. The election of the Supreme People's Council and of local people's councils before that, markedly consolidated the working people's power.

The YSP Program provides that in the long term, once the stage of the national-democratic revolution has been completed and the material, technical and socio-economic prerequisites for transition to socialist construction have been created, the present political power 'will grow into a form of people's democracy exercising the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.'

In the more than 10 years since the June 22 'corrective action,' radical changes have taken place in the country's economy. Resolute measures were put through to undermine the positions of foreign capital, the comprador bourgeoisie, the feudals and the semi-feudals. The nationalization of the property of foreign and big local owners created the basis for a state sector which now variously covers every sector of the economy and has control of the commanding heights in the key sectors. The state fully controls banking and insurance, marine and air haulage, wholesale and foreign trade, tourist travel, hotel services, film distribution and so on. There is a steady growth of the share of the state sector in industry as well. It dominates in electric-power generation, oil refining, textiles, the fish industry and the production of some foodstuffs. On the whole, in 1978 the state sector accounted for 62 per cent of total output of enterprises run by the Ministry of Industry.

A radical solution of the agrarian problem in favor of the toiling peasantry has made it possible to get down to collectivizing agriculture. The cooperative movement in the countryside has assumed extensive proportions thanks to the persistent efforts in educating the peasants in a spirit of cooperation, visual demonstration of the advantages and benefits of collective labor, and great

assistance to the new cooperatives from the state. By the end of 1978, the cooperative sector accounted for almost 80 per cent of agricultural output in the country. A state sector, consisting of state farms, machine and tractor stations and other enterprises, has also emerged in agriculture. The cooperative and the state sectors have become the dominant ones in fisheries, a key industry in Democratic Yemen. In 1978, 70 per cent of internal demand was met by the fishing cooperatives.

In accordance with the fundamental principles of the economic policy pursued by the revolutionary-democratic power, the participation of private capital in the sphere of production was encouraged. The emergence of a mixed sector was a new phenomenon in economic life: in 1977, it accounted for 29 per cent of output by light-industry enterprises under the Ministry of Industry. The YSP Program envisages the utmost use of the potentialities of the mixed and private sectors 'within the framework of development plans and under stringent control by the government and the masses for the purpose of consolidating the national economy and making more rational and efficient use of material and financial resources.'

The task of developing and consolidating the material and technical basis of the economy in order to satisfy the vital material and spiritual needs of the working people required and continues to require the pursuit of a thoroughly considered and scientifically grounded economic policy based on the general objective laws of socio-economic devlopment and implying careful consideration of the national specifics, as otherwise our country would be doomed either to wander about in the labyrinths of empiricism or to a mechanical copying of the experience of others.

The system of economic administration was based on the principle of democratic centralism, which requires a blend of centralized direction of the economy by the state and utmost development of creative initiative on the part of local organs, production units and all the working people. The fundamentals of planning, as a key and organic element of this system, have been laid. In the past period, two development plans — a three-year plan and a five-year plan have been fulfilled. In early 1979, Democratic Yemen got down to fulfilling its second five-year plan. In the preceding period, planning covered mainly the sphere of investments. Production programs were drawn up for the sectors of industry and agriculture. Planning did not apply to domestic and foreign trade, to manpower resources, wages, price formation and so on. That was due to the shortage of material and financial resources, a shortage of trained personnel and the imperfection of the elements of the economic-administration system. But what has already been done is a highly important step toward organizing broader, more detailed and larger-scale planning ranging over every sphere and sector of the economy.

These measures have markedly raised the living standards of the masses. There has been an improvement in the supply to the population of foodstuffs and consumer goods, whose prices are being maintained at a low level through large-scale state subsidies. Rent remains stable and relatively low. Free education and medical services have been introduced. Democratic Yemen has not only got rid of unemployment but now has a labor shortage. The policy of further steadily raising the Yemeni working people's material and cultural standards continues to be an immutable element of the YSP's socio-economic policy.

But we have also had to overcome very grave difficulties and shortcomings in the economic sphere. These negative phenomena were largely produced by left-opportunist elements whose practices distorted and twisted the fundamental principles of the economic policy pursued by the revolutionary power and the political leadership's basically correct decisions and instructions. Thus, as a result of the activity of left-wing opportunists, the sectors of material production are still less than fully involved in the process of accumulation, while the share of the financial and commercial sectors and the service sphere comes to more than 90 per cent. Among the other serious shortcomings there is the disordered state of the pricing policy, which still fails adequately to reckon with the law of value, a law which fully continues to operate in our society; the inadequate use of the principles of commodity-money circulation in relations between enterprises; the existence of large and chronic defects in the wages system; the incorrect policy in the sphere of distribution: this policy should create favorable conditions for the steady development of the sectors of direct material production, instead of giving commercial enterprises advantages at their expense, and so on. However, none of this can minimize the tremendous importance of the radical and progressive transformations in the economic sphere.

The effected transformations have entailed deep-going changes in society's social structure. The influence and weight of the working class and peasantry and other sections of the working people have grown, and their drawing closer together has led to the establishment of relations of alliance and fraternal trust among them. At the present stage, this alliance is the mainstay of the national-democratic revolution.

Of fundamental importance for the successful advance of newly-liberated states along the road of socialist orientation is the shaping within them of the national working class, the vehicle of the ideology of scientific socialism, and the strengthening of its ranks. The establishment and development in Democratic Yemen of a state sector in the economy, the implementation of economic-development plans, the building of new and modern industrial enterprises and the extension and growth of the general education and technical and skill training of personnel have led to a quantitative and qualitative growth of the working class. A nucleus of industrial workers employed at the enterprises of the state sector has emerged and been consolidated within the ranks of the working class itself as its most advanced and organized contingent. Under

the influence of the ideology of scientific socialism, the workers have adopted new revolutionary concepts, ideas, customs and traditions. In the fight against the forces of imperialism and reaction, their class self-consciousness has risen to a new level and their organization and activity in putting through socio-economic transformations and defending the revolutionary gains have increased. The role of the working class in economic administration and management has been strengthened through the broader involvement of trade unions in the formulation and implementation of economic policy and development plans and the workers' actual participation in the management of enterprises. The working class of Democratic Yemen, once oppressed and exploited by foreign capital and the local comprador bourgeoisie, has become the collective owner of the means of production, standing in alliance with the other sections of the working people, at the head of the political power in the country.

The revolution, having given land to the peasants and the implements of fishing to the fishermen, eliminated the parasitical strata of the feudals, usurers and middlemen. For the first time in Yemen's long history, the peasants and fishermen have begun to work for themselves and for the benefit of society. Cooperation has led to the emergence of two new social sections: the cooperative peasants and fishermen, who together with the working class constitute the broad social base and main motive force of the revolution.

The left-opportunists' adventurist acts did much harm to the relations between the revolutionary power and the peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie. Instead of painstaking and persevering explanation of the substance of the socio-economic policy being pursued, the leftists resorted to crude administration by fiat and pressure, so causing discontent among a large section of the peasants and the urban petty-bourgeois strata. In the countryside, left-opportunist elements confiscated land allotments which were not in excess of the maximum size as laid down by the agrarian reform law, and insinuated into cooperative-farm management their own protégés, who pushed them into complete collapse. This resulted in an outflow of the rural population into the towns and a drop in the output of farm produce, notably vegetables and fruit. The unwarranted curbs on petty traders and artisans in the towns turned out to be a heavy economic and financial burden falling on the state.

The YSP is aware that individual farmers and urban petty-bourgeois sections continue to play an important role in the production and supply of some types of products. In order actually to involve these social groups in the process of revolutionary transformations and the building of the new society, the YSP has done everything to stimulate their economic activity under stringent control on the part of the state, while explaining to them the advantages of collective labor and promoting their association in cooperatives on a strictly voluntary basis. The party, working hard to educate them in a spirit of collectivism on the basis of the doctrine of scientific socialism, carries on a relentless struggle against any manifestations of bourgeois ideology and petty-bourgeois anarchism and adventurism.

The numerical strength of the intelligentsia has grown rapidly in the process of radical transformations. The revolution did away with the social order which used intellectuals to serve anti-popular forces and to seek only personal benefits, haughtily keeping aloof from the masses of people. The best part of the intelligentsia, having fraternized with the working class and other working people, has adopted scientific socialism and has actively joined in the economic, social and cultural construction. At the same time, the revolution paved the way for the formation of a new revolutionary intelligentsia from among members of the working class, peasantry and other sections of the working people. It has a high responsibility in spreading the ideas of scientific socialism, asserting the new ideals and values, helping the working people to acquire knowledge and educating the masses in the spirit of the principles and goals of the revolution.

In the past period, a great deal has been done for the genuine emancipation of women, who have now for the first time in the history of Yemen, risen to dignity and an active political, social and cultural life. Women's rights have been legislatively established through a series of enactments, primarily the law on the family. However, a fundamental and complete solution of the women's question continues to run up against great difficulties, which are produced, on the one hand by the survivals of the past in the minds and behavior of men, and on the other by the ideas concerning the emancipation of women implanted by the ideologists of the bourgeoisie.

We believe that development and consolidation of our relations of fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation with the socialist-community countries, with the great Soviet Union in the first place, are a key and necessary condition for the successful advance of our revolution along socialist lines. As Abdel Fattah Ismail, General Secretary of the YSP CC, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council of the PDRY, said in one of his speeches on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union, our countries have established 'a solid bridge of friendship, which has been further fortified in the course of the struggle against imperialism and its aggressive schemes.' Our people will never forget the Soviet Union's support at the time of trial and its sincere and selfless assistance in defending the young revolutionary regime of the PDRY. With the assistance of Soviet organizations, many agricultural, industrial and cultural projects have been built, exploration of oil deposits is being carried on and national personnel trained in Democratic Yemen. The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the PDRY, signed by Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev and Abdel Fattah Ismail, is a fresh and visual embodiment of our bonds of brotherhood.

The successes our people have scored over this

short period in every sphere of life are truly impressive and are justifiably a source of pride for us. These resulted from the selfless efforts of workers, peasants, fishermen and all the other working people of Democratic Yemen, testifying to their firm resolve to advance along their chosen road regardless of the obstacles and difficulties and any intrigues by imperialism and reaction. They also show the inexhaustible energies that are awakened in the masses when they are released from the yoke of colonialism and oppression by local feudals and comprador bourgeoisie that doomed them to terrible backwardness and poverty.

Life shows that the choice made by the people of Democratic Yemen is the only correct one. Under the leadership of the Yemen Socialist Party, equipped with the theory of scientific socialism, it has continued steadily and confidently to advance along the road of radical revolutionary-democratic transformations with a socialist perspective.

1. The day the right-wing elements were removed from the National Front leadership. — *Ed.*

2. The only mass political organization in the country, set up in 1963. Now disbanded. — *Ed.*

3. See A. F. Ismail, 'A New Vanguard Party,' *WMR*, No. 1, 1979 — *Ed.*

---

the Party

Our aims and our course

Pedro Antonio Saad
General Secretary, Communist Party of Ecuador

Ecuador is experiencing a process of accelerated capitalist development. This is taking place against the background of growing dependence on imperialism and the preservation of backward forms of economic structure. This process began a long time ago and has been sharply intensified in recent years. In 1972-1979 the economic growth rate in Ecuador was double that of 1964-1971 and was among the highest in Latin America. Per capita income also showed a marked increase. In the 1971-1977 period the foreign currency reserve grew 23-fold. There has been an expansion of output in most industries.

The ruling circles use these facts to argue that there have been social changes and that the nation's economy is sound. However, in the opinion of the communists, there has been nothing but an economic growth, a growth that has not improved the living standards of the working people or the nation as a whole.

The main factor behind this growth was the development of the huge oil deposits discovered in the eastern part of the country in 1967. At first, the military government that came to power in 1972 got down to reconsidering the onerous contracts with foreign companies. It secured the return of most of the oil-rich areas leased to U.S. monopolies, took over control of the oil output, and introduced a new tax system limiting the domination of the transnational corporations. The Ecuadoran Oil Corporation was set up with most of the shares belonging to the state and the rest, a smaller proportion, to Texaco Gulf Co. of the USA. The functions of the new corporation are to survey and develop oil fields (either independently or on the basis of contracts), refine oil and market oil products. The government banned the refining of oil by private companies, local or foreign. It also formed the Ecuadoran Oil Tanker Fleet Company, which carries at least half of the exported oil. Ecuador is now a member of OPEC. This has made it easier for the country to defend its natural resources. It now maintains relations with the petroleum producing countries in Asia and Africa.

Within a short span of time Ecuador has become Latin America's second biggest exporter of oil. The state's revenues and influx of foreign currency have sharply increased. Rational utilization of these funds, even within the framework of the capitalist system, could have opened the way to industrialization, the enlargement of the public sector, the enforcement of an agrarian reform and expansion of irrigated farming and electrification, an improvement of public health and public education systems and the alleviation of the housing shortage, in other words, it could have helped change the entire social climate. However, among the military leadership the proponents of the 'desarrollista'[1] model prevailed. In keeping with their concept, the bulk of the investments in the form of subsidies and credits was channelled into the private sector of the economy. At the same time, the ruling circles decided to encourage foreign capital and the establishment of mixed companies.

A recent study shows that the transnationals opened 134 new subsidiaries in Ecuador in 1960-1975. The 1975-1980 period witnessed a further penetration by imperialist concerns. There has been a lot of talk about local monopolies (which have also been given broad coverage in the press). Indeed, several big firms controlling individual economic sectors, such as bananas, sugar and flour,

have appeared in recent years. However, a careful analysis shows that all of them are either directly controlled by foreign capital or wholly dependent on it. Ties to the U.S. concerns General Motors and General Electric are the only explanation that a country with one of the lowest levels of development in Latin America has plants manufacturing cars and refrigerators, some of which are even exported.

Despite the increase in foreign currency reserves, the foreign debt has grown rapidly, from $241 million in 1970 to $2.9 billion in 1979. The latter is a greatly understated figure because it does not include (allegedly for security reasons) the military debt. In 1980 about 20 per cent of the state budget is to be spent on repaying part of that debt. At the same time, the transnationals are reaping huge profits: the U.S. monopolists alone are taking $160 million out of the country annually. As a result, Ecuador is becoming more heavily dependent on foreign technology and also on the financial centers of the capitalist world. The government has to yield to foreign pressure and accept 'economic growth programs' in order to get new loans and a deferment on payments.

In a statement to the UN, Fidel Castro speaking on behalf of the non-aligned nations, condemned these 'operations' of the transnationals. The communists say that despite the growth of its productive forces Ecuador is still dependent on imperialism with all the accompanying negative implications for national sovereignty and the economy.

During this period capitalist relations made some headway in the countryside. The first agrarian reform law was promulgated in 1964. But it fell short of what the peasants had expected because latifundism remained the principal obstacle to development in agriculture. It was only later that survivals of feudalism were really undermined by decrees and the measures prescribed by them. They finally abolished the system of land distribution[2] described by the Ecuadoran writer Jorge Icaza in *Huasipungo*. In 1973 the military government passed another agrarian reform law with provisions curtailing the rights of big landowners. However, it was not put into effect in full. That is why the big estates still exist. According to the 1974 census 709 landowners held 20 per cent of the arable land. An interim report on the reform, published in January 1979, showed that of the 220,000 hectares of land distributed among the peasants 200,000 hectares belonged to the state and only 20,000 hectares to the latifundists.

Capitalist relations in the countryside are developing mainly along two classical lines, which Karl Marx described as the 'Prussian' and 'American.' On the one hand, numerous middle landowners are turning their feudal-type farms into capitalist farms making wide use of agricultural machinery. On the other, the government is encouraging the development of unused lands with the purpose of blunting the edge of the struggle for land in the most fertile coastal and central areas. Having lost their tiny plots, many of the peasants are joining the ranks of the rural proletariat or are migrating to towns in search of jobs.

The 'oil boom' has shown that higher foreign currency revenues and a larger gross domestic product do not yet mean balanced economic development. Social contradictions are being aggravated and the disproportion in the distribution of material benefits is widening. Proceeding from a study by the National Planning Council, the Communist Party has assessed that 50 per cent of the country's population are getting 19 per cent of the national income, whereas only 5 per cent get 25 per cent of the income. Unemployment has reached a high level. The National Planning Council believes that there are 110,000 jobless in the country. But this number includes only those who have lost all means of subsistence. In addition, huge numbers of people have no permanent jobs. Even official statistics admit that close to 52 per cent of the economically active population are only partially employed. Spurred by the growing external debt, inflation has soared. The cost of living is rising inexorably, having more than doubled in the past few years. A survey conducted by the Working People's Confederation of Ecuador jointly with the National Planning Council and the universities reveals that although the monthly minimum cost of living of a worker's family is 5,000 sucres,[3] real wages are under 3,000 sucres. In other words, the workers are earning just over half the living wage.

A country with a population of about eight million is short of 1,300,000 homes. Social insurance covers only 17 per cent of the economically active population. The living conditions, especially in the poverty afflicted areas, are perhaps the most appalling in the world. Forty per cent of the people are undernourished, 90 per cent of the urban population have no running water, 99 per cent of the rural and 74 per cent of the urban inhabitants live in houses without sewerage.

These factors, naturally, are fuelling social tensions and escalating the class struggle. In opposing poverty and unbearable living conditions the working class is demanding the right to live and have a better future. The bourgeoisie, which is linked to imperialism and the transnationals, is intensifying the exploitation of the working people and seeking to nullify the people's democratic gains. The working class is becoming better organized, acquiring a higher class consciousness and growing numerically. In 1970 there were 39,000 industrial workers. There are now 100,000, not counting those employed in transport, construction and agriculture. The peasants, who make up about 60 per cent of the population, are demanding the implementation of the agrarian reform law. They want the abolition of all survivals of feudalism and latifundism and support for cooperative farming. Driven to despair, people from among the middle sections are likewise trying to find a way out of the present situation, although sometimes they do this wrongly by resorting to terrorism and anarchist actions.

The resistance of the working people made it impossible for the military dictatorship to remain in

power. The regime was forced to make concessions and take steps to constitutionalism, i.e., restore limited bourgeois-democratic guarantees. The process was extremely protracted and painful. A referendum held in 1978 showed that the people favored a more democratic draft of the constitution drawn up by legal commissions consisting of representatives of various political forces, including the Communist Party. This constitution paves the way for the country's economic development and provides the legal basis for a struggle for complete national independence and social progress. The presidential and parliamentary elections were held under the new fundamental law. A nominee of the populist party — People's Forces Union — which generously promised to end extreme poverty and backwardness won the elections. Thus, the returns reflected the massive disaffection with the military regime and the desire for change, rather than the people's approval of the populist party's program.

Jaime Roldos Aguilera, the elected president, was officially inaugurated in August 1979. The new government has introduced some progressive reforms in the sphere of legislative and executive authority. It has restored relations with Cuba, assisted the people of Nicaragua against Somoza and supported the anti-imperialist moves of the Andean Group.[4] In response to the demands of the people the government has repealed the decrees infringing upon trade union rights and raised wages and allowances. This shows that, provided the masses are active, it is possible to advance along the road of democracy. However, matters are complicated by the deep split in the ruling party. The wing headed by Assad Bucaram, leader of the party and chairman of the parliament, and the wing supporting the President cannot come to terms. To some extent this is a struggle between legislative and executive authority and it seriously obstructs progressive changes. The communists regard it as a grave danger. If the conflict goes too far, it may result in another intervention by the military. That is why they are doing everything to avoid such a course of events.

In this situation the Communist Party has called on the people of Ecuador to fight for observance of democratic rights, higher wages and allowances and the nationalization of the entire oil and power industries, against the domination of imperialist monopolies, for the preservation and enlargement of the public sector of the economy, a democratic agrarian reform, effective aid to cooperatives and community farms, better conditions for the people, friendly relations and peace with all other peoples and promotion of ties with socialist countries. The communists propose that military expenditure should be cut to a level that would meet solely the requirements of national defense. It is incredible that a small country like Ecuador, which has serious economic difficulties, should take part in the arms race, while progressives all over the world are fighting to end it. A cut in military expenditure would release substantial funds and make it possible to clear the external debt. In short, the Communist Party has put forward a program for national independence and social emancipation.

The communists have told the government that they are prepared to support measures in pursuit of the above demands, but will resist any step that may hurt the vital interests of the working people and the nation as a whole. We are not in opposition for opposition's sake. The Communist Party represents the working class and for that reason adheres to class positions relative to the government.

This line stems from our overall approach to national problems and also from the Party program, which states that the situation at home and on the international scene makes the national liberation revolution inevitable in Ecuador and that the people will achieve freedom, well-being and progress only by beginning to build a socialist society.

The Communist Party of Ecuador was founded and is working for precisely this goal, which has been attained by a considerable part of humanity, including the people of Cuba. But the people can go on to building the new society only as a result of revolutionary changes. This transition depends on the breadth of the national liberation, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic revolution and the alignment of forces that will take shape as it develops. The communists are sure that the revolution in Ecuador will be not only a national liberation, but also an anti-capitalist and ultimately a socialist revolution. They regard it as a process in the struggle spearheaded above all against the nation's main enemy — imperialism. Operating in disguise and making use of the latest scientific and technological achievements it penetrates all spheres of the political, social, economic and cultural life of our society and forms a part of its present internal structure.

The anti-imperialist liberation movement is headed by the working class. I have already noted that it is growing numerically. True, this rapid growth is not accompanied by a rise of ideological maturity. Although the working class is eager for change, reformist sentiment is still strong in it. The ideological education of the proletariat is therefore one of our most pressing tasks. It must become the leading force of the revolutionary process in the true sense of the word. Its chief ally is the peasantry, which despite the influence of petty-bourgeois ideology, plays an important role in society's life. The communists are working to unite them with the proletariat to make the worker-peasant alliance the backbone of the future national liberation front, which would include the middle sections (artisans, shopkeepers and small proprietors, intellectuals and students), and also some groups of the bourgeoisie which have contradictions with imperialism. The communists do not regard the bourgeoisie as a single whole. They understand that from time to time some of its groups, including industrial, commercial and even banking interests, come into conflict with imperialism, the big landowners and governments representing various groupings of the ruling class. As a result the stand and actions of part of the bourgeoisie frequently

coincide with the interests of the people. This circumstance must be reckoned with and used in the struggle waged by the oppressed masses.

Faced with the rising popular movement in Ecuador foreign reaction, especially U.S. imperialism, has sharply stepped up its activities using not only traditional ties with the more conservative section of the ruling classes but also new links with ascending sections of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Other forces hostile to the people follow suit. The Socialist International launched an outright onslaught in Ecuador, as in fact, throughout the Latin American continent. With its connivance there is now even a Democratic Left Party, which presses for some reforms within the framework of the capitalist system. It has much in common with a number of social-reformist parties widely known in the region, such as the Democratic Action of Venezuela and APRA in Peru. International Christian-Democracy is likewise penetrating Ecuador.

In short, a conglomerate of political forces is trying to take advantage of the popular discontent and the impasse brought on when the military dictatorship was in power. The communists are well aware of what reformism (regardless of its disguises) stands for ideologically. That is why they are fighting against the spread of reformist ideology. As regards concrete demands, in some cases they coincide and thereby pave the way for cooperation. This concerns the Democratic Left Party and the ruling People's Forces Union.

The political spectrum in Ecuador is very broad. Of course, there are organizations whose stand is close to ours. These are chiefly, the Ecuadoran Socialist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, our traditional ally which has the backing of some contingents of the working class and students, the Revolutionary Left Christian Movement and several provincial organizations.

The military, who are at present a heterogeneous mass, should not be overlooked. The army is unquestionably torn by internal discord and is characterized by ideological and political stratification. However, partiotic, progressive nationalistic trends and sentiment are gaining strength in it. The further intensification of these trends depends on pressure from the people, on the successes of the revolutionary movement.

It is obvious that in Ecuador there is a need for the broadest alliance of forces seeking national liberation and social emancipation, in other words, victory for the people. The communists are not the only people who realize this. That was why a Broad Left Front came into being three years ago. In addition to the communists, it was joined by the Revolutionary Socialist Party, Revolutionary Left Christian Movement, Left Unity Movement, Movement for the Second Liberation and the People's Committee. None of these organizations claims the role of leader. All are allies with equal rights, fighting for a common cause. The Front was organized not only for the election campaign. It is a rudimentary form of a permanent alliance for struggle for the cause of the people. A common platform has been worked out which is consonant with the desire for structural changes. It speaks of the character and aims of the revolution in Ecuador, which is defined as an anti-feudal, anti-imperialist and democratic revolution developing in the direction of socialism. The platform does not rule out the possibility of cooperation with other political forces subscribing to its basic provisions. After the elections the Broad Left Front stepped up its activities and won considerable prestige among the people.

Alongside the formation of this alliance, progress has been made in furthering the unity of the three main trade union centers: Working People's Confederation, Confederation of Free Trade Union Organizations and Confederation of Class Organizations. Their leaders reached agreement on united action six years ago in response to the demands by grass-roots committees. This made it possible to undertake large-scale actions. They declared the need for a United Trade Union Center of the Working People. This has the support of other trade union associations. The communists subscribe to the idea in toto, but like the spokesmen of trade union organizations they feel the situation is not ripe for such a step. The center will emerge as a result of improved coordination of actions between the leading trade union organizations and the strengthening of the working-class and popular movements.

The preamble of the main document drafted for the 15th Congress of the Working People's Confederation emphasizes the need for united action by the three trade union centers as a cardinal task of the trade union movement. Undoubtedly, far-reaching changes have taken place in this respect. There have been two general strikes. Late in 1979 the trade union organizations forwarded to parliament their joint demands for higher wages and allowances, the establishment of a minimum monthly wage of 5,000 sucres, the enforcement of the agrarian reform law and convocation of a congress of all the trade unions. Authorized representatives of the trade unions discussed these demands with the government.

The communists are confident that in the present situation it is possible to rally all the forces working for changes and to remove the obstacles to radical transformations. However, they know that a politically, ideologically and organizationally strong Communist Party is one of the main factors of victory. Although they do not claim leadership either in the Broad Left Front or in a future alliance, the communists have made it clear that only if this condition is met will the working class heading the revolution be able to carry out its historic mission of liberating the people of Ecuador from dependence on imperialism and to lead it to socialism.

The preparations for the 10th Party Congress to be held this year are being conducted on the basis of precisely these concepts.

It is impossible to understand the national problems in isolation from an analysis of the international situation and above all, of the current state of

the world communist movement. We proceed from the belief that the effort of the communists in Ecuador is part of the worldwide struggle, including the struggle in Latin America. Of course, the level of capitalist development in Ecuador is incomparable to similar indicators in other Latin America countries, for example Brazil or Argentina. However, we are convinced that we have common aims and a common platform and are fighting a common enemy. This was confirmed by the Havana Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean in June 1975, whose fundamental conclusions are in our opinion still valid.

The Communist Party of Ecuador regards itself as part of this great movement, which has already secured victory in Cuba. We admire the victory of the Nicaraguan people and hail the successes of the progressives in the Caribbean countries. In a struggle there are of course setbacks and temporary reverses, as in Chile for instance. However, the Chilean people, beyond doubt will be victorious. The communists are working under extremely difficult conditions in Uruguay, Paraguay, Guatemala and Brazil (although in the latter country the situation has changed somewhat). El Salvador is experiencing a most difficult period. Despite this, the struggle of the communists in on the ascendant. This gives us, the communists of Ecuador, additional strength. In pursuing our program we regard the revolution in Ecuador as part of the world revolutionary process and we are proud of our mission. We maintain relations with all the communist parties of the world, and emphatically denounce those who, like the Chinese leaders, have betrayed Marxism-Leninism.

The communists are doing their utmost to draw nearer the triumph of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism in Ecuador. They are fighting against arbitrary interpretations and distortions of these principles and against Maoist and Trotskyist concepts that are hindering the people's advance toward revolutionary transformation. In this we are getting inestimable help from the socialist countries, which maintain a sound, principled stand on international questions, unflaggingly and effectively expose the intrigues of imperialism and its policy of aggression, arms race, provocations and threats. The communists spare no effort to raise the consciousness level of the working class, organize its struggle and actions, promote the ideological education of the masses and strengthen the solidarity of all revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces. Such is our program, such are our aims and such is our road.

1. Originated from the Spanish 'el desarrollo' — development. — *Ed.*

2. The provision of Indians with plots of land that were too small to feed their families. As a result, the Indians were compelled to work for the latifundists who were thus provided with cheap labor. An Indian tied to his land will never abandon it. He will accept the terms forced on him. — *Ed.*

3. One U.S. dollar is equivalent to 26.5 sucres. — *Ed.*

4. A sub-regional trade and economic association, which includes Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru and Ecuador. The founding treaty was signed in 1969. — *Ed.*

Report at first hand

Vitaly Moyev
Staff member, *WMR*

WITH THE PEOPLE, AGAINST MONOPOLY

An account of the day-to-day work of Greek communists

I found myself in the whirl of events almost as soon as I alighted from the plane and was met by Greek comrades. The opening of a 10-day peace festival (held for the first time), a meeting of the Athens City Committee of the CPG, an evening in honor of Yannis Ritsos the Communist poet, a party meeting on action against Greece's membership in the Common Market . . . But what is the pivot of the communists' manifold activities? What is the main thing in the party's work today? I had an interview on this at the Central Committee, where I met with Antonis Ambatielos, member of the CC Political Bureau; Orestes Kolozof, member of the CC Secretariat, head of the International Department; Dimitris Sarlis, CC member, head of the Ideological Department and other comrades.

They said the party's everyday work followed three main lines: it is a struggle, first, against Atlantic policy, for the free and independent development of Greece; second, against 'austerity,' or belt-tightening, for the immediate satisfaction of the working people's pressing needs; and third, against authoritarianism, for the promotion of democratic rights, freedoms and institutions and for people's democracy, opening the road to socialism.

I set out to explore these three lines.

I

Athens greets you with a medley of languages. Esso, Grundig, Toyota . . . foreign ads everywhere — on signboards and car sides and overalls. I even saw one on the belly of an airship sailing over the Acropolis. On the outskirts, a new signboard reading 'Supermarket' was being put up over a dingy shop. 'Just the stuff for a columnist,' a journalist I know said. 'If old Diogenes were to rise again he'd

pick up his rusty lantern to start on a hunt for Greece.'

When, in 1974 the Black Colonels' junta fell, encouraging changes began in Greece. Political parties, including the Communist Party, emerged from illegality. After a nationwide referendum, the monarchy gave way to a republican regime. The New Democracy Party (NDP) which took over, promised further changes, including the country's deliverance from the fetters of dependence and subservience. It talked a lot about sovereignty, about taking Greece out of the NATO military organization, abolishing U.S. military bases, developing relations with the socialist countries. Subsequent events told a different story.

In 1978 the United States had more servicemen at its Greek bases than even before those hints at dissociation. Greek forces join in NATO war games. On the plea of a 'special relationship,' the government is out to drag the country back into the Atlantic military set-up.

Greece's foreign economic dependence began to grow along with military political dependence. The NDP took a perfectly frank step by giving constitutional approval to the privileges of transnationals and foreign capital. Foreign business secured key positions in the Greek economy at the cost of rather modest investments and with the financial support of both the Greek government and other national agencies. It controls at least one-third of Greek industrial production and from 50 to 90 per cent of metals, power, chemicals and oil refining — industries for which it has a predilection.

Against this background, the foreign policy of the Communist Party, which champions the interests of labor and the nation, has been shaping as an alternative to that of the regime. The communists have invariably taken a sober view of the situation created by the demise of the junta. They never shut their eyes to the importance of the changes that came about, but neither do they overrate them. The party came to the conclusion that there was a deal between junta supporters and U.S. and other bourgeois political forces, whose strategy consists in 'adapting the oligarchic regime to new conditions while making minimal concessions to the popular movement and in bolstering the shaken position of Greece in the imperialist system,' as the CPG Central Committee pointed out in its report to the 10th Party Congress (Athens, 1978). In reply to this, the party 'raised the banner of anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic unity in the struggle to free the country from U.S.-NATO dependence, win genuine independence, abolish the power of domestic and foreign monopolies and bring about substantive democracy.'

An alternative is certainly not a mere rejection of what the ruling circles advocate. The party, Orestes Kolozof said, has the experience and strength to shape foreign policy by itself, according to its own concepts and its analysis of reality. This is confirmed by the definition of the party's position on Common Market membership, an issue which has claimed the attention of the whole country over the past year. The communists' task was made no easier by the fact that earlier a similar problem had confronted other contingents of the international communist movement. The EEC comprises nine countries. Besides, Spanish and Portuguese government quarters are mooting the idea of joining it. There are considerable distinctions in the approach of the communist parties of these countries to Common Market membership.

How had Greece's communists worked out their position? What is that position and what prompted it?

The government wanted to take the country into the Common Market speedily, before public opinion could realize what was going on. Nevertheless, the CPG coped very well with the job of putting its decisions on a sound theoretical, scientific basis.

Synchroni Epochi, a publishing house disseminating Marxist-Leninist literature, brought out *Greece and the Common Market, The Natural Resources and Development of Greece* and *Problems of Greek Economic Development*. These are Marxist-Leninist monographs on Greek membership in the EEC. The problem was discussed at a special meeting of the CC, whose decisions contain numerous economic analyses. They show what such a step will mean in regard to natural resources, the power industry, engineering, agriculture, small-scale enterprise, the state budget, taxation, banking, insurance, transport, merchant shipping, foreign trade, tourism, the handicrafts and other fields.

Yannis Dragasakis, staff member of the CC in charge of the Economy Department of the Ideological Commission, acquainted me in detail with the party's decisions and general conclusions.

'It's typical of our economy,' he said, 'that mechanical engineering, usually seen as an indication of stability and dynamic economic growth, is weak. Agriculture cannot meet the demand for food staples. Greece exports mostly raw materials and semi-finished products, while it has to purchase costly technology and machinery.'

As the Greek communists see it, the economy needs a far-reaching restructuring. This implies mustering large forces and resources and government control to ensure that they are used according to national plans and development goals.

Can membership in the Common Market help in this? The facts show that it cannot and that even the early steps toward closer relations with the EEC are making Greece more dependent and subordinate than ever, injuring the working people's interests. I saw indications of this when I went to Thessaly.

Last summer the Thessalian plain was ablaze with poppy. This was an evil sign meaning that the winter crops had been hit by frost. In May, torrential rains battered the tobacco and cotton fields. 'I've no idea what'll become of us,' said Xanthos Mitroulias, a peasant.

Mitroulias' home village, Zarko, lies on a gently sloping hillside. He has 50 stremmas* of land. This

* One stremma equals 0.1 hectare.

is not little by Greek standards, since 70 per cent of the peasants own only from 20 to 30 stremmas. Eight years ago Mitroulias bought a second-hand tractor. A new tractor costs from 600,000 to 700,000 drachmas. His income? The last time he sowed 25 stremmas to cotton and harvested eight tons. Production cost him 32.5 drachmas per kilo but he had to sell the cotton at between 16 and 18 drachmas per kilo. That put paid to any idea he had of buying a new tractor. He's in debt to the bank to the tune of 90,000 drachmas.

The returns are thus smaller than the outlays. But perhaps Mitroulias is a poor performer even though his father first entrusted him with a plough when he was eleven? Not at all. The eparchial board of the peasant trade union supplied me with detailed information showing that more often than not the purchasing price falls short of the costs of the most diverse products. This surprises nobody in Greece. The government knows how matters stand but this does not seem to interfere with its intentions. The plans for Common Market membership envisage a reduction of the number of people engaged in agriculture from 1,100,000 to 400,000, or by nearly two-thirds, which means that hundreds of thousands of 'redundant' people are being prodded into beggary.

In the past the state used to give the peasants some subsidies, but the link-up with the EEC will put a stop to this.

Formerly, national industrial output was protected by customs duties. The new relationship with the EEC will end this protection.* Import is being increased to the detriment of export, for numerous Greek enterprises are no match for their West European counterparts.

Formerly the state somehow controlled banking but now control is slackening. More and more banks and subsidiaries are owned by private capital, which considers its profits far more important than national interests.

All this fully warrants the apprehension of the communists that EEC membership will have adverse consequences.

'The CPG,' the 10th Party Congress stressed, 'proposes a policy of equitable economic relations with all countries;' its aim is 'to step up efforts toward developing a mass movement for peace and détente that would encompass all people of goodwill in our country; to intensify its struggle for the dismantling of U.S. and NATO bases, the annulment of humiliating agreements, the withdrawal of our country from NATO and the transformation of the Mediterranean into a peace zone, to expand the struggle for national independence, against imperialist intrigues.'

But conceiving a foreign policy line is only a beginning. How should the party go about implementing it? What levers does it command to this end as a party operating in a capitalist country, outside the government and holding only 11 of the 300 seats in parliament?

It must be remembered that the NDP has an overwhelming majority. The communist MPs' rights are curtailed. The regime never assigns communists to inter-state talks or other official high-level meetings.

Nevertheless, the party does have some means of pursuing its foreign policy line. This line, aimed at achieving independence, equality, freedom and prosperity for the country, finds a ready response in, among others, the peace movement, which is the largest popular movement in Greece. I satisfied myself that the party's prestige among peace supporters is very high.

I interviewed Stratos Korakas, General Secretary of the Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace, alternate member of the CPG Central Committee. The interview also involved Vasilis Efremidis, member of the Committee Presidium and the CPG Central Committee. They stressed that the party's prestige is conditioned not only by the personal participation of many communists in the work of numerous organizations, committees and sections of the peace movement but by the impact of CPG policy and ideology.

As everywhere else, the Greek movement for peace and disarmament has a humanitarian mission. Through it Greeks protest against the war danger threatening the world or erupting into 'local' wars. But it is also a patriotic movement, for its members refuse to have their country ordered about from abroad and used for barracks and proving grounds. They do not want millions of drachmas to go down the drain of war budgets instead of being spent on building hospitals and kindergartens and modernizing the country.

It so happened that my acquaintance with this aspect of the struggle of the party and the people was both an introduction to my trip and its conclusion. After attending the opening of the 10-day Peace Festival I have mentioned, I witnessed its final event. This took place at the Athens Karaiskakis stadium. There were speakers from the World Peace Council, guests from other countries, public figures and people active in the arts and letters. Like a giant megaphone, the bowl of the stadium amplified the 50,000-strong chorus of voices chanting 'No to NATO' and 'No to the Common Market of monopoly.'

The party's foreign policy leans on the peace movement as well as on other mass movements, on the workers, peasants and democratic-minded population groups. It is a policy of and for the people and this is what gives it its strength.

II

The Greeks like to poke fun at themselves, saying that half of them sell and the other half buy lottery tickets. Indeed, the impression is of a beehive. Agents, go-betweens and middlemen of every de-

---

* Duties on imports from Common Market countries (15 per cent) are to be abolished altogether. As for imports from third countries, duties are to go down from 25 to 7 per cent, as is customary in the EEC. Over half of the imports from the EEC have already been exempted from duties completely and the rest, partly.

scription are on the move all day. But try and guess what is really going on. The crisis which set in in 1974 strongly affected the modest Greek economy. It brought with it an assortment of troubles: a production slump, a mounting trade deficit and national debt, runaway inflation, soaring prices and unemployment, especially in the form of part-time jobs.

It added a hated word, 'austerity,' to the nation's vernacular.

To make up for the privileges granted to big capital and put the burden of the crisis on the working people the government resorts to belt-tightening, which it euphemistically calls 'austerity.' I will cite some facts to give an idea of this burden.

In 1974 wages rose 87 per cent but the cost of living went up 100 per cent. Old-age and disability pensions are niggardly. Each time I went to the CPG Central Committee I used the same route and stopped along the way. I saw people lying on the ground in gateways. These were mostly disabled elderly men who had put aside crutches and artificial limbs, and lay with their eyes closed to conserve their strength. They were on a hunger strike of protest. When I last passed them by, their strike had entered its seventh day.

Taxes are growing but what is collected is spent without any visible social effect. A few years ago Salonika was struck by a severe earthquake, which is also remembered by many people abroad. A special relief tax was imposed to aid the city. It brought in 10,000 million drachmas. But the quake victims actually got only about a million drachmas (I heard the figure at a municipal council meeting). The Ambelokipi district of Salonika lacks hospitals and even maternity homes; it has not a single park, club or library.

Rural Greece is in an even worse plight. 'A hospital?' a Thessalian villager said, echoing my question. 'The papers have written that 33 villages of our province have medical aid stations. But there are about 150 villages in our parts. We have no pharmacies, either. The food shops display aspirin as a drug against all ailments.'

Greece is one of Europe's most backward countries in expenditures for education and holds first place in industrial accidents.

This is what 'austerity' means.

In Larissa, Vasilis Tousias, a trade unionist, described the attack on living standards with a proverb: 'The knife has reached the bone.' This is also revealed by popular protest, which has been growing ever since the NDP took over.

Statistics show that 352,000 people were on strike in 1975, 1,340,000 in 1976, 1,606,000 in 1977, and three million in 1978. As Greece has roughly four million economically active inhabitants, this means that three-fourths of them have been involved in strikes.

In leading this struggle the party's priority task is 'to mitigate the effects of the crisis on the working people, restructure the distribution of the national income in their favor, revive the economy . . . and restrict the domination of foreign and domestic monopoly capital' (CC report to the 10th Party Congress).

From what I heard, many actions by workers have resulted in a wage rise, the granting of extraordinary allowances or a reduction of working hours. But these results are affected, in the party's opinion, by miscalculations and outright mistakes, some of which are made by communists. This was pointed out at the 10th Congress. In striving to remove subjective shortcomings like these, the party considers it very important to bring out objective difficulties. It has made a most careful study of the problem of trade union unity, which it regards as the principal factor for the success of the struggle for the workers' demands. The trade unions, it must be remembered, are split.

The NDP has contributed its share to the long and painful history of this split, as it also did during the latest, extraordinary congress of the General Confederation of Greek Labor in 1978. According to eyewitness accounts, every manner of stratagem, including bribery and forgery, was used to bring about a 'majority' that put reformist, pro-government elements in the union leadership. While some trade union organizations have become mere playthings in the hands of these elements or only exist on paper, others are denied recognition as if they did not exist at all. Of the 400 unions in Athens alone, 150 unions (with a membership of 100,000) are ignored.

The party has called for greater activity in the trade unions to achieve coordinated action and the unity of all opposition currents. This is done primarily through ESAK-S, a democratic movement of trade unionists, which includes communists as well as people cooperating with the Communist Party.

At the ESAK-S headquarters, I talked with General Secretary Dimitris Koliarakis and his colleagues.

The democratic movement in the trade unions, I was told, was gaining strength and now influenced many branch organizations. ESAK-S has won solid prestige in a number of central federations, including the Building Workers Union, one of the country's largest (200,000 members), and in some local workers' centers.* This was forcefully demonstrated on last year's May Day. The Athens Workers' Center, led mainly by pro-government functionaries with the democrats forming a minority, could not bring together more than 500 people for the event. But a call from the democratic trade unions drew 50,000 demonstrators to Athens' Areos Square.

It is too early to say that the problem of trade union unity has been solved. But all the signs are that the party has chosen the most effective course of action.

The 10th CPG Congress pointed to yet another conspicuously weak aspect of the class struggle. In the countryside, the mass movement is not exactly what the peasants visualize. The party felt that it

---

* Urban trade union federations.

had not been doing enough in rural areas. It urged its members to extend the network of party organizations in the provinces, reinforce their militant cadres and join efforts with the communes and with cooperatives and other mass organizations in the countryside.

There have been some advances since the congress.

I was given the opportunity of getting a fairly close insight into the work of the communists in rural Thessalia. Last winter and spring the peasants came out strongly in what came to be known as the 'five-month movement' or 'the tractor movement.' It was joined by 100,000 peasants. Thousands of tractors rumbled to the cities. The authorities called out motorized police who put up a barrier of shields, truncheons, steel helmets and armored vehicles. They cut and saddled highways. The tractor columns pierced these cordons, linked up and rolled into city squares.

At the headquarters of the Trikkala peasant trade union committee I talked with people who had taken part in that epic march. I am not exaggerating when I call it 'epic' — this was the impression made by the eyewitness accounts and the numerous photographs collected by the committee.

Night fires were lit during the march. There were skirmishes along the route. City streets and squares were crowded with marchers. Shops were closed in solidarity with the peasants. There were rallies and showers of leaflets. Slogans read 'No to austerity,' 'Send tanks against enemies, not against the people.' The asphalt was drenched with milk and mountains of cotton were ablaze. The peasants were protesting against the ruinously low purchasing prices. Garlands adorned the tractors. Hands clasped in solidarity. The police used their truncheons and some marchers were arrested. (In Trikkala the entire trade union committee was tried for the 'illegal' strike and soon 200,000 demonstrators surrounded the courthouse.) Once again there were kilometers-long columns of marchers. There were demonstrations in Karditsa, Larissa and Thessalia, and a national demonstration in Killeler.

In speaking of the outcome of this struggle, I could probably confine myself to strictly practical results, such as the recognition of the peasant union, some concessions on prices and some measures to improve health care. But I would like to quote Nikos Genas, Secretary of the Thessalian Provincial Committee of the CPG. 'There are new party and trade union organizations in the countryside,' he said. 'Although the movement is occasionally called the 'five-month movement' it isn't over yet and, in fact, its coordinating committee is still functioning. We've learned a lot.'

This is very important. Experience, better organization and inspiration for the future are among the fruits of the struggle.

III

I recall what Anna Teneketzi said at our meeting with trade unionists in Salonika.

She was going to form, along with another comrade, a trade union organization at a steel mill when the mill owner hit a women bookkeeper. The workers went on strike and Anna Teneketzi became the virtual head of the strike committee.

While the strike was on, 120 workers (out of 180) joined the union. While talks were going on with the owner four members of the strike committee, Anna's fellow workers, were fired.

What does the law say to short shrift like that? It says that where there are up to 50 employees the owner is free to discharge them all without giving any reason. As for bigger plants, the owner may reduce the staff by four per cent monthly or, if authorized by the Labor Minister, by 10 per cent. 'This authorization is usually granted.'

After the dismissal of the first four, the management shut down the whole designing department where Anna was employed, and threw out another five workers.

Anna and the others are now jobless and have been sued to boot.

The meeting was attended by seven or eight trade unionists. All had been on trial at one time or another. Even this time — they looked around — all who were present were being prosecuted. When I was naive enough to ask why I only raised smiles. They said I had surely heard about a series of laws against action by labor, such as Law 330/76, the laws on the state of emergency, special punishment and others. Law 330/76 in fact abolishes the right to strike. Estimates show that in Salonika proceedings on account of violations of this law are instituted once every four days on the average. Since 1975 trade union activity has cost 9,500 workers their jobs. Among them are thousands of union group organizers, whom the law is supposed to protect.

There was nothing extraordinary about the meeting. The facts which meetings like it have revealed give a dismal picture.

The press constantly tells you of open-air meetings that have been banned or of demonstrations broken up with truncheons and tear gas. Talk to communists and you will be told that factory party branches are still semi-legal. In introducing you to the secretary of such a branch they may ask you to withhold his name for reasons one can well appreciate. A cadre member of the party told me casually that he had long known by sight the man assigned to spy on him.

I am not trying to systematize the various manifestations of the offensive against democracy and the intensification of authoritarianism. I am merely reporting what anybody can see for himself. You have only to spend a week or two in Greece to realize why the Communist Party regards the fight for the restoration and advancement of democratic standards and freedoms, for substantive democracy, as one of its main fields of activity.

This is no easy work — not only because Greece is far from having jettisoned the junta's legacy or because semi-official reactionary organizations and numerous pro-fascist alignments are still active. The biggest problem is the lack of cohesion among sincere leftist forces in the democratic camp. They

have yet to come to terms in their struggle against increasing authoritarianism.

What is particularly dangerous, as the communists see it, is the belief current in Greece that the country cannot cope with its problems by itself and can only hope for help from 'European democracy.' In 'free Europe,' it is alleged, democracy has dependable positions and strong roots. The working class and other working people of Western Europe have scored impressive gains and the labor unions have ample rights and forces. And since Greece is about to 'enter free Europe' through the EEC, the benefits of 'democracy' are expected to start pouring in from there.

'Some also argue,' said Nikos Kotzias, alternate member of the CC in charge of current ideological work, 'that it would be possible to transform the "Europe of monopoly" into a "workers' Europe" and that this would even pave the way for Greece as an EEC member to advance gradually to socialism.'

I asked who argued like that.

'Quite a few people,' came the answer. 'It's one way of lauding the government policy of merging with the EEC and is thus amenable to the regime, which certainly has no intention of moving to socialism, not even with EEC countries. This is a further development of an idea expressed by the people in the opposition. It is accepted by the so-called Democratic Socialism Party and Socialist Initiative group, as well as by the organization that has broken away from the CPG and calls itself the "CPG (Interior)".'

Greece's communists reject this approach. During my trip I heard many of their public statements, objections and arguments to this effect.

Let us face the facts, the Greek comrades say. Greece is being adapted to EEC terms and the government heartily welcomes multinationals. This is a loss for democracy, not a gain. And it is in line with this policy that new anti-democratic laws are passed. Significantly enough, many of them are patterned on laws made in 'free Europe' — for instance, in West Germany. It follows that the 'dependable positions' of European bourgeois democracy are not a hindrance.

It is true that the working people's gains and the trade unions' role in capitalist Europe are remarkable. But they are no gift from monopoly. Any European communist and indeed, any worker will tell you that they are a result of unrelenting struggles by the workers, their unions and parties. One can and should count on their international solidarity but the important thing is to keep fighting.

'When somebody claims,' Nikos Kotzias said, 'that the "Europe of monopoly" may become a "workers' Europe", we ask how. Western Europe is still a Europe of monopoly and this shouldn't be forgotten. If the underlying idea is that a "democratic majority" has only to win somewhere in a EEC body or the European Parliament for socialism to set in and to supply its surplus products to Greece, we Greek communists don't believe this wishful thinking. But if this implies that the workers of Europe must win power by revolutionary means why should we Greeks sit back in the meantime? Greece has its own experience of struggle for freedom and its own militant traditions. The oligarchy has turned to authoritarianism because it realizes that its hold isn't strong enough.'

CPG documents stress that 'to establish anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democracy for the people will mean effecting a *revolutionary change*' and that 'the establishment of people's democracy will not come as a gift from anyone at home or abroad' (CC Report to the 10th Congress).

The CPG is doing its utmost to form a united democratic front and, as an important prerequisite, left unity. It has taken the initiative in forming numerous committees for left-wing forces.

Over 30 such committees were functioning in Athens when I arrived there and preparations were under way to set up a coordinating body. In Larissa I learned that there had been a meeting to form a similar committee. It was attended by Mikis Theodorakis, the composer. A local committee of left-wing forces had already been formed in Volos. I understood that there were plans for forming many committees in Thessalia, in all eparchies, cities, factories, etc. On these committees there are communists and non-communists and individual members of such democratic parties as PASOK or EDA. True, the latter still operate on their own and not as spokesmen of their parties. Stressing the need for uniting democratic forces 'from below,' the party also urges cooperation on the level of parties and it is none of its fault that numerous roadblocks still exist.

The entire day-to-day struggle against authoritarianism helps pave the way for a united democratic front, the communists say. This struggle ranges over a wide area but to give a more vivid idea of it, I will take elections, a sphere in which representative power opposes authoritarian power.

On the wall behind the dimarchos, or head of the elected local government body, was an effigy of Christ. A communist and former baker, his name is Christos Raptis.

Local self-government scares the regime with the ghost of a 'second authority,' and so the NDP spares no effort to strip it of real power and make it a tool of the central authority.

'However, public opinion will never reconcile itself to this,' Dimitris Sarlis told me. 'Local government has strong roots and traditions dating from the National Resistance period. We approach it as an autonomous democratic institution. Its program is determined during elections and approved by the electorate. This is why the party Central Committee considers work in local government bodies very important.'

In Salonika I made a point of learning all I could about this work. Yannis Pappadopoulos, who is responsible for it in the city party committee, told me how very carefully candidatures recommended by the party are discussed. This is done collectively, at party meetings. To give communist members of municipal councils a better insight into the more intricate problems, the party prepares various

documents and analyses, enlisting the help of teams of experts. He stressed that the communists were striving to ensure cooperation among all democrats on the councils, to adhere to the electoral program and keep in touch with the electorate.

The Ambelokipi municipal council, Christos Raptis told me, is composed of 19 members; 10 seats are filled by Communists, 3 by PASOK and 6 by rightists. In other words, democrats outweigh the others by an impressive margin.

Raptis first became dimarchos 15 years ago. In 1967 he was put in prison but returned after the junta had fallen. He was re-elected in 1975 and 1978.

In jotting this down, I commented, 'So there was no break.' 'Yes, there was,' Raptis answered sarcastically.

According to regulations, the decisions of town and communal bodies are controlled from above. The provincial governors are appointed by the government and have the authority to suspend elected officials. Raptis is among those who were ostracized in this way. On one occasion the pretext was a council resolution demanding a fair settlement of the Cyprus problem and on another, the council's refusal to celebrate the anniversary of the Anglo-American invasion.

The local bodies' tendency to express their own views and take an independent stand on national problems goes against the grain of the central authority. I learned this in Thessalia, which I visited as a guest of the Zarko communal council. In the latest elections the population had defeated all NDP and other rightist candidates. The communists won a majority and PASOK was the runner-up. The council decided to allot land to the peasants. Although this concerned communal land, which the council was entitled by law to use as it saw fit, the higher authorities torpedoed the measure.

Communists and democrats in local councils never abandon their position, even under the threat of repression.

In Ambelokipi, Raptis said, a district peace committee was formed under the auspices of the municipal council. The council undertook to care for repatriates, who return from exile in their tens of thousands. Its relevant decision insists that the government should restore the property and citizenship of these people, grant them pensions and so on. In its own district, the council does all it can for repatriates. It registers them and helps them look around and get a job.

Not long ago the council discussed the problem of education and leisure for young people. It enlisted the assistance of parents' and teachers' committees and cultural, educational and sports organizations. Its resolution stressed the urgent need for a kindergarten and three schools; it insisted on ridding the district of night bars and reducing the area occupied by the nearby military camp to release space for playgrounds.

'We'll have a fight on our hands for these decisions,' Raptis said. 'They may be rejected. We don't conceal our difficulties from the constituency. Moreover, we seek its help. People understand us and give us strong backing.'

This massive backing is seen in the democratic forces' gains, which grow in local self-government from election to election. Over 30 towns have communist mayors. In north Greece, where the democratic block (including the CPG) put forward its list in 48 municipalities in 1978, it won seats in 37 municipalities and a majority in 25. It contested seats in 478 communes and won seats in 402 and a majority in 231. Regarding the seats held by communists, the CC Bureau for north Greece supplied me with the following data:

	Elected				
	Mayors	Chairmen of communal councils	Members of municipal councils	Members of communal councils	Total
1975	5	40	86	146	277
1978	10	91	156	496	753

'We know of many people who are sympathetic to our program but vote for other democratic parties,' commented Kostas Tsolakis, member of the CC Political Bureau, CC Bureau Secretary for North Greece. 'The reason for this is that they are afraid they may be persecuted if they vote communist. So you mustn't take it seriously when it's alleged that election results are a mirror of our party's actual influence. But we also know of cases in which elections are said to be largely a "freak" of the electorate and things like that. Voters are alleged to favor some candidates on one occasion and others on another. We've never heard of voters reversing their orientation after giving preference to the communists. This also goes for trade union elections.'

In the threefold struggle for national independence, satisfaction of the working people's urgent needs and greater democracy, the CPG gives priority to the struggle for democracy. This is because the strength of the forces involved and the outlook for the solution of Greece's present-day and future problems depend on gains in this sphere.

The communists' work in conditions of legality is a new Greek reality. Barring a few brief periods, this is the first time in its more than 60 years' history that the CPG has come out into the open. I would like to add a few concluding lines in this connection.

The Athens party organization gave me an opportunity to see communists at a large meeting. It was in the Chatzi Christou cinema, which was packed. The audience was highly mixed age-wise. It included people who had an eventful life behind them and others who had parted with adolescence shortly before. This is perhaps the salient feature of the party's composition today.

Still active in the party ranks is a splendid cadre of fighters who have gone through all imaginable trials: underground work, guerrilla war, imprisonment, exile. Leafing through my notebook, I see that all the cadre members I met have drunk that bitter cup to the last drop. Antonis Ambatielos, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC CPG:

a death sentence commuted to life imprisonment. Loula Logara, member of the CC Political Bureau and Secretariat, Secretary of the Athens party organization: eight years in prison and four years in exile. Georgis Moraitis, CC member, on the staff of *Rizospastis*: 15 years in jail and a labor camp. Nikos Genas, CC member, Secretary of the Thessalian party organization: 11 years in prison, including five years on death row. This is not a deliberate selection but just a list of those my trip brought me into contact with.

These people are the party's backbone. As for the young, most of them have been admitted in recent years. In Salonika, for one, I was told that between 1975 and the 10th Congress, or in three and a half years, the party organization had grown by 450 per cent. In party branches, it is a rule that communists between 30 and 40 years of age account for 80 to 90 per cent of the membership. Add to this the Communist Youth of Greece, now the country's largest youth organization.

The comrades I talked with pointed out time and again that often things did not work out as they should. This was due both to external difficulties and to the communists' own blunders, weak points and shortcomings. I was asked not to shut my eyes to this. There certainly are difficulties and apparently blunders, weak points and shortcomings as well. But it is beyond doubt that over the past five years the party has been gaining in strength and influence. It has set up a network of branches and groups covering the whole country, and has extended its contacts with virtually all democratic mass organizations. Communist strategy and tactics are based on a consistent and creative application of Marxism-Leninism to Greek realities. The Greece of working men and women knows the CPG slogan, 'With the people, against monopoly.'

---

exchange of views

The nationalities question in developed capitalist countries

INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL SYMPOSIUM

The growing crisis of relations between nationalities in the capitalist world is a hallmark of today. The nationalities question has become a serious factor in the political life of many countries. To acquire a deeper Marxist understanding of the problem, to identify its universal and specific features, to compare the tactical and strategic aims of the communist parties the editorial staff of *World Marxist Review* with the assistance of the Swiss Party of Labor, conducted a symposium on The Nationalities Question in Developed Capitalist Countries and the Position of the Communists, in Basle. It was attended by representatives of the communist parties of Belgium (*Robert Francis,* representative of the Communist Party of Belgium on *WMR*), Canada (*Peter Boychuck,* alternate member of the Central Executive Committee, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada, member of the *WMR* Editorial Council), Great Britain (*Finlay Hart,* veteran of the working-class and communist movement), Ireland (*James Stewart,* Deputy General Secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland), Spain (*Rafael Ribo,* member, Executive Committee of the Central Committee, United Socialist Party of Catalonia), and the United States of America (*John Pittman,* member of the Political Bureau, Central Committee, Communist Party USA, member of the *WMR* Editorial Board).

An unaccomplished democratic task

What are the factors that have sharply aggravated the nationalities question in a number of developed capitalist countries? Can the present exacerbation of the nationalities question be compared, as some bourgeois authors have done, with the vigorous rise of national movements in Europe in the 19th century? The participants in the symposium showed that such a comparison is not valid. By their historical conditions, scope and more importantly, their objective place in social development, these are fundamentally different phenomena. In the 19th century capitalism had the support of the national liberation movement. In contrast, the present contradictions between nationalities are most frequently anti-capitalist. The struggle for national rights is identified more and more often with the movement for a fundamental solution of acute social problems. This is quite logical, because conflicts between nationalities today are rooted in the capitalist system itself — in its exploitative, class essence. In pursuit of its mercenary aims monopoly capitalism intensifies not only social but also national oppression. We are witnessing what Lenin saw more than half a century ago, namely, that

imperialism 'means that national oppression has been extended and heightened on a new historical foundation' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 408).

'Some people's first reaction to the emergence of the nationalities question in advanced capitalist countries,' Finlay Hart said, 'is surprise. They express the view that it is diversionary, a petty-bourgeois phenomenon or even downright reactionary. It is more complicated than this and has to be considered in relation to the main economic, social and political processes of our time.' He pointed out that the period of imperialism, of big monopolies, is characterized by the tendency of big capital to concentrate more and more economic power in its hands, and in parallel, more and more political power. As a result we are witnessing an offensive of political reaction all along the line. All this is taking place against the background of a severe economic, social and political crisis of capitalism. This crisis is expressed by capitalism's inability to solve economic problems, by its increased assault on working-class living standards, by attempts to limit the possibilities of the working class to challenge these policies, by attempts to curtail or even nullify the democratic freedoms won by the working people in the course of long years of struggle, by attempts to undermine local government and the parliament. We are thus witnessing an all-out effort to deny the people the possibility of saying 'no' to the dictates of big capital.

At the same time, we observe a growth of the working-class movement, of its mass organizations (e.g., the trades unions in Britain), of new social movements (women, students, immigrant workers, environmental questions and so on). Consequently there are two tendencies: the big monopolies aiming to limit democracy, and the working people resisting and developing new democratic forms of organization and action. These developments are bearing out Lenin's words: 'Imperialism does not halt the development of capitalism and the growth of democratic tendencies among the mass of the population. On the contrary, it *accentuates* the antagonism between their democratic aspirations and the anti-democratic tendency of the trusts' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 51). The growth of national-liberation movements is linked to this process, which is further assisted by the emergence and growing strength of the socialist system.

'Owing to the difficult and contradictory process of social development in the context of state-monopoly capitalism,' Peter Boychuck remarked in this connection, 'the scope of democratic tasks far from decreasing, increases. The ability of capitalism to cope with them is questioned more and more. The granting of national rights to peoples and national groups who do not enjoy them in advanced capitalist countries is a democratic task yet to be accomplished.'

Among the factors underlying the aggravation of the nationalities question, the participants in the symposium identified the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism; the sharpening of existing and the emergence of new social contradictions in capitalist countries; the involvement in political life of the intermediate social strata, who in many cases do not appreciate the objective need for an alliance with the working class, or are headed by nationalistic and chauvinistic elements; the increasingly uneven and disproportionate socio-economic development of individual regions; the integrative processes in the capitalist economy that are breaking up long-standing national-ethnic ties, creating new and aggravating old nationalities problems; and the mounting democratic, anti-monopoly aspirations of the working people.

In the concrete conditions prevailing in individual countries the operation of these factors is peculiar and often highly specific. The participants in the symposium tried to show this specific: for in its approach to the nationalities question Marxism-Leninism requires maximum historical concreteness and rejects abstract deliberations.

The general and the specific

Belgium. The formation of the Belgian state in 1830 does not fit into any known pattern, Robert Francis said. It was not the result of the evolution of groups of individuals who had achieved a development level where the concept nation could be applied and where they were able to form a centralized nation state. It was the result of political and diplomatic moves by big foreign powers. Two groups — the Flemings and Walloons, whose economic, religious and cultural development had proceeded along totally different lines — were united in a single state.

For a long time (three-quarters of a century) the heterogeneity of the Belgian population was practically of no consequence for the reason that when the state was proclaimed none of the regions had a national movement seeking to set up a state structure of its own. The rapid development of the Walloon provinces, rich in coal and other natural resources, did not put Wallonia in a dominating position. The benefits of this development were reaped by the united bourgeoisie: the Walloon bourgeois were part of this bourgeoisie. They wanted the consolidation of the centralized united state, rather than the development of a Walloon national movement. The accelerated industrial development of Wallonia, which was accompanied by the emergence of a numerically large proletariat, soon brought social problems into prominence. The conflict between the united bourgeoisie and the working class followed the pattern of a class struggle from the outset. It did not acquire a national character.

The glaring social problems in Wallonia and the formation of trade unions and political organizations by the working class necessarily affected Flanders. These developments helped the people to see that the backwardness of the Flemish provinces had deep-rooted socio-economic causes, that it was the outcome of a policy pursued by the Belgian united bourgeoisie exclusively in its own interests.

With the depletion of mineral resources and the replacement of coal with imported oil products the

focus of development shifted to Flanders. This resulted in stagnation and even economic decline in Wallonia, which gave rise to the problem of employment. Since the unitary structure of the state is one of the main instruments used by the bourgeoisie to move the focus of growth, the question of state structures and of a transition to federalism arose as a matter of course in the working-class struggle to preserve the basic conditions of its existence. This question acquires growing acuteness.

Britain. Finlay Hart said that some factors contributed to the growth of the national movements in Scotland and Wales, notably the misshapen development of Britain's capitalist economy to the detriment of these parts of the country. It is important to point out that the pernicious consequences (decline of traditional industries, growing unemployment) of the policies pursued by British monopoly capitalism are paralleled by its consequences in the social sphere: public health, housing, social services and so on.

The Scottish national and Welsh nationalist parties are taking advantage of the disaffection of the Scottish and Welsh peoples with the socio-economic difficulties. Their activities and skyrocketing popularity are sapping the positions of the two main parties — Labour and Conservative. In this situation the Labour leaders announced that in home policy one of the major goals would be to grant partial autonomy to Scotland and Wales through the establishment of their own legislatures.

The Devolution Bill (i.e., delegation of some of the powers of the center to the local authorities, ruling out however, both separatism and federalism) was passed by the House of Commons in early 1978. However, the Conservative opposition secured the adoption of a reservation regarding the referendum that was held on March 1, 1979. Since the required 40 per cent vote was not obtained the plans for instituting legislative assemblies formally failed. After the Tories came to power the bills were scrapped.

Does this mean that the question has been removed from the agenda altogether? By no means. The socio-economic difficulties, multiplied by the consequences of the crisis for the whole of Britain, are still there.

Ireland. James Stewart began by saying that the British Crown annexed Ireland in the 17th century. In 1921 the ascendant national liberation movement resulted in the proclamation of a nation state consisting of 26 of the 32 counties. The most highly industrialized north-eastern part (Ulster) of the island remained under British rule. Two-thirds of Ulster's population (1,500,000) are descendants of Protestants who had migrated from England and Scotland. They are the mainstay of the Unionists, who unconditionally want the preservation of links to Britain and dominate political life in the region. The remainder of the population are Catholics — descendants of the indigenous inhabitants. After Ireland was artificially partitioned they were discriminated against on religious grounds in jobs, housing and education.

British rule reduced Ulster to a backward province with the highest unemployment rate (about 13 per cent), low wages (the earnings of more than one-fourth of the Northern Irish families are below the official poverty line), and dilapidated houses in the workers' districts. In the late 1960s these social conditions sparked off clashes between the Catholics and the Protestants. British troops were brought into Ulster. Later London suspended the Stormont (Northern Irish Parliament) and imposed direct rule from Westminster. Since then there has been a civil war situation in Northern Ireland; during the past 10 years about 2,000 people have been killed and 20,000 wounded.

The Irish Republican Army (founded in 1919, it demands the unification of Ireland) objectively found itself in the role of defender of the Catholics. But it later split into the Official and Provisional wings. The Provisional IRA, which adopted terrorism as its tactics, consists mainly of young people, who have been left stranded by the civil war and the economic crisis. The ideological platform of its leaders may be characterized as petty-bourgeois anarchism. The Communist Party of Ireland and the civil rights movement hold that the Provisional IRA tactics play into the hands of the Protestant right-wing extremists and London, which has been using this as the pretext for escalating violence. That is why they call for unity among all republican forces in the struggle for a political solution of the Ulster problem.

Spain is formally an integral nation and an integral state, Rafael Ribo said. But in fact it consists of 15 historically-shaped regions inhabited by the most diverse ethnic groups with different languages, cultures and traditions. Each of these regions wants self-administration. The movement for autonomy intensified with the incipient democratization of the country's socio-political life. It has acquired the greatest dimensions in Catalonia, the Basque Provinces and Galicia, which had earlier enjoyed autonomy.

Practically all the regions have now won the right to autonomy. However, the problem has not been solved. Far from it. But the difficulty lies not only in the present political situation (the fragile state of democracy, the posture of the armed forces authorized by the constitution to defend the 'unity of the state,' and the economic crisis). The government is in no haste to translate its decisions into practical terms, doing all it can to delay the drafting of permanent statutes on autonomy and restrict the powers of the local authorities where such exist. It is under pressure from forces resisting all concessions to ethnic regions in the fear that regional autonomy would seriously threaten the unity of the state. What the reactionaries and conservative elements fear even more is the political consequences of this process. In some regions the left political parties are stronger than on a national scale. If there were a genuine federal system with independent parliaments and general councils these parties could implement their policies. In other words, the reactionaries fear the possible emergence of republics of

a socialist character in the framework of a single non-socialist state.

Canada. Canada is a two-nation state. However, Peter Boychuck pointed out, all the political parties, with the single exception of the Communist Party of Canada, either deny that the French Canadians (Quebec) constitute a nation, ignore the question or by-pass it. Until its election defeat in May 1979, the Liberal government under Trudeau confined itself to a policy of bilingualism and bi-culturalism, thereby refusing to recognize Canada's bi-national character. It did not raise a finger to end the subordinate economic and social status of the French Canadians.

The minority Conservative government also sidesteps the basic issue of Canada's two nations. It proposes a decentralization of power and its division between the federal government and all the provinces, claiming that this would solve the confederation crisis. As far as the Parti Quebecois, which came to power in Quebec at the end of 1976, is concerned, its basic aim is secession. In its own way it distorts the meaning of self-determination by reducing it to political separation, although it is obvious that of the 41 per cent of the voters who cast their ballot for the Parti Quebecois, most wanted change, radical social reform, and not secession. They voted against corruption and government mismanagement, against its anti-labor policy, against an economic situation of high unemployment, inflation, slow growth and a huge budget deficit. This, of course, does not mean that the Parti Quebecois may not succeed in its goal, namely secession. Pressure from the French Canadian petty bourgeoisie for independence (paralleled and abetted by the hard-line policy of a Conservative government) may be the catalyst for such a break. Another possibility is the use of military force, which is not ruled out, to keep Quebec within the present bounds.

USA. 'Racial and national oppression,' John Pittman said, 'is observed in most capitalist countries in one degree or another. Except, perhaps, in the Republic of South Africa, Zimbabwe and a few other countries, racial and national oppression is not practised on such a broad scale anywhere as in the USA. Here it has become an inherent aspect in the activities of the industrial corporations.'

Afro-Americans are subjected to the most ruthless racial and national oppression. Although the economic crisis and inflation have created serious problems for all working people, the economic gap will be further widened between Afro-Americans and European Americans. One of every four Black workers is without a job. For the Black youth the crisis began long ago, because every generation of Black workers inherited an unemployment rate of 60 per cent. Twenty-eight per cent of the Afro-American families live in poverty, as compared to 7 per cent of white families. Racism, ideas of white supremacy impart a special cruelty, depth and breadth to the oppression to which Afro-Americans are subjected. Their status cannot be compared to that of any other oppressed ethnic group in the country.

The Chicano people, or Americans of Mexican origin, are also subjected to chauvinism, national oppression and discrimination. In most of the areas inhabited by Chicanos the per capita income is below the poverty line. The high unemployment rate, the low-paid jobs and seasonal work, the discrimination in housing, education, medical services and cultural welfare and the ruthless police harassment are fuelling the fight of the Chicano people for equality. The condition of the Puerto Ricans is no better.

The search for energy resources has unleashed another war against the Native American Indians to compel them to abandon their lands and transfer them to the monopolies. The Native American Indian and Alaskan Native peoples are fighting for survival. They are the victims of the unbridled exploitation, the plundering of their land and energy resources by the transnational corporations and the U.S. government, enormous unemployment and terrible social and economic privation.

Summing up John Pittman said that the system of racial and national oppression in the USA remains basically unchanged. The working class — colored and white workers — are rallying and closing their ranks, but at the same time, the ultra-right and fascist groups are beocming more active. Racism is still a constant attribute of everyday life.

Danger of nationalism

From what was said at the symposium about the nationalities question in various countries we can draw the following general conclusions. The aggravation of national contradictions in the developed capitalist countries stems from deeply-rooted, chiefly socio-economic, conditions; this explains the breadth of the forces rallying around those who are fighting for national equality; this also explains another aspect of the problem, namely why national demands are more and more frequently advanced together with demands for democratic reforms and social changes, why the nationalities question is becoming a part of the struggle against monopoly domination, for democracy and socialism.

But every intensification of friction and conflicts between the nationalities, every aggravation of the nationalities question in a society with antagonistic socio-class relations, promotes the growth of nationalism, which is the psychology, ideology, policy and social practice of isolating and dividing the working people of one ethnic community from another in the interests of the exploiting classes. This danger mounts especially if the proletariat is insufficiently class conscious, poorly organized and particularly if it is split. This danger becomes very acute, when formerly passive intermediate sections join the political movement. A hallmark of the present situation in Belgium, Robert Francis said, is that nationalistic trends are growing in all parts of the country. The Flemish national movement, which sprang up from legitimate demands, is

clearly showing a tendency to extend its aims and give the Flemish community a dominating position in Belgium. More, it has evolved into Flemish nationalism, with the Volksunie party as its political spokesman. Nationalistic trends have ranged beyond the Volksunie party and now tangibly influence all other political organizations in Flanders, including working-class organizations.

A parallel nationalistic movement has emerged in Wallonia as well. It has a different point of departure. Its mainspring did not consist of traditions of struggle for equality in language and culture, because the Belgian united bourgeoisie and the Walloon community have a common culture and language. Essentially speaking, it came into being when the economic development of the Walloon provinces was threatened. The importance of the socio-economic problems facing this part of the country and their direct significance for the working class are making it easier to draw the workers into the nationalistic stream. The danger exists of nationalistic deviations arising, of the primary class aims of the workers being replaced with tasks of a nationalistic character. As long as problems are set in the form of counterposing one national group to another, in the form of a struggle for hegemony among the national groups, the responsibility borne for this by the united bourgeoisie will be obscured. The battles now unfolding will not be spearheaded against the bourgeoisie. In this sense, far from harming the bourgeoisie the nationalistic trends will give it an instrument for maneuvering and parrying the danger threatening it.

Because the ruling capitalist class is homogeneous socio-politically, the class struggle against it must be conducted by the workers nationwide and means must be employed by them that would give them maximum cohesion. 'Dividing the working class into the proletariat of Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels is out of the question' Robert Francis said. 'A united bourgeoisie must be opposed by a united working class.'

That the bourgeoisie is using nationalistic slogans to corrupt the workers was mentioned by other participants in the symposium. Finlay Hart, in particular, spoke of the policy of the Scottish National Party. Playing on wounded national pride, it poses as the champion of the interests of all Scots. Its propaganda trump is the oil wealth discovered off the coast of Scotland. The Nationalists are vigorously exploiting the 'Oil for the Scots' slogan politically. They are careful not to mention that practically all the big oil deposits in the North Sea have been farmed out to big foreign, above all American interests, which have long-term contracts limiting the productive use of the revenues from oil for the development of Scotland or Britain as a whole. They are also silent about the fact that secession from Britain, the rupture of age-old economic, scientific, cultural and other contacts would make Scotland easy prey for the transnational corporations.

The contradictory character of the national movements, their motley class composition, inadequate reflection of social problems in the consciousness of some nations and the visible growth of the national factor in the political struggle of various forces show the complexity of the nationalities question.

Internationalism versus national nihilism

Essentially a social problem, the nationalities question is, in the final analysis, subordinated to the general tasks of the class struggle of the proletariat: this point was made clear by all the participants in the symposium. Also, they made another point with equal clarity, namely, that Marxist-Leninist theory has under no circumstances ignored national movements. Unlike the bourgeoisie, the working class wants not the suppression but the development of the national consciousness. In a letter to Giennaro Bovio of April 16, 1872, Frederick Engels wrote: 'In the working-class movement *genuinely* national ideas . . . are always genuinely *international* ideas.' Every big national task confronting one contingent of the international working class or another is of great international importance. A distinguishing feature of a truly Marxist-Leninist policy is that it gives priority to national tasks that form a major element in the activities of the international working class, elevates the national consciousness of the masses to an internationalist consciousness and brings patriotism into dialectical unity with internationalism.

The Marxists, Finlay Hart said, have always understood and supported mankind's striving for what Lenin termed the 'inevitable integration of nations' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 147). They have always considered that the evolution of the human race leads in this direction. But this is a long and complex process. All experience shows the immense strength of the national factor, demonstrating that whatever may be one's subjective views about it, it exists and will exist until it has exhausted all its potentialities. In countries like Britain the nationalities question today arises not because of the whim of leaders of nationalist parties, but because of the deep-going processes at work, because the causes of national discontent — contempt, discrimination and oppression — have not been removed. They can only be extirpated by socialism. However, this does not mean that under capitalism nothing can be done to end the most flagrant manifestations of national oppression. It is possible to compel the state, the government and other institutions to relax national tensions, even if these measures are partial or provisional, even if they carry no guarantees.

The revolutionary party of the working class, John Pittman said, should take national pride and patriotism into account. But national consciousness is one thing and nationalism another. Nationalism is a weapon used by monopoly capital to obscure class contradictions and class exploitation. The working class and its party cannot borrow that weapon. Our national consciousness, he said, and our concept of proletarian internationalism do not come into conflict. On the contrary, they are inter-

connected. The communists uphold the genuine national interests of all peoples by adhering to internationalism. The patriotism of the working class, though national in form, is internationalist in content. Our slogan is unity. Our task is vigorously to fight racial and national oppression in all sectors of the struggle and find forms that would channel it into a single common stream.

The participants in the symposium emphasized the intransient importance of internationalism in all of its aspects, namely, ideological, political and ethical. They all noted the unfading validity of Lenin's words: 'Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism — these are the two irreconcilable hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26). In particular, they showed that proletarian internationalism is a principle of concrete unity, of unity of the diverse, in this case of the nationally diverse. National diversity is not ruled out by the principle of internationalism, which implies and harbors it. Thus, internationalism opposes national nihilism, which rejects the national specific and ignores national distinctions. A world outlook that disregards national forms and relations and divorces itself from reality, insults national feeling and sentiment. The Marxist-Leninist world outlook opposes nationalism and national nihilism with the principle that specific national interests are in harmony with the common interests of the working people of all nationalities, that patriotism is in harmony with internationalism.

A scientific policy

The communist parties implement the principle of internationalism mainly by consistently pursuing a scientific policy on the nationalities question. Under capitalism this is expressed by the promotion of proletarian solidarity among the different national contingents of the working class, by a creative application of general theoretical principles to the specific national conditions in individual countries generating distinctions in the concrete aims of the struggle and in the methods for the accomplishment of the common task.

'The essence of the Canadian communists' approach to the nationalities problem,' Peter Boychuck said, 'is the primacy of the interests of the working class, the need to defend not only the short-term interests but the long-term interests as well of the working class in both English Canada and French Canada.

'People who pose as great democrats, who see the road to socialism, if that is their real aim, as a succession of democratic developments exclusively, for some reason always hesitate on, balk at or evade one of the main democratic steps, that of self-determination for all subjected nations within the given state.'

The argument most often used is that from an economic standpoint the seceding nation would be badly hurt. At one time this argument was used against the colonies breaking away from their imperialist masters. But the question these democrats raise by their stand, Peter Boychuck said, is: why do they always pose the question as if it is a matter of secession and nothing else? No matter how they phrase it, these people simply echo the arguments of the dominant capitalist class, which continues to amass super-profits from the exploitation of subjected nationalities.

In calling for the right to national self-determination for French Canada, the Communist Party implies that French Canada has a right to secede. Without that right there can be no talk of equality with English Canada. Without the recognition of that right, all other solutions are mere palliatives or reactionary moves. But the right to secede is not a demand; it is not the only democratic expression of self-determination. It can also take the form of federation or the form of autonomy. Any of these forms, if it is the genuine wish of the nationality concerned, is a democratic expression of national sovereignty. The question is which form is the best from the standpoint of the class interests of the working people.

The independence of Canada as a whole is constantly threatened by U.S. monopoly capital, which has a stranglehold on many of its main industries. The Canadian working class bears the brunt of the negative effects of this situation. The American branch plants in Canada are the first to close when an economic crisis hits the USA. For some time now, a policy of de-industrialization has been pursued in Canada. U.S. investments are now used more and more to develop Canada's natural resources, with oil, gas and hydropower getting priority. The end result is that Canada has the highest unemployment rate of all the developed capitalist countries. There is a parallel attack on all the social achievements of the working people. To defend its positions successfully the working class needs the maximum of unity, not division, otherwise the Canadian workers will be sitting ducks for monopoly capital from south of the border, as well as Canadian. This is felt almost instinctively by Canada's working class, both English- and French-speaking.

To solve the nationalities question, while defending the real interests of the working class, the Communist Party of Canada proposes in its program — *The Road to Socialism in Canada* — a 'confederal republic with a government consisting of two chambers: one, such as the House of Commons today, based on representation by population; the other to replace the present Senate, to be composed of an equal number of elected representatives from each of the two national states. Each chamber should have the equal right to initiate legislation, but both must adopt the legislation before it becomes law. This structure will protect both democratic principles: equality of rights of nations whatever their size, and majority rule. Above all, it will

strengthen the bonds of solidarity of the working people of both nations.*

In its quest for a solution to the 'crisis of communities,' which is the Belgian variety of the political crisis that has gripped many capitalist countries in various forms, Robert Francis said, the Communist Party of Belgium proceeds from the assumption that there is really no Flemish or Walloon national movement in the true sense of the word. Neither the population of Wallonia nor that of Flanders has acted as a Walloon or Flemish nation led by its own bourgeoisie. Power remains in the hands of a united bourgeoisie, which is using the national distinctions in Belgium to further its own interests. This is one main reason why the working class both in Flanders and Wallonia should take a sober approach to the problem of communities and keep its own class interests in view.

Quite naturally and logically the working class resists measures inhibiting the economic, cultural or language development of the respective regions. More, in the struggle against measures of this kind it would be desirable for the working class to assume leadership of this struggle in order to infuse it with its dynamism and organization, give it a consistently class character and safeguard it against nationalistic deviations. But the working class is far from making a fetish out of these problems. 'There is a definitive criterion,' Robert Francis said, 'which can be applied to concrete conditions: does one state structure or another serve the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie? In the present conditions the further regionalization or, still better, the institution of a federal system would put the bourgeoisie at a disadvantage because this would help control and limit its power. It would no longer be in a position to juggle with districts, sacrifice one to the others. Further, this would facilitate broad democratization, narrow the gap between the upper and lower strata and help involve various sections of the population in the adoption of decisions on fundamental issues.

'On the other hand, regionalization (and federalization to an even greater degree) would in each region help expose the discrepancy between the policy of the united bourgeoisie and the country's actual interests, the oligarchic character of state-monopoly capitalism and consequently, rally politically all who are prepared to fight it. Federalization would put an end to the splitting tactics of the bourgeoisie, which constantly sets one region against another and claims that all problems (for which its class policy is fully responsible) are rooted in national contradictions.'

The Spanish communists advocate Spain's unity, provided the national rights of the individual regions are observed. The Communist Party of Spain proposes a federal system based on the self-determination of the Catalans, Basques and Galicians. Rafael Ribo said that the communists emphasize the need for a flexible approach to autonomy. This, he said, means that national autonomy should not be confused with regional autonomy, because in some of the regions nationalities have not yet crystallized, and that autonomy should not be regarded as an end in itself. Autonomy in the name of what? For whom? In whose interests will the local authorities act? If self-government stands for broader possibilities for the solution of the urgent socio-economic problems confronting one region or another, for deepening the process of democratization in political life, the Communist Party will undoubtedly be in favor of it. (In this sense Catalonia is the first concrete result. A provisional autonomous government has been set up there with the participation of the communists, who were able in the course of the struggle against Franco and separatist trends that were to be observed even in the working-class movement, to pose the problem of autonomy in such a way as to make it an element of democracy and progress influencing democratic development in the whole of Spain.) If autonomy is sought in subservience to particularist sentiment, if the demand for autonomy is only the result of parochialism, a product of unjustified illusions and unrealistic, unreasonable hopes, the Communist Party will naturally be opposed to it.

The Communist Party of Spain makes cause with respect for the national rights and identity of the selfsame Basque provinces. It reminds the people that the Basques are oppressed and exploited mainly by the local industrial and finance oligarchy, that the captains of industry and bankers in Bilbao had once asked Franco to move 400,000 Andalusians to the region's working-class centers to breach the unity of the Basque trade unions. In a situation in which political, economic and social questions have become entangled in a tight and complicated knot, over-emphasis, for instance, of the problem of language would mean overlooking the main thing, namely, the struggle of the working people for their social, economic and political rights. The more so, therefore, are acts of terrorism deplored by the Communist Party of Spain. Whatever slogans the extremist nationalists use, they objectively act in the interests of those who are trying to obstruct democratization, who long for a 'strong government,' meaning of course, another dictatorship.

Finlay Hart said that while it fully supports the right of the peoples of Scotland and Wales to decide their destiny, including the right to form separate, independent states if they wish, the CPGB has always viewed the nationalities question in the context of the interests of the working class and all other working people. For the Scottish and Welsh peoples the main problems are unemployment, the wage freeze, insecurity, bad housing and other social conditions, the decline of culture and language. Basically, these same problems face the working class and all other working people in Britain as a whole and have been generated by British monopoly capitalism. There is no separate Scottish or Welsh monopoly capitalism. There is only

---

* *The Road to Socialism in Canada*, Toronto, 1972, pp. 21-22.

British monopoly capitalism plus foreign multinationals, which exploit all three peoples. They have a common enemy and should therefore unite in the struggle for socialist transformations. Common tasks can be best carried out by a common effort on the part of the labor movement united not only in terms of organization but also politically and ideologically and motivated by the common aspiration for a socialist Britain.

Devolution for Scotland and Wales, the establishment of Scottish and Welsh parliaments with effective powers, is not a retreat from this aim or an obstacle to socialism, because it has nothing to do with nationalism and separatism. On the contrary, it offers the Scottish and the Welsh working people the only opportunity for taking a direct part in deciding their own affairs, influencing progressive aspirations in the country as a whole and working for a socialist future for Scotland and Wales within the framework of the struggle for a socialist Britain.

Self-government in Scotland and Wales, Finlay Hart noted, would not of itself solve the problems of capitalism. Planning economic and cultural development at the level of national regions would not eliminate anarchy in production, which is dominated by multinational corporations. But democratically elected regional assemblies could be an instrument of public control over the operations of the monopolies, give the people the opportunity to state their requirements and problems, open their eyes to the shortcomings of the social organization and identify those responsible for the hardships. This would impel the peoples of Scotland and Wales to reshape the existing system, with democratic institutions serving as the instrument for this change.

Another point that must be made is that the devolution program will allow maintaining the solidarity and unity of the working class and the labor movement in all the national regions in the struggle to remake society. The communists therefore regard it as part of their class and socialist program. If it is not carried out the nationalities question will not only remain on the agenda but grow more acute than ever. If the Scottish and Welsh working-class movements do not come forward as the initiator and leading force in resolving that question, the upper hand will be gained by diehard nationalists, who may split the British working class, divert it from its socialist goal and retard the labor movement in Britain as a whole and in its individual national regions.

The Communist Party of Ireland, James Stewart said, is consistently fighting sectarianism, Unionism and chauvinistic nationalism, which divorces the struggle for national independence from the struggle for working-class emancipation. We want, he declared, a united socialist Ireland. The party's day-to-day work is aimed at uniting the working class, the small farmers, the small businessmen and professional people in the struggle for democratic rights and at forming an anti-monopoly alliance of all these forces. We hold that this must be a three-pronged offensive against British imperialism: from the North, from the South and within Britain itself.

In the North the aim of the Communist Party of Ireland is to put an end to direct rule from London. To gain this end the party considers that it is necessary:

(1) To repeal all repressive legislation and measures and replace them with a bill of rights which will: (a) guarantee the annulment of all repressive laws that flout common law and contravene international legislation on human rights; (b) guarantee freedom of political thought and activity for all citizens in Northern Ireland; and (c) ban discrimination for reasons of religion, political views and persuasions, sex, race or color.

(2) To hold elections to a Northern Ireland Assembly under a system of proportional representation. This elective assembly should be bound by the provisions of the bill of rights so that there is no return to Unionist discrimination and sectarianism in administration.

(3) To parallel the adoption of a bill of rights to protect the democratic rights of the people of Northern Ireland with the granting of fiscal powers to the Northern Ireland Assembly by the British Parliament so that an end could be put to domination by foreign monopolies, which control 78 per cent of the economy, and economic development could be harnessed to the interests of the working people of Northern Ireland.

(4) That besides discharging these obligations to the people of Northern Ireland and the Irish people as a whole, the British government must pledge to refrain from political, military and economic interference in Irish affairs and allow the people of Ireland, of the North and the South, to determine their country's future structure in keeping with their interests.

Relative to the working class the basis for the realization of such a program exists. This is seen in the demands of the Northern Ireland Committee of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions for the right to live a life free of violence, sectarianism, intimidation and discrimination; guarantees for the right to work; the right to free association and to advocate political change by peaceful means; the right to good housing and equal opportunities to receive an education.

In the Republic of Ireland the CPI's task is to halt the collaboration of the bourgeoisie and its government with the British ruling class and the administration set up by it, to compel them to pressure the British government into ceasing the repressions in the North and putting the above-mentioned policies into effect.

'On the basis of our program,' James Stewart said, 'we Irish communists are confident that we can overcome the unnatural division created by the imperialists between the organized labor movement and the national independence movement, and in so doing create the necessary class conscious unity of the entire Irish working people. It is also essential that we win support amongst the British labor movement and the British democratic forces for our

demands regarding Northern Ireland, because we have a common enemy — British imperialism. Today the weakest link in the imperialist chain, which still holds both our peoples in slavery, is the undemocratic Northern Ireland statelet. If the labor and democratic forces in Ireland and in Britain attack the British ruling class on this issue we can go forward to win not only democratic rights for the working people in Northern Ireland, but to build the unity in policy and action of both our working classes and working people, which is essential to achieve democracy, independence, peace and socialism in our respective countries.'

The Communist Party USA, John Pittman said, sees its task in finding ways to rally around the working class the 50 million people subjected to racial and national oppression. It is important that the connection between the struggle against racial and national oppression and the class struggle should be correctly understood. This understanding comes from an accurate assessment of the class struggle, of the role of the working class and the alignment of forces in the struggle for national liberation. The class struggle is the pivotal phenomenon in capitalist society. It determines the character of all processes. That is why the CPUSA is rejecting all attempts to equate the role of class struggle and that of the working class to the role of any other movement, including the tendency to speak of other movements while remaining silent about their links with the working-class movement.

A difficult multifaceted phenomenon

From what the participants in the symposium said it thus follows that the communist parties of countries ruled by monopoly capitalism are using Marxist-Leninist theory as the basis for their strategy and tactics on the nationalities question. Its mandatory requirements are: a *historical* approach to the nationalities question ('that it be examined within *specific* historical limits'), a strictly *class* analysis (i.e., to assess 'any national demand . . . *from the angle of* the workers' class struggle') with account of the *national distinctions* (because 'the various countries differ from each other in the rapidity of their national development, in the national make-up and distribution of their population') (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 400, 411 and 401). Fulfillment of the communist parties' programs for far-reaching economic, social and political changes will make it possible to untie the knot of national contradictions. Under present-day conditions Lenin's teaching on combining the class struggle for socialism with the struggle for the abolition of national oppression is being implemented by linking the struggle for fundamental anti-monopoly changes to the efforts to resolve the nationalities question.

What theoretical and political difficulties confront the communist parties when they draw up and carry out their programs on the nationalities question? One of these difficulties is that as a community of people a nation is a highly complicated and many-faceted phenomenon embracing the economic, social, political and cultural aspects of society's life. Moreover, much of the essence of a nation is linked to ethnical factors, to consciousness and psychology, whose relationship with socio-class factors at the level of the ordinary consciousness is often understood incorrectly or incompletely. This gives the spokesmen of the bourgeoisie, especially in view of the changing correlation between the objective and the subjective, between socio-class and ethnical factors, between international and national factors, the possibility of making capital out of difficulties and ambiguities and forcing on the people a deliberately distorted idea about the actual role and importance of the various spheres of life and relationships between nations. This is being done with the obvious purpose of sowing discord among opponents of the capitalist class, undermining the unity of the revolutionary forces and diverting the minds of the working people from the socio-class aspects of society's life.

As a matter of fact the same purpose is served by the attempts to prove that ethnicity will supersede the classes in playing the cardinal role in the life of society. Here ethnicity is interpreted in such a manner as to orient the working people on the incitement of racial conflicts instead of the struggle against the ruling classes and the global neo-colonialist strategy of the monopolies.

Nationalism has become a factor determining state policy and social practice in the capitalist world today. It undoubtedly contributes to the creation of a specific social atmosphere that perceptibly influences the consciousness and ideology of the working class. But in their search for effective ways to combat nationalism, which is one of the most complex social phenomena in terms of genesis and form, the communist parties experience a shortage in theoretical and political instruments. They sometimes have recourse to pragmatic definitions and strategic and tactical concepts, which ultimately prove to be untenable from the standpoint of theory. This is partly due to the inadequate attention that the communist movement gives to the nationalities question in developed capitalist countries. Whereas in most of the national-liberation movements in so-called Third World countries, Marxism's leading role and achievements are indisputable, in advanced capitalist countries, where new forms of nationalism and national movements have been and are still developing, the communist parties have in many cases ignored these phenomena or erred in their approach to them. The effects of this are obvious today when it is necessary, say, to give a correct answer to the question of the relationship between class consciousness and national consciousness or to find a sound solution to nationalities problems on the institutional level.

The participants in the symposium said they were confident that the exchange of views would give a further impetus to the study of the problem discussed.

The communists and the women's movement

Shortly before International Women's Day, March 8,* *Naziha Duleimi,* representative of the Iraqi Communist Party, and *Rodny Öhman,* representative of the Left Party — Communists of Sweden, met at *WMR* to discuss communist work in the women's movement in capitalist countries.

The problem today

Duleimi. It may be interesting, if not easy, for us to discuss problems that are so dissimilar in our two countries.

Öhman. They do differ considerably but I believe we also have much in common, primarily as regards the communist approach to these problems, to work in the women's movement.

I must say the importance of the women's question in Swedish politics has been growing. As communists, we realize that this is one of the general problems of the working class which cannot be solved radically until after the transition to a new social system. And so at every stage of the struggle for women's rights we try, with due regard to the situation, to formulate demands which, if met, would enable us to raise the struggle to a qualitatively new level.

One of the major social changes in the past decade is, I think, the appreciably increased proportion of female wageworkers. As many as 71 per cent of our women in the 20-59 age group (62.2 per cent in the 16-74 age group) are employed and the polls say that most housewives want to get jobs. As far as I can say, the percentage of women workers has also been increasing rapidly in other developed capitalist countries. Over 50 per cent of U.S. women are wageworkers and 41 per cent of all workers are women. According to official data, West German women account for one-third of the able-bodied population and it's indicative that more than half the country's nearly one million jobless are women.

This rapid proletarianization of women is no passing phenomenon. It is also a result of scientific and technological progress and of the struggle for equal rights, and is closely linked with this struggle. Women's changing social standing, in turn, has an effect on the nature of the working-class movement and on trade union and political activity and exacerbates the inter-party struggle for influence among the mass of women. More and more women stand as candidates in municipal and general elections. You may have noticed that Sweden has lately had more women in its cabinet than ever before. I think the time is past when one could easily imagine a government without women.

I could also give you some different facts. For example, we now have many clergywomen. Formerly this was out of the question but the government has adopted a relevant decision. There was even the case of a woman who was nominated for a bishopric.

Duleimi. Did she win?

Öhman. The clergy who voted did their utmost to defeat her: for them it was a matter of 'conscience.'

Of course, the few progressive changes that have occurred within the framework of bourgeois democratic institutions mustn't be overestimated. The bourgeoisie often resorts to such devices to distract public attention from more important issues. The system of vocational training and distributing the work force shows that traditions of the past persist. Women's employment is confined to an extremely limited sphere. As there is an acute shortage of nurseries and kindergartens, many women find it impossible to hold a job while at the same time running the house. That is why women today play a very active part in the movement for the right to work and to live in healthy conditions fit for human beings. However, this is by no means a simple process. Readiness to stand up for one's interests does not always imply a clear idea of the goals of the fight, the road it should follow or the real causes of inequality.

In speaking of the growing proportion of women workers, we should also bear in mind that the social composition of the working class as a whole has been markedly changing. Owing to the great concentration of production, many erstwhile businessmen become wageworkers, among whom petty-bourgeois concepts are easily asserted. These new strata exert a considerable influence on public life in general and the women's movement in particular.

We come up against petty-bourgeois feminist theories. Although they've been updated, they still treat the sex question and the antithesis between men and women as the main issue of emancipation. Bourgeois ideologists try to channel the women's movement in this direction so as to divert it from the struggle for solving acute social and political problems. Besides, in view of the growing unemployment which hits women particularly hard, an effort is once again made to enshrine woman as mother

---

* The decision to mark the day was taken at the Second International Conference of Socialist Women held in Copenhagen in 1910 on Klara Zetkin's proposal. It became traditional after it was marked on March 8, 1914, by the women of Austria, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Russia, Switzerland and the USA. In non-socialist countries March 8 is marked as the day of struggle for women's rights and social progress under slogans stemming from the concrete situation. It is marked in all countries as a day of women's solidarity in the struggle for peace. — *Ed.*

and housewife — and nothing else. As a result, the views in the women's movement range from extreme conservatism to radical feminism.

This proves how very important and necessary it is for communists to work in the women's movement, so as to show in both theoretical and practical terms that the problem of women's emancipation, a problem in its own right, can be solved only through a class approach.

Duleimi. The women's movement in Iraq has been developing in close connection with the rise and expansion of the general democratic movement. It is a product of the working people. Women have never dissociated their fight from general patriotic action against colonialism, military bases and the Baghdad Pact. So it is now traditional to regard the women's question, both in theory and practice, as part of the country's political, social and economic development.

Of course, some problems concern only us women and must be approached accordingly. This is a necessary condition, I think, if we want to draw women into the democratic struggle, including the struggle for socialism.

Our movement sprang up in an extremely backward country and this must be taken into account. At that time, women were not allowed to attend meetings or join in demonstrations without the permission of their husbands or parents. Most of them were confined to the home, barred from all public activity. And so the chief problem today is how to increase woman's role in public life.

Women in Iraq's industry and service sector account for 13 per cent of the wage and salary earners. Compare this figure with yours, and you will realize that in our country we are only taking the first step on a long road. To be sure, the Iraqi women's movement, which has a 40-year record, has won many important gains, improving our women's condition in education and production. We had a big drive against illiteracy. There are more women now who have learned a trade. They work in the new industries and the service sector and you will find them in virtually every public sphere. That is not to say however, that women have already won their rights and everything else on which their role in social, as well as political and economic life depends. There is discrimination on political, religious and ethnic grounds. A lot more will have to be done for Iraqi women to achieve real equality with men.

I have talked with many comrades from the fraternal parties of developing countries and have come to the conclusion that we have much in common as regards the approach to the problem we are discussing. What I mean is that we give priority to enlisting women's effective participation in public life. Surely we can only speak of real emancipation where it is not just individual women, however talented, but large numbers of women that are active in every public field.

Öhman. I'm sure you will agree if I say that it is precisely an active attitude to life that helps women play a greater role and win a new standing in both society and the family. And it's certainly the communists who can in response to women's demands do much to ensure that women's aspiration for democratic change translates into a struggle for political and social progress.

How the party operates

Duleimi. At various stages of the women's movement in Iraq, our party has followed three main lines.

First, it popularized progressive ideas and Marxist-Leninist views on the problem of women's emancipation and established the connection between this problem and general patriotic problems as well as the class struggle of the workers and peasants.

Second, the party formulated program slogans, strove to convey them to all working women and studied the social condition of women, their everyday problems, their views and notions and so on.

Third, we carried on organizing activity to draw women into the work of democratic organizations and recruit them for our party, since women communists, as experience has shown, are the backbone of the women's movement, the front-line contingent in the struggle for women's rights and for a better future for their children, in the struggle for peace and socialism.

In the early 1950s, when it was decided to found a league of Iraqi women, we met in homes to discuss the problems before us. Sometimes there were 30 or more women — housewives, clerks, factory workers. We talked about the situation in the family, working conditions and society's attitude to women. We held many such meetings and they helped us form an idea of the pressing problems that had to be solved to improve women's social condition. We worked out a program for a democratic women's organization and it was extended as time went on. In putting it into effect, we come up against new problems and search for ways of solving them.

I would say our party has played a big role in evolving programs for progressive women's organizations. Moreover, the women's movement as a whole may be said to have been developing mainly within the framework of our demands. But while the aims of the women's movement are virtually inseparable from those the communists set, our party's demands certainly go farther.

For example, we call on women to help formulate and materialize the demands of the democratic mass movement as a whole. But their possibilities are rather limited. Speaking of peasant women, it isn't enough to teach them to read and write or give them vocational training. This is no doubt essential. But we also consider it necessary to see to it that they participate effectively in the activity of agrarian cooperatives and collective farms and in shaping their policies and plans. This also applies to the struggle for their rights, such as equitable remuneration. As for the slogans of women's official organizations, they bear mostly on the former aspect of the problem, that is the elimination of illiteracy, the organization of health care and so on.

I've said that our party considers it necessary to ensure that women go beyond the four walls of their homes to get jobs and participate in public activity. However, this participation is often seen as a purely economic matter. We constantly stress the need not only to heighten women's role in production and the economy generally, which is highly important for their emancipation, but also to combine this with their participation in planning, in the framing of economic policy, in the country's socio-political life.

In other words, it is a question of extending the content of the women's movement, a task we communists help in large measure to accomplish. Party work in this field is aimed at transforming programs and slogans evolved in the course of the mass movement into a motor of the masses' own effort for their fulfillment.

Öhman. There can be no question that concrete work on concrete issues is gaining in importance. When working in the women's mass movement, we try to concentrate on problems that come to the fore.

First among these problems is the fight for peace, which no progressive movement should stay out of today. Last December, 20,000 women marched through the streets of Stockholm, demanding disarmament and a ban on nuclear weapons. The aims of this fight are particularly cherished by women, who can play a special part in it by actively opposing imperialism and its arms race. Besides, participation in the peace movement makes for the rapid growth of women's political consciousness and helps them go all the more resolutely beyond the bounds of the specific interests which individual groups or organizations are fighting for.

Communists can contribute to the women's movement by linking it more closely with the struggle for peace and for guarantees of the existence of the movement. If these problems do not become an organic component of women's struggle, it will clearly have no future.

A serious problem in our country today is to preserve existing jobs and create new ones. This is particularly important in the context of mounting unemployment. We show that jobs can be created by, say, building an adequate number of children's institutions, more hospitals and better homes. We consider that 300,000 apartments must be built in the next few years and that there must be better housing for all at lower rent.

Nowadays, part-time industrial jobs for women are quite common in Sweden. Yet employers show an increasing tendency to curtail social benefits and rights for women who work only a part of the day. The communists and the progressive women's movement strongly resist this tendency.

Women's social problems are becoming a part of our party's program goals. As I have said, we are doing our best to take into account the peculiarities of work among women. What precisely?

Women's attitude to capitalism is often somewhat different from men's, all the more so because very few women belong to the core of the working class. The jobs held by 70 per cent of the women should be seen rather as an extension of their erstwhile occupation as housewives. Working at small enterprises and in semi-domestic conditions, they fail to perceive the antagonism between labor and capital as keenly as men, most of whom are employed at big industrial enterprises. This makes it one of our chief tasks to find the most effective ways and means of raising women's class consciousness.

Work in the trade unions becomes of special importance. We want women to be more actively involved in trade union work, creating the necessary conditions and getting the trade unions to devote attention to the women's demands and in fact having these demands most vigorously promoted. (In the 1970s, for instance, we had active unions involving workers in various mental jobs, the garment industry and cleaning companies.) We seek to carry the old trade union slogan of 'organizing the unorganized' to the non-unionized strata of the working class, above all the small enterprises, the services, shops and offices, and this means mainly organizing working women. This will undoubtedly add strength to the working-class and the women's movement not only in the economic but also in the socio-political spheres.

Duleimi. Now that we have come to the question of work in the trade unions, I should like to note that in this context considerable importance now attaches to the effort to see that words are translated into deeds. We in our country, for instance, have laws on labor, public activity and social security, under which women also have certain rights, but from day to day the practical implementation of these laws is in crying contradiction with their content.

For instance, the law says that there shall be equal pay for equal work, but in many spheres of production, both in the public and the private sector, especially in the latter, this provision is not fulfilled and is dodged by the employers in various ways. Or take the law which says that there must be a nursery school at every factory. This law even lays down the working hours for this child welfare institution. But I am quite sure that up to now there is not a single nursery school at the enterprises. In general, we have very few of them and these are not be found at the enterprises.

Much depends on the trade unions' consistent and resolute action. We constantly urge women to participate effectively in the activity of the trade unions, and the latter, actively to protect the rights of working women.

Öhman. Let me add: all working women and in every sphere. One of the gravest problems in our country today is that connected with immigrant workers. Of Sweden's eight million inhabitants, one million are first- and second-generation immigrants. It is highly important to establish and strengthen contacts with this part of the population and especially with women who come to our country with totally different habits and frequently from countries where patriarchal attitudes are strong. We believe that it is necessary to give these women the

right to attend schools with instruction in their mother tongue, while enabling them to study Swedish, to find out about the social rights existing in Sweden and then to enjoy these rights themselves ever more fully. We say that it is not enough to issue diverse proclamations and manuals about the rights of foreign workers. There is a need to carry on a concrete struggle, to set up language courses, to organize consultations for these people, etc. The party attaches much importance to this kind of activity.

I feel compelled to say that problems connected with various sexual perversions, pornography and increasingly open prostitution, and that among very young girls and even children, are a source of grave anxiety in our country. Here, so-called black capital has built up a whole industry. The communists and the progressive women's movement cannot, of course, ignore these problems, for we stand up for the dignity of women and the right of children to grow up in a healthy environment and resolutely oppose such business.

Duleimi. I think that when we speak of the concrete questions and concrete demands put forward by the party, it is especially important to find approaches to these problems, approaches to various strata of the population and gain an understanding of their mentality and their problems.

One of our special concerns, for instance, is work with peasant women. I remember how I was involved in this work myself. Villages in Iraq are far apart. A great number of women are illiterate. Their social condition is such that it does not at all enable them to take part in social life and this applies even to the most conscious peasants. While a peasant may himself be aware that he is being exploited, this awareness does not somehow apply to his wife. It was hard for any stranger in the village to get the women together and have a talk with them. We had to find someone who had close bonds with life in the countryside, like teachers, doctors or other medical personnel. But even they did not always succeed in having a talk with the peasant women. In the recent period, we have succeeded in getting the peasants themselves, our party comrades, to involve their families in the women's movement.

Of course, the Iraqi countryside today is not what it was say, 20 years ago, but to this day it has difficult problems before it. Roughly 45-50 per cent of the women work in the fields, virtually without any pay, for they work as members of the peasant's family. They cannot join a cooperative and even when they can, they must have a plot of land of their own (and this happens mostly when a family loses its breadwinner). Of course, women also work as farm hands, but that is seasonal work with extremely low pay.

Our party fought for amendments to the land reform law that would require equal pay for equal work done by women and men in the countryside and for securing women's right to possess plots of land and be members of producers' cooperatives and state farms. For a long time, the party has fought directly and through democratic organizations (legally and clandestinely), for provisions in the family law to protect the rights of women and to guarantee their equality. At the same time, a special contribution to such struggles comes from every concrete step and every right word that helps to make a practical advance in solving these problems. Our countryside needs efforts to eliminate the old traditions, superstitions, patriarchal attitudes and notions, which are still alive.

Öhman. I think that the question of involving the greatest possible number of people representing the most diverse strata of the population — working women in town and country, housewives, office workers, students, etc. — in the struggle for equality and for social progress arises in every country in its own way, but it always arises. In this context there is apparantly a problem of cooperation between the communists working in the women's movement and representatives of other parties and mass organizations which exert their own influence on various groups and strata of the population.

Problem of cooperation

Duleimi. Unfortunately, today I can consider this problem only in the light of past experience. In the old days, before 1968, we cooperated in women's organizations with members of other parties. (I must say that the number of women in the ICP was then insignificant, but now the situation has changed: until 1974, it was 7 per cent, and went up to 17 per cent in 1978.) Cooperation spread to the whole women's movement and was to be found not only in the sphere of struggle for women's rights but in many others as well. It was both temporary and more lasting, but the main thing is that it was massive, involving the party members themselves.

Not all the parties in Iraq stood for the equality of women and there were few political forces recognizing the need for this. Still, we strove to involve these parties as well in patriotic activity. Then the situation changed. Some obstacles arose in the way of the development of the women's movement, especially over the past 10 years. A law was enacted in Iraq on mass organizations under which only one organization in every sphere of social life was allowed to be established, while the others were banned, but even then only those who supported the Baath Party were eligible to work in that one organization, which made it an instrument for Baath policies. All who tried to continue their activities outside its framework were severely persecuted in law.

The law establishing official mass organizations defined their purposes and rules, so that these were not worked out, say, by women themselves but were handed down from above in the form of an order. This leads to a weakening and even a halt in the growth of women's organizations, and to a lesser contribution to their activity by people of different persuasions, though I must stress that the progressive forces are active today as well.

Before the enactment of these laws, we demanded the working out of a formula for uniting the whole women's movement on a democratic basis.

In the enactment of the law, this demand was not considered. Following the establishment of the National Progressive Front, the party tried to turn the women's movement into a field of cooperation among the forces within the Front, but for many political reasons, above all the absence of democracy, we could not solve the problem, and now that the Front has ceased to operate (since last year) the party has once again called on our comrades in the women's movement to resume the activity of the Iraqi Women's League.

Because of political discrimination, thousands of Iraqi women are now deprived of the right to work, education and the upbringing of their children in a spirit of peace and friendship (for the Baath education system is shot through with chauvinism). Hundreds of women are persecuted, jailed and tortured for political reasons. The key task before us today is to fight for the re-establishment of democracy, for only then can the rights of women, as of all other working people, be ensured. We want women to enjoy political rights, the right to act in their own legal organizations to enable the progressive women's movement to advance and develop.

Öhman. At this point I must say that the situation in my country has been shaped in a very different way. With a few exceptions, the traditional bourgeois women's movement is being ever more closely integrated with the bourgeois parties. In the working-class movement the ties between its political organizations and women's organizations are growing stronger. Independent women's associations and groups continue to play an important role in rallying those who share general democratic views but who are not members of any other organization. A sizable section of young women workers has come under the influence of neo-feminist groups and trends.

This already makes it clear that special importance attaches to contacts and work generally in progressive strata of the women's movement which may not be affiliated with any party but which nevertheless declare their adherence to socialist ideals. That is why it is necessary to maintain ties with the neo-feminist organizations as well. Many young people think that the feminists are real fighters for the emancipation of women and we have to do a great deal to make them find the right approach to the problem. Within some general democratic organizations, including the Left Union of Swedish Women, there is a process of differentiation in the course of which many activists join the parties of the labor movement. In our party, for instance, the number of women over the past 10 years has increased from 26 per cent to 33.7 per cent, while 50 per cent of the young communists are women.

I have no intention of specially dealing here with the various aspects of the feminist movement. There is an obvious need to come out against the petty-bourgeois, separatist, feminist conceptions, because they tend to reduce the working women's capacity for united and effective struggle. But we cannot isolate ourselves from the masses under the influence of feminist organizations, or of the various groups of active women who are not affiliated with any women's organizations or parties but constitute their own movements, like that of the environmentalists, etc. We seek to find ways of working among them and have been making consistent efforts to ensure cooperation of various organizations — even those which are under the influence of bourgeois parties — on the basic problems facing women.

What unites women and induces them to take concrete action is the problem of peace, the problem of work, the home and children. We do not, of course, have to work in such hard conditions as the Iraqi party, but even in our country it takes courage, resolve and ability to carry on the struggle in order to resist the shift to the right.

Duleimi. We cannot, of course, deal in our conversation with all the problems of the mass women's movement. One recent publication is the proceedings of an international conference sponsored by the SUPG Central Committee to mark the centenary of August Bebel's book, *Woman Under Socialism,* a conference both of us attended.* For three days, the representatives of 87 communist, workers', socialist, social-democratic and revolutionary-democratic parties and organizations discussed the importance of the women's question in the revolutionary struggle of the international working-class movement. We saw for ourselves how fruitful that exchange of opinion and experience was. I think, therefore, that in conclusion it would be useful for us to emphasize that on which there was a consensus among the communist women from various countries of the non-socialist world.

The communists realize that women still have to overcome the age-old legacy of discrimination in every field of social life, to acquire faith in their own powers and potentialities. That is a protracted and intricate process in the course of which women come up against a great many obstacles stemming both from the social conditions in which they live and from their own mentality. A tremendous amount of work has to be done in the cultural, social and political fields and that is above all the job of women themselves, of their mass movement. At the same time, the women's movement, tackling its own specific tasks, cannot be successful without relying on the working-class movement, without close ties with the struggle against the monopolies and for peace, democracy and socialism. In the course of concrete work among the masses, the communists show that although democratic progress can be achieved and some elements of inequality overcome in present-day conditions when efforts are pooled for common purposes, a radical and ultimate solution of the women's question is possi-

---

*The International Conference of the SUPG Central Committee devoted to the centenary of the publication of August Bebel's book *Woman Under Socialism*, GDR, Berlin, February 23-25, 1979, Working protocol (unauthorized), Parts I, II.

ble only in the struggle against capitalism, in the struggle for a new society.

Öhman. That is, of course, the main thing. I should also like to recall what we spoke about at our meeting in Berlin. The capitalist society has a stake in spreading divisions not only among employed and jobless, among men and women, but even among the women themselves so as to resist the tremendous power of the women's movement united on a socialist basis. But experience shows that cooperation among various trends in the women's movement has been growing. This is most evident in the celebrations of International Women's Day on March 8, and we take this opportunity to extend our congratulations on the day to all working women.

Capitalist rationalization strategy

Michael Graber
CC member, CP Austria

Technological rationalization, which has spread to the leading industries in the developed capitalist countries in the recent period is simultaneously a product of the scientific and technical revolution of the second half of this century and one of its motive forces, which makes it an important factor behind the socio-economic and political processes in the capitalist world. The extensive use of new hardware and technology in industry and the services has an effect on the very basis of capitalist production, modifying its structure and ultimately deepening the general crisis of capitalism. Austria's experience shows that this is true not only of the major but also of the 'minor' capitalist countries, whose economy naturally has its own specific features.

As the West German Marxist economist Heinz Jung quite rightly said in his article, extensive application of microelectronics in the key industries is the most important feature of the present stage of rationalization. What is specific about microelectronics is that in virtue of its technical potentialities and even its relative cheapness it is used in the most diverse spheres of production, above all for measuring, control and regulation.

Microelectronic devices are already being used in machine-tools and means of communication, for processing various types of data, energy supply, medical appliances, auto electric circuits, consumer goods and household appliances. While helping to modernize production, these devices command ever broader marketing outlets.

Microelectronics is an embodiment of scientific knowledge and technological experience reflecting the tremendous scale on which production has now been socialized. The effects of its application bring out in bold relief the potentialities Marx had in mind in predicting that the time would come when the creation of real wealth would become less dependent on labor-time and on the amount of labor expended than on the power of the agents set in motion in the course of labor-time and which themselves, for their part (their powerful efficiency), are out of all proportion to the labor-time actually required for their production, but depend rather on the general level of science and technical progress or on the application of that science to production.

But nowadays, the extensive use of the latest scientific and technical achievements in capitalist society merely goes to intensify its organic contradictions. After all, being the result of social labor, the new technology is monopolized by capitalists, while its application is not determined by social but by private capitalist rationality. As a result, technical progress is converted into an instrument for intensifying the exploitation of the working class and putting pressure on all the working people, in the process going to multiply private property instead of social wealth.

Rationalization, sharply stepped up in the mid-1970s owing to the attempts by monopoly circles to overcome the world economic crisis, has consequences whose analysis shows the limited potentialities of the capitalist relations of production. What is brought out in even bolder relief is that the development of the productive forces under capitalism can run only through a deepening of its social contradictions.

The sharpening of the class contest in the capitalist countries has confronted bourgeois ideologists and theorists with the task of working out a system of arguments to justify the negative socio-economic consequences of capitalist rationalization, so as to present them as a 'necessary evil,' which allegedly goes hand in hand with what is on the whole a beneficial effect of scientific and technical progress on the material conditions of life in society.

Thus, the apologists of the monopolies claim that the mass unemployment in the developed capitalist countries has 'technological' roots. They seek to bracket two phenomena in the contemporary capitalist economy — rapid technical development and the disappearance of jobs — and to present the former as the 'natural' cause of the latter, so as to make the working people accept the existing state of things.

But it is a deliberate distortion of the truth to say

We continue the discussion of the socio-economic problems of capitalist rationalization started by H. Jung (see, *WMR*, January 1980).

that the current mass disappearance of jobs is due to the technological factor. It is not new technology as such that matters, not the new technological and production processes but their capitalist mode of application, that is, what matters is that the productive forces have to develop under the control of monopoly capital.

When considering the consequences, I want to deal in greater detail with the problem raised by Jung in the most general terms. The fact is that the introduction of *new* technology is being effected through the use of *traditional* methods and instruments which have long since been designed to enhance competitiveness and boost monopoly profits. An analysis of this aspect of the problem of rationalization is of practical importance in working out the strategy and tactics of the working people's struggle against its pernicious effect on their working and living conditions.

The spectrum of state-monopoly rationalization methods is exceptionally broad, ranging from accelerated concentration of production and centralization of capital, which results in the closure of enterprises and intensification of labor, which falls as a heavy physical and mental burden on the working people. Under the impact of new technology, the aggregate influence of these methods on the economy as a whole and on the individual economic structures tends to acquire qualitatively new proportions.

State-monopoly methods of controlling rationalization have resulted in a situation (in Austria, for instance) in which the number of bankruptcies has reached record highs despite some revival of the economic outlook. Or take another example. The merger drive in the state steel industry for the purposes of rationalization was carried out several years ago but its impact on the traditional production processes is beginning to tell only now: thousands of workers have been laid off, while thousands more have to seek jobs far away from their homes, which increases the cost of travelling and results in much loss of time. From 1974 to 1978, labor productivity in Austrian industry as a whole went up by 25.4 per cent (per man-hour) while the use of capacities dropped from 89 per cent to 83 per cent and the number of jobs by 60,000 (i.e., by more than 10 per cent).

Considering the impact of rationalization on economic processes in a broader context, we find that contrary to the expectations of bourgeois theorists and practitioners, it has not had any marked effect on the development of the economic cycle, which means that it has not helped to ease the crisis phenomena in the down-phase or to invigorate the economy in the up-phase. Thus, despite the above-mentioned marked growth in labor productivity, Austria's industrial output in 1978 was only 4 per cent up on 1974.

Investment policy provides a clue to the mechanism of rationalization. One has to note a remarkable trend in its dynamics: while the share of total investments going into Austria's industry fell from 18.2 per cent in 1971 to 13.9 per cent in 1978, the proportion of inputs into rationalization has been steadily growing. This is borne out also by data for crisis and post-crisis periods, when inputs into new technology went up from 58 per cent of total investments into industry in 1974 to 64 per cent in 1977.

These figures mean that rationalization is now being carried on not under the impact of a shortage of production facilities, as was the practice in the past, but with an excess of capacity produced by the crisis. The fact is that the monopolies make use of the ever lower cost of modern technology in order to economize on capital and display no concern at all for jobs. That is why they have been spending less and less on the expansion of fixed assets, for this would create new jobs but would slice their profits.

In private property society, it is never the social weal but the drive for profit that is always the main purpose of investment in scientific and technical progress. The resultant disproportions in investment activity become a key factor generating, sharpening and dragging out structural crises.

In its efforts to overcome these disproportions, the Austrian government has stepped up its state-monopoly measures to stimulate private investment activity oriented upon rationalization, with the result that tremendous amounts of public funds are being so re-distributed as to allow the use of scientific and technical progress for monopoly accumulation. Considering that public funds mainly come from the taxes levied on the working people, it turns out that the latter finance the measures which ultimately convert them into recruits of the reserve army of labor.

State-monopoly rationalization in the textile industry in Austria's eastern regions shows how large-scale production facilities and public funds are being squandered, a practice that is objectively inevitable under the chaotic capitalist relations of production. At its first stage, the losses incurred by large private enterprises were covered by government banks, and then these enterprises were closed down. This was followed by the next phase, in the course of which easy investment credits — once again from government funds — were made available to the entrepreneurs for investment in new enterprises up to the latest standards, provided the old plants were scrapped. As a result, the monopolies obtained additional profits at the cost of firing about 2,000 persons. Let us bear in mind that all such operations are financed from the taxes levied on the working people.

This obviously suggests the following conclusions: state-monopoly stimulation of scientific and technical progress for the benefit of the monopolies has done nothing to change the haphazard character of capitalist investment activity and its attendant rationalization, whose uncontrolled social consequences have confronted the Austrian working people with a number of hard problems.

For a small country like Austria, the installation of new technology carries yet another specific danger stemming from the monopolization of scientific and technical progress by the large trans-

nationals, a danger indicated as a trend in which the smaller countries are converted into suppliers of intermediate products for the powerful foreign monopolies, which goes further to intensify their dependence on the big imperialist powers.

The preliminary results of studies carried out in Austria give an idea of some of the social effects of the haphazard application of new technology, microprocessors in the first place. It is possible fairly reliably, for instance, to predict a reduction in the number of skilled workers, fitters and mechanics, on the one hand, and a rise in the number of automatic-machine operators (especially in quality testing and control) and skilled specialists, electronic designers and computer engineers, on the other. In other words, it is the skilled workers in the traditional trades that are faced with a loss of jobs.

Many specialists anticipate a growing polarization of the skill structure. In the printing industry, for instance, the purpose of rationalization is to use untrained manpower for operations which had once required high-skill standards. The experience of Austria and other capitalist countries, among them the FRG and Britain, shows the danger of a loss of skills among entire professional groups.

Since microelectronically-based computers can now be used not only at big but also at small and medium-size plants, the social consequences of rationalization are also much more pronounced here than they were in the past. Thus, the elimination of at least one workplace in one-half of Austria's 220,000 small enterprises (employing under 50 persons) through new technology will mean a loss of jobs for more than 100,000 people. And this at a time when at least 30,000 new jobs need to be created every year for school-leavers alone.

The impact of the new technology may prove to be greatest in office work and management, in insurance and banking, above all in the processing of statistics and texts, as in the production of computerized standard texts, letters, orders, reports, etc. Some authoritative studies suggest that at large enterprises it is possible to formalize roughly 30 per cent and automate 25 per cent of the office work. At the small and medium enterprises, the figures are respectively, 45 per cent and 25 per cent, and in government and municipal administration, 72 per cent and 38 per cent. The programming of text processing could mean a seven-fold increase in the productivity of office work.

Computers are now about to take over mechanical drawing and design. It is expected that by 1985 up to 90 per cent of technical drawings in the United States will be done by microcomputers. Unless some special measures are effected — something that is highly unlikely under capitalist rationalization — this will lead to a loss of skills and earnings for some specialists.

The capitalist rationalization of office work is having an effect not only on those whose jobs it affects directly. The long-term calculations concerning the movement of redundant manpower from industry into the services, public utilities and management are being upset and this fully applies to Austria, where until recently relatively high employment was maintained and mass unemployment averted largely through a growth of the above-mentioned non-production sectors.

The far-reaching consequences of the extensive use of microprocessors in the making of watches and in printing have been described at length. For us Austrians the sharp class struggle which has flared up in these industries in the FRG and the resistance by the West German trade unions to the capitalist strategy of rationalization have become an element of the international class struggle. They have made an impression even on the leadership of the Austrian trade unions, whose thinking is shot through with the spirit of 'social partnership.'

There is a growing demand also in our country, which is threatened with a reduction in employment, for the establishment of trade union and public control over the introduction of new technology. The impact of the strike by West German printers will be seen, in particular, in the one-year moratorium on automation in the Austrian printing industry introduced by agreement between the trade unions and the employers. The trade union of office employees of private enterprises has made a detailed study of the effects of intensive rationalization through the use of microelectronics, and says in its action program: 'We want planning, control and participation in management to turn technical progress into progress for man and society as well.'

The possibilities of economizing on living labor through rationalization are used by capital for its own benefit by intensifying labor, but those whose labor productivity is rapidly boosted by the new technology want shorter working hours without wage cuts. Many trade unions believe that this would allow a fair distribution of labor throughout the labor force, not merely maintaining employment but actually extending it. But what business wants is not just economy on labor-time, but economy in a form that would increase surplus labor as the source of profit. That is why the trade union proposals are being opposed by the monopolies and the government catering for their interests.

Meanwhile, right-wing trade union leaders suggest that the problem of growing unemployment caused by rationalization could be solved through a sharing out of the available payrolls among all the working people, including the jobless. But is it not clear that this would virtually mean a general reduction in earnings? That is the kind of 'solidarity' the capitalists would also support, because it would do nothing to change the rate of exploitation. These and other similar 'bold' plans of the apologists of 'social partnership' do not touch the profits of the monopolies and can merely worsen the condition of the working people.

We Austrian communists believe that it is impossible to pursue a policy of employment fully meeting the working people's interests without curbing the capitalist mode of production. Such a policy can be realistically conducted only under the planned

use of manpower and social property in the means of production. That is why we regard the struggle for shorter working hours as a part of our struggle against capitalist exploitation. Here, as in every other attempt to avert or ease the negative socio-economic effects of capitalist rationalization, there is a clash between the political economy of the working class and that of the capitalists.

The new technology produced by the scientific and technical revolution opens up tremendous prospects before mankind. It could entirely release man from the need directly to take part in the production process, bring about a gradual elimination of every type of arduous, monotonous and unskilled labor, all-round development of the creative elements in labor and a marked reduction in working hours.

But under capitalism, scientific and technical progress poses a growing threat to the working people's source of livelihood. Instead of work being made easier, industrial workers and employees are subjected to growing stress and many production operations become ever more monotonous. Monetary upheavals and inflation, the energy and raw materials crises, growing budget deficits and mounting taxation further sharpen the socio-economic consequences of rationalization and exacerbate the material conditions of millions of working people.

The contradictions between the potentialities of scientific and technical progress and capitalist reality induce the trade unions to insist on the humanization of labor. But in Austria, most of the working people's demands are blocked by the right-wing social democratic leaders' orientation on 'social partnership' with capital and their practice of protecting 'sacrosanct' profits.

In the presence of capitalist property and the inhuman social system, it is no more than an illusion to try to use rationalization for the benefit of the working people. The fundamental way out will be found in deep-going socio-economic transformations and reliance on the experience of existing socialism, which shows very well that balanced application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress and its conscious control for the benefit of the working people have ceased to be a hypothesis and are a working reality.

---

the press

Book reviews

INTERNATIONALISTS WHO FOUGHT FOR SPAIN

Connolly Column by Michael O'Riordan. Dublin, New Books, 1979, 232 pp.

The revolt of 'the four generals' against the legitimate republican government of Spain in 1936 and the support given to them by German and Italian fascists already in power aroused the indignation of progressive people throughout the world. Many of those who cherished democracy, who were aware of the grave danger of fascism were driven to more active forms of solidarity. Thousands of volunteers from 53 countries came to fight for Spain. Some, like the German anti-fascists, had already learned what fascism was from their own experience and were determined to fight it with arms in hand. Others defied their governments' policies of non-intervention, policies which were in fact aiding the fascists. Still others came from the Soviet Union, which resolutely sided with the young Spanish Republic. (The Soviet Union, then the world's only socialist state, rendered inestimable aid to the Spanish Republic, sending some of its finest military experts, armaments, food and medicines.)

The volunteers who marched through Grand Via in Madrid on November 8, 1936, singing *The Internationale* were formed into International Brigades. During the war there were seven such brigades. Men of different nationalities, political persuasions and social origin fought in their ranks. There were republicans, Catholics, non-party people, communists, liberals, socialists, factory workers, office employees, peasants and intellectuals. All were united by their hatred for fascism and devotion to freedom. The then young Communist Party of Ireland also decided to send an Irish contingent to Spain. News reached Dublin that several Irishmen were already fighting in the ranks of the International Brigades. The communist Bill Scott, who fought in the Ernst Thaelmann German anti-fascist battalion, wrote to Sean Murray, the then General Secretary of the Communist Party:

'It's the most sacred cause in history to defend freedom.'

And further:

'I feel I would be failing in my duty if I did not

report to you a little of what I have seen, and warn you of what awaits you if fascism is allowed to grow in Ireland.'

In December 1936 the first contingent of Irish Internationalists set out for Spain. They chose to name their unit after James Connolly, the Irish socialist who had been a leader of the 1916 rebellion (being heavily wounded, Connolly was captured by the British and shot). Michael O'Riordan, then a young communist, now General Secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland, was with the contingent. His book *Connolly Column* is devoted to the stern years of the Spanish Civil War and the Irish volunteers who fought for the Republic.

The first pages give the reader an idea of the atmosphere that reigned in Ireland, when the column of Irish internationalist volunteers was formed. The domestic political situation was not favorable for those who supported the Republican side in Spain. The Eucharist Congress held in Dublin in the early 1930s incited religious hysteria in the country. The right-wing forces had been strengthened by it, the left then was small. Attacks on public meetings of communists, socialists and republicans were common. In 1933, Connolly House, the headquarters of some revolutionary workers' groups which soon after founded the Communist Party of Ireland, was burned down in Dublin.

The fascists posed a real threat to Ireland. The 'fuehrer' of the Irish fascists was General O'Duffy, who had been dismissed as Chief of Police by the new De Valera government in 1933. Backed by leading religious figures the fascist 'Blueshirt' movement was closely identified with the main opposition party.

At the last moment it lost ground, when it backed down from a confrontation with the progressive anti-fascist forces. Spain gave the discredited General O'Duffy a second chance. It is believed that he intended to use the time in Spain to build up a political and military base that would later bring him to power.

The Civil War in Spain was portrayed by the Irish bourgeois and clerical press (and also by many British papers) not as a fascist attempt to overthrow a legal government, but as a 'Christian crusade.' Newspapers and pamphlets detailed alleged 'atrocities' of the Republican forces and described the fascists as devout heroes of the people. The bishops authorized church collections in support of the fascist cause in Spain. At the same time, a 'Christian Front' was formed to channel the religious hysteria into support for the fascists and in a short time it was organized throughout the state. Another development within its framework on O'Duffy's initiative was the hammering together of an 'Irish Brigade' to fight for Franco in the Civil War. In November 1936, 700 'Christian warriors' set out for Spain.*

In this connection Michael O'Riordan writes:

'The atmosphere of hysteria forced the leadership of the Irish Labour Party and of the Irish Trade Union Congress to "forget" that in 1934 they had issued a Joint Manifesto condemning fascism' (p. 33).

However, the traditions of proletarian solidarity upheld by the Irish working class could not be destroyed, even in the face of frenzied pro-Franco campaigning. The book states:

'Despite the hysterical support for the Spanish Generals, the Irish Anti-Fascists stood firm. Credit must go for this to Sean Murray, the Secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland, who in his weekly articles on international affairs in the columns of the duplicated *Worker* gave a clear analysis of what was happening in Spain' (p. 29).

From the very beginning of the war the Communist Party of Ireland and the Left Republicans had attempted to reveal the truth. They were aided by other democrats, including one brave priest, Father O'Flanagen, who exposed the hypocrisy of the official Church attitude.

Most of those who made up the Connolly Column were communists, having at one time or other been active members of the Republican movement. Their leader was Frank Ryan, a republican with previous experience in the rebellion for independence and in the Civil War of 1922-1923.

The author quotes Frank Ryan's statement for the press just before the group sailed for Spain. He said:

'The Irish contingent is a demonstration of revolutionary Ireland's solidarity with the gallant Spanish workers and peasants in their fight for freedom against fascism. It aims to redeem Irish honor besmirched by the intervention of Irish fascism on the side of the Spanish fascist rebels. It is to aid the revolutionary movements in Ireland to defeat the fascist menace at home' (pp. 55-56).

Thus, Frank Ryan declared the credo of all the Irishmen who went to fight in the International Brigades.

Christmas 1936 saw the Connolly Column in action for the first time at Cordoba. It was a baptism of fire. Eight members of the small contingent gave their lives in this first engagement. Killed too were any illusions that this was any sort of romantic adventure, but the determination of the volunteers did not flag.

The book describes the experiences of the column in further battles. The volunteers took part in such engagements as Jarama, the Brunete offensive, Teruel and the Aragon offensive, before their final contribution on the Ebro River. The author painfully reflects on the shortages of ammunition, food and clothing the Republican forces experienced. He reminds the readers about those who aided Franco

---

*Those who volunteered for O'Duffy's brigade stayed less than six months. They saw action only once — in a clash with a Moorish unit of their own side. The fighting cost them seven lives, while they gathered into their ranks some Irish deserters from Franco's Spanish Foreign Legion, causing the Dublin playwright Brendan Behan to comment that they were the only army in history to return with more men than they had set out with! They returned to Ireland, in the main, as disillusioned 'defenders of Christianity' and many ignored the official welcome prepared for them.

in the war against the people. He gives the number of superbly outfitted regular German and Italian units, the quantities of combat equipment, latest models of aircraft and tanks in particular, the fascist generals had in the war. The reactionaries also know how to muster their forces. This is something the progressives should never forget.

Although it was tough on the fighters of the International Brigades, their spirits and morale were always high. In this air of internationalism in Spain many close friendships were built up for life.

In describing the fates of his countrymen and comrades in arms the author devotes much attention to the leader of the Connolly Column, Frank Ryan. In his person the Irish progressive movement, beyond doubt, lost a most capable leader. Refuting all insinuations surrounding his experiences following his capture on the Aragon front, the author quotes evidence and documents to reconstruct the tragic fate of the leader of the Connolly Column. Frank Ryan was sentenced to death by a fascist court martial. But a broad protest movement in Ireland caused the Spanish fascists to commute it to 30 years' imprisonment. In 1940 the German authorities, hoping to win favor in Ireland, offered to arrange Ryan's release. Frank Ryan flatly refused to collaborate with the nazis and died in Dresden in 1944.

One hundred and forty-six Irish volunteers fought for the Spanish Republic. Michael O'Riordan gives a list of them. Another list gives 61 names of the volunteers who fell in action.

The veterans of the Spanish Civil War made significant contributions to the subsequent development of the working-class movement in Ireland. In June last year Michael O'Riordan and other veterans of the Spanish Civil War travelled to the German Democratic Republic. Their purpose was to accompany the body of Frank Ryan, who had been buried in Dresden, on its final journey to Ireland. The reburial of Frank Ryan's remains in his native land grew over into a mass political manifestation. It was one of the biggest political occasions in Ireland in years. Even the bourgeois press could not remain silent on the event.

Many books have been written on the Spanish Civil War of 1936-1939, about the International Brigades, the men who fought in them, their self-denying solidarity and heroism. And now another page has been added to the history of the first international armed rebuff administered on fascism, which already then cast a dark shadow over a sizable part of Europe. But the theme of the book exceeds the framework of history alone. It is about the intransient value and importance of international solidarity in general. The author aptly makes the point in the epilogue:

'There is a deeper understanding of the vital connection between the cause of Irish independence and social progress, and the battles that were fought in Spain, Indochina, and Angola, with those being waged in Chile, South Africa, Rhodesia, and elsewhere, and the struggles yet to come which, as in the past, will need to be assisted by the appropriate form of internationalist solidarity' (p. 161).

Devoted to a great period of internationalism, Michael O'Riordan's book, which has become an important event in the political and cultural life of his own country, will beyond doubt, kindle interest among readers in many other countries.

Thomas O'Flaherty

THE MADMAN THEORY EFFECT

William Shawcross, *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon and the Destruction of Cambodia,* Andre Deutsch, London, 1979, 467 pp.

In the vast catalogue of the crimes of U.S. imperialism in Southeast Asia in the 1960s and 1970s the slaughter and devastation perpetrated in Cambodia (now the People's Republic of Kampuchea) are outstanding in their horror.

The chain of events that led to the Cambodian tragedy, and that paved the way for the murderous Pol Pot regime[1] that followed U.S. aggression were set in motion soon after the Nixon administration assumed office in the U.S. in 1968. They began with the B-52 bombing of alleged Cambodian 'sanctuaries' of Vietnamese liberation forces in March 1969, continued with the invasion of Cambodia by U.S. troops in April 1970, and culminated in colossal indiscriminate bombing of that country until August 1973 in support of the Lon Nol puppet government.[2]

In his valuable study of these events, British journalist William Shawcross reveals the immense and cynical deception and the callous inhumanity with which President Richard Nixon and his chief advisor, Henry Kissinger, carried out the U.S. policy in Southeast Asia. Mr. Shawcross has been able to use previously unpublished documents pried out of Pentagon, State Department and intelligence agency hands.

The U.S. air force systematically bombed the Cambodian 'sanctuaries' across the border from Vietnam and just as systematically obliterated from orders, reports and news releases all mention of the attacks on a neutral country. This was done to conceal the extension of the war, which was in violation of international law and of U.S. law, from both the American people and the U.S. Congress. Up until 1973 President Nixon and his officials, who knew of the bombing persistently claimed that the U.S. had 'scrupulously' refrained from attacking locations in Cambodia until the spring of 1970.

Mr. Shawcross has analyzed the processes of policy-making in the Nixon administration that brought about the assaults on Cambodia and the manner in which they were carried out. He describes how Kissinger, with Nixon's approval, devised systems of excluding from decision-making government departments with responsibility for making decisions. This enabled Nixon and Kissinger to conduct a war in Cambodia that could be concealed.

Wrote Marvin and Bernard Kalb, biographers of

Kissinger who are quoted by Mr. Shawcross: 'Kissinger ... felt that if it became known that the United States was widening the war geographically, extending the bombing into Cambodia, this would prompt a wave of angry denunciations from an increasingly disillusioned Congress and anti-war critics across the country' (p. 95).

Coupled with this was what Nixon called his 'Madman Theory.' He told his aide, H.R. Haldeman: 'I want the North Vietnamese to believe I've reached the point where I might do *anything* to stop the war. We'll just slip the word to them that "for God's sake, you know Nixon is obsessed about Communism. We can't restrain him when he's angry — and he has his hand on the nuclear button" — and Ho Chi Minh himself will be in Paris in two days begging for peace' (p. 90).

Nixon said also that 'the real possibility of irrational U.S. action is essential to the U.S.-Soviet relationship' (*ibid.*). The raining of bombs on Cambodia in 1969 was presumed to 'signal' to Vietnamese and Soviet leaders the readiness of the U.S. to be 'tough.' To Nixon, Kissinger and U.S. generals it also had a certain logic: it was to disrupt the Vietnamese liberation forces' presumed base areas and prevent attacks on U.S. troops as they withdrew from Vietnam.

Mr. Shawcross gives a detailed account of the consequences of the clandestine attack on Cambodia: the overthrow of the Sihanouk government, the installation with U.S. backing of the repressive anti-communist Lon Nol regime, the growth of a Cambodian Khmer Rouge guerrilla liberation army and the general spread of full-scale warfare over the entire country.

The U.S. air and ground forces entered the hostilities and the war was developed in accordance with the Pentagon Doctrine under which Asian troops were to fight U.S.-financed and armed wars in Asia. U.S. aid and advisors built a Lon Nol army of 230,000 men for the war in Cambodia.

Cambodia became the proving ground for the 'Madman Theory.' Between 1969 and 1973 a total of 539,129 tons of bombs were poured upon that country; of these, 257,465 tons were dropped between February and August 1973 (in comparison, 160,000 tons had fallen on Japan during World War II). Over $7 billion were expended by the U.S. on the bombing of Cambodia alone. This concentrated holocaust of bombing shattered the economic and social life of Cambodia. It made between two and three million people homeless (out of a population of seven million). It killed an inestimable number of people, causing the indirect and direct death of perhaps half a million.

But the criminal Nixon adventure in Cambodia, according to *Harpers Magazine*, brought no advantage to the USA. On the contrary, it further impaired that country's international prestige and millions of Americans were shocked to learn the truth about the 'undeclared war.' As it could well be expected, the Cambodian policy pursued by the White House did not produce the desired effect — to scare Vietnam and the Soviet Union.

That adventure contributed greatly to the Watergate episode that drove Nixon from the presidency. The first illegal wiretap by the Nixon administration was against a *New York Times* correspondent who reported the illegal 1969 bombing.

Mr. Shawcross concludes his book, which has become a bestseller in the USA and Britain, with a chapter on the brutal Pol Pot regime that came to power with the collapse of the Lon Nol government. It only hints at the nature of the Pol Pot rule but Shawcross stresses that the Pol Pot regime was 'born out of the inferno that American policy did much to create.' He adds: 'Cambodia was not a mistake; it was a crime' (p. 396).

William Pomeroy

1. The Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime, which exterminated about three million Cambodians, came to power in April 1975 and was liquidated on January 7, 1979, by the forces of the Kampuchean United Front for National Salvation. — *Ed.*

2. The pro-American Lon Nol government was installed after the coup of March 18, 1970. — *Ed.*



THE ARMS MENACE

By Fred Weir

A timely analysis of the current arms drive, the sources and mechanics of build-up.
Is the arms race out of control?
Who is initiating the process?
What are the prospects for disarmament?

26pp $.50 Each

Progress Books, 71 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

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, Tamil, Gujarati and Telugu

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