

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

April 1984, Volume 27, Number 4 \$1.00



FRG / 30

Guinea-Bissau / 58

**Lenin's ideas in the
peace struggle / 1**

**Local government
under socialism / 47**

**The nuclear threat
& politics / 41**

Argentina / 19



WORLD Problems of **MARXIST** Peace and Socialism **REVIEW**

April 1984, Vol. 27, No. 4

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 V.I. Lenin: ours is the ideal of peace
Statements by leaders of communist and workers' parties on the importance of Lenin's ideas in the anti-war struggle
- 12 Lenin's school of exactingness
Y. Yakovlev (USSR)
- 19 Argentina: an indispensable condition of social progress
A. Fava

The party

- 26 Austria: the main direction
F. Muhri
- 30 FRG: a new situation and new prospects
H. Gautier
- 36 Vietnam: the whole people wants the vanguard to act effectively
Dao Duy Tung

Exchange of views

- 41 The nuclear threat and politics
G. Ganev, Y. Kazar, S. Mitra

Viewpoints

- 47 Realities of socialism: representative democracy at work
- 58 Guinea-Bissau: guideline — the welfare of the people
V. Cabral
- 62 Congo: restructuring the agrarian sector
J.R. Kississou-Boma
- 66 USA: election tightrope-walking
A. Land

Book reviews

- 67 The way to justice is hard
A. Bunzlova
- 72 In thrall to old notions
S. Mark
- 74 He did not bow down
N. Farrell

Facts and figures

- 75 Communist youth leagues
- 78 Under the proletarian banner
150th anniversary of the Lyons weavers' uprising



V.I. Lenin: ours is the ideal of peace

*Statements by leaders of Communist and Workers' Parties
on the importance of Lenin's ideas
in the anti-war struggle*

Marking the 114th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin, communists and many other progressive people in the world now turn, in the atmosphere of sharply growing international tensions, to Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. The communists have always wanted to see the abolition of every type of oppression and social and national inequality, which capitalism would like to perpetuate. Today, in the face of the obvious increase in the danger of nuclear catastrophe, they are also carrying on a struggle to preserve civilization on Earth and the human right to life. Guided by Lenin's ideas, the communists strive to ward off the nuclear threat and radically to improve international relations, regarding this as the key factor in ensuring social progress.

In 1922, Lenin drew attention to the need to deepen and broaden the resistance to the threat of an imperialist war and added: "It is worth devoting one's whole life to the struggle against this kind of war; it is a struggle in which one must be ruthless and chase to the furthest corners of the earth all the sophistry that is uttered in its defense."* Lenin's call is especially pressing now that imperialism has created a new and terrible danger.

Below, the leaders of seven communist and workers' parties consider the significance of Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence, and how Lenin's ideas are linked with the contemporary social, economic and political processes.

FOR SECURITY, COOPERATION AND GOOD-NEIGHBORHOOD

Erich Honecker

General Secretary, SED CC,
Chairman, GDR Council of State

Now that nothing can be more important than safeguarding humanity from annihilation in a nuclear catastrophe, Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence are, I believe, more signi-

ficant and attractive than ever before. They accord with the communists' noble urge to eliminate war from the life of the peoples and to have the historical contest between the two opposite social systems — socialism and capitalism — proceed without the use of armed force. However complicated the international issues that may arise, they must be settled through negotiation, and not by means of "fist law."

That is precisely the sense in which the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems constitute a sound basis for practical policies meeting the realities and requirements of our epoch. Their practice will help to establish equitable international relations and ensure mutually advantageous cooperation. It should also help to settle a great many pressing issues in world politics affecting the peoples' vital interests. Those who act in the present situation with a sense of responsibility must realize that peaceful coexistence has no rational alternative.

Lenin's immortal achievement is that he always tied in the struggle for social emancipation with the struggle for ever stronger peace. Thus, the triumph of Red October more than six and a half decades ago entitled Lenin to speak of "the first victory in the struggle to abolish war."¹ The first decree issued by the fledgling Soviet power, addressed to all the people of the world, was the Decree on Peace, which proclaimed the unity of socialism and peace.

Let us recall that from his analysis of the uneven development of imperialism Lenin drew the conclusion that socialism could initially win out in a few "or even in one capitalist country alone."² That is why, he stressed, there would be a historically long period, "the period of coexistence side by side of socialist and capitalist states."³ That conclusion is of an exceptional importance for the elaboration of strategy and tactics by the parties within the international communist movement and for the peace forces' struggle throughout the world generally.

The policy of the CPSU and the USSR shows that they are now the most consistent fighters

*V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 434.

for asserting the principles on the basis of which Lenin charted the peoples' way into a future free from threats and destruction in new wars. The land of Red October is the mightiest bulwark of peace. The Soviet Union's action for ending the arms race, and for limiting and reducing armaments has been a fresh inspiration to all those who seek to prevent mankind from sliding into a nuclear war disaster, and to assure the world of the prospect of life in peace. Those are the objectives which inform the foreign policy activity of the whole socialist community.

For nearly 35 years now, the German Democratic Republic, which lies along the divide between the socialist and the capitalist worlds, between the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries, has been making a constructive contribution to this action for peace. Our country has remained true to its oath of doing everything to prevent war from ever again stemming from German soil. The present situation in Europe clearly brings out the meaning and usefulness of relations of peaceful coexistence and bears out the truth that their maintenance meets the vital interests of all the peoples of the continent.

The policy of confrontation and superarmament being conducted by the aggressive circles of the United States and other NATO countries has led to the start of deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe, notably the FRG. This has pushed the world into a new and possibly the most dangerous period of its post-war development. The deployment of first-strike nuclear weapons is an expression of Washington's avowed urge to secure military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist community states. That is why to preserve the equilibrium necessary for the maintenance of peace our countries have had to take corresponding counter-measures. But that is not all. At the same time, we now have an even keener sense of our duty to redouble our efforts to achieve concrete agreements on ending the arms race, and on limiting and reducing armaments on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. In so doing, we are prepared to cooperate with everyone who displays reason and a sense of realism, and who seriously strives to stabilize peace.

The GDR wants a return to the situation which existed before the start of the missile deployment in the NATO countries. That would make it possible to do much to produce fresh positive results in the spirit of the détente of the 1970s. The first thing that needs to be done is to lower the level of military confronta-

tion, and to put an end to the reckless superarmament with its harmful consequences for international relations and people's social condition, not least importantly in the very capitalist countries which are now spending astronomical amounts of money for ever new types of weapons and which are no longer capable of escaping from the dead-end of mass unemployment. A freeze of the nuclear arsenals is imperative. The establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of our continent could pave the way for a future Europe free from nuclear weapons. If the Warsaw Treaty and NATO concluded a treaty on the repudiation of the use of armed force and the maintenance of peaceful relations, as the socialist states proposed in their Prague Political Declaration, a substantial stride forward would be made toward solving the most burning issues now facing the peoples.

By taking part in the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe, now on in Stockholm, the GDR is resolved to work for the realization of these proposals. We are sure that the plans of those who want to doom Europe to constantly balancing on the brink of a nuclear war can be frustrated, and that a turn can be effected toward security, fruitful cooperation and good-neighbor relations.

The viability of Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence is powerfully and effectively manifested in our day. They are embodied in the state policy of the socialist community countries, and have the approval, support and active defense of immense numbers of people throughout the globe, whatever their differences on other issues may be.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 56.
2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 342.
3. *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 39.

THE CAUSE OF THE REVOLUTION WILL TRIUMPH

Cheddi Jagan
General Secretary,
People's Progressive Party of Guyana

With the victory of the Great October Revolution, and the establishment of the first socialist state, the working class struggle for the social transformation of the society became international. Lenin formulated the policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems as the only reasonable form of this struggle. His long-term strategy for arranging peaceful relations between the socialist states and the capitalist states is not

only sound morally and in class terms. It is also highly realistic.

The reactionary circles of world capital from the outset opposed peaceful coexistence with socialism. The ideologists who advocated the interests of the monopolies claimed that peaceful coexistence was a "cat's paw" and a "Trojan horse" of communism. At the present stage, with the bellicose adventurists having gained the upper hand in some imperialist countries' foreign policy, these principles are being even more fiercely attacked. The Reagan administration falsely claims that the Soviet Union is a "terrorist nation" exporting "terrorism" especially to the Third World countries, thus endangering the interests of the United States.

Behind a screen of demagogic talk, U.S. imperialism has been conducting a brazen policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other peoples. It has allocated vast amounts of money for the development and manufacture of new types of weapons. It is common knowledge that the United States has sabotaged the Geneva talks on a reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe whose positive completion could contribute to the preservation of peace. U.S. first-strike missiles are already deployed in some West European countries. President Reagan keeps hypocritically talking of peace, while his actions in the international arena prove that he stands on guard of the interests of the most reactionary section of imperialism — the military-industrial complex — for which rising tension and another round of the arms race mean huge profits.

The communists have never engaged in "exporting" revolution, and have always opposed it. Lenin wrote that "Marxism has always been opposed to 'pushing' revolutions, which develop with the growing acuteness of the class antagonisms that engender revolutions."¹ He said: "We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy... The struggle in this field has now become global. Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale."²

From the very outset, the Soviet Union took the way of peaceful economic development and the establishment of good-neighbor relations with other states. It called on all the countries to cooperate in peace and at the 1922 Genoa Conference made a proposal for general disarmament. The USSR's entire record is one of major peace initiatives and acts of good will. Today, when the international situation is becoming highly critical through the fault of

the militaristic policy of the NATO countries, the United States in the first place, the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are working hard to avert a thermonuclear war. Broad masses of people in various continents are coming out for peaceful coexistence, because they understand that in this nuclear age of ours humankind would have to pay too high a price if the contest of ideas developed into a military contest.

For the peoples of the Caribbean, the struggle for peace is not just an abstraction. It has become a pressing need if we are to move forward on the road to social progress. Lenin never separated the struggle for peace from the struggle for social progress. For their part, successes in social development help to consolidate the positions of peace.

We also know that peace will not be handed down to us on a platter, that we have to struggle for it. The invasion of Grenada by the United States has strikingly shown that U.S. imperialism is the real enemy of peace and social progress in our region. Today we see Washington poised to attack Nicaragua and El Salvador in an effort to defeat the revolutionary and peace forces in those countries. The United States would like to destroy the Cuban revolution as well. They want to do so to destroy the example and hope which heroic Cuba inspires in the hearts of the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean.

We are confident that the policy of international, state terrorism conducted by U.S. imperialism against the revolutionary and progressive movements will fail. This optimism of ours is well founded. The imperialist policy is resisted by the peoples of the developing countries; it is resolutely opposed by the socialist community which practises the ideas of proletarian internationalism; the peace movement in our region is growing and also gathering momentum in Western Europe and North America, in the imperialist centers.

In these conditions, the practice of the principle of peaceful coexistence and the strengthening of the unity of the three main revolutionary streams of our day become of the utmost importance. This unity will tie the hands of the aggressor and confirm Lenin's idea that peace for the whole of humankind can be ensured despite the resistance of imperialism. We are confident in the triumph of our just cause.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 71-72.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

THE LIVING BREATH OF GENIUS

Herbert Mies

Chairman, German Communist Party

Those who are devoted to peace and who want to know what the attitude of the communists and socialism is to the people's movements for peace would do well to turn again and again to the writings on peace by Lenin and his successors and followers.

What I have in mind above all is, of course, the Decree on Peace, but I also think it is necessary to recall the "Speech and Government Statement at the Session of the All-Russia CEC, July 15, 1918,"¹ the "Report on the Tactics of the RCP, July 5,"² and the "Interview given to Michael Farbman, *Observer* and *Manchester Guardian* Correspondent."³ Still, what needs to be re-read most of all is the "Report on Peace, October 26 (November 8)"⁴ and the "Concluding Speech Following the Discussion on the Report on Peace, October 26 (November 8),"⁵ 1917.

I believe that Lenin's ideas of peace are now being consistently continued in the CPSU's political activity and its documents. The striving for peace which will be seen in the Soviet state's acts of good will, the statements by its leaders and the corresponding practical struggle for peace are convincing evidence that socialism has no need of war. It needs peace, and it creates peace. People need peace, and here I think of the decisions of our party's seventh congress, which was held in Nuremberg in early January 1984 under the slogan: "Peace Must Win! Jobs Instead of Missiles Right Now!"

At the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, Lenin delivered his "Report on Peace" proposing the adoption of the Decree on Peace. He began with these words: "The question of peace is a burning question, the painful question of the day."⁶ Lenin could not know that 66 years later — in our day — the communists would literally repeat what he had said: For the communist, for socialism, and for the whole of humankind, nothing is more important than peace.

Lenin knew and said that the communists' prime duty was to work for peace. That is why we keep returning to Lenin's Decree on Peace, which is of abiding importance and which continues to breathe with Lenin's genius, which constantly inspires us to an active approach to the ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence. The Decree on Peace, I think, is not just a document of the Soviet State, but is something much greater. It has served as a guide for all the communists in working out their correct,

communist attitude to the movement for peace and to take a clear-cut communist position within that movement.

The historical truth is that Lenin not only pioneered the struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. He also truly pioneered the struggle for the communists' effective participation in the defense of peace. He did not regard the peace forces in the other political and ideological camps and clerical circles as "useful idiots," as the bourgeois press claims, but as allies and partners. Lenin's vigorous stand which unites all the peace forces on the question of peace exemplifies the attitude to the peace movements for the communists of our country as well.

The Decree on Peace formulated the principles of a just and democratic peace "for which the overwhelming majority (of the working class and other working people . . .) are craving."⁷ Lenin always saw peace and freedom as a unity. He always saw as one the vigorous struggle for peace and the vigorous struggle for anti-imperialist, social and democratic rights and freedoms. That is why the communist, the true Marxist-Leninist cannot view with equanimity the attempts by the advocates of the policy of confrontation and arms build-up, the organizers of the intervention in Grenada and the provocations against Nicaragua, and all the other enemies of the peace movement to cover up their acts with the slogan that peace and freedom are indivisible. They cannot calmly watch the imperialists demagogically use this slogan for their own interests. "Peace and Freedom" is not a bourgeois slogan, let alone an imperialist one. It is essentially a communist and socialist slogan which was put forward by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The Decree on Peace said that the Soviet state was prepared "immediately to begin open negotiations for peace."⁸ It did not in any sense regard its terms for peace as an ultimatum, for it was prepared "to consider any other peace terms."⁹ Lenin objected to the couching of the terms for peace in the form of an ultimatum, as this could be fatal to the cause of peace as a whole. The principles which Lenin said should underlie the relations between states with different social systems determine the communists' attitude to the peace movement and their positions within that movement even today. When it comes to peace, we, communists, are prepared to make acceptable compromises, always emphasizing that which unites us, and pushing into the background that which divides.

Following the start of the deployment of the

U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, we, communists of the FRG, say that we are linked and united with the other peace forces in the country by the following: we shall not stop the struggle until the missiles are removed from the territory of the FRG, until it becomes a part of a nuclear-free zone in Europe, and ultimately of a nuclear-free Europe.

Like the other peace forces, we are grateful to the Soviet Union for never allowing, in accordance with Lenin's precepts, the imperialist states any pretext for saying that socialism has no negotiation proposals. This is evidenced by all the documents issued by the CPSU in the recent period. They express the USSR's principled line of reducing the danger of war and strengthening the foundations of peace and détente. They simultaneously propose a set of important measures to achieve practical accords on freezing, limiting and reducing nuclear weapons on the principle of equal security, and for improving the international situation as a whole.

Lenin's Decree on Peace spoke of the final ratification of all the terms of such a peace "by authoritative assemblies of the people's representatives of all countries and all nations."¹⁰ He declared that the new workers' government was making its peace proposals to all the governments and the peoples of all the countries. That is exactly what the Supreme Soviet of the USSR recently did once again.

Lenin believed that the Soviet state's peace policy and the activity of the popular masses in the struggle for peace constituted a single whole, and that is so in actual fact. That is why the communist has every reason to explain to the other participants in the peace movement in his country that it is wrong to assume that the peace policy of a socialist country's government is one thing, and the policy of its peace forces, another. On the contrary, the truth is that the peace-loving state plus the peace-loving society constitute the movement for peace under socialism.

When substantiating the Decree on Peace and in his subsequent speeches, Lenin made no secret of the fact that "now that the clouds are gathering and the danger of war is increasing," there is a need to tell the workers and peasants most clearly: "Triple vigilance, caution and endurance, comrades! Everyone must be at his post! Everyone must give his life, if necessary, to defend the Soviet power, to defend the interests of the working people, the exploited, the poor, to defend socialism."¹¹ That is something the communist must remember today, when the task is not only to defend the policy of détente and peaceful coexistence, but also to

frustrate Reagan's announced "crusade" against socialism.

The communists in 1920 and today are heedful of what Lenin said at the time: "Let the American capitalists leave us alone. We shall not touch them."¹² He added: "We have reiterated and reiterated our desire for peace, our need for peace . . . But we do not propose to be strangled to death for the sake of peace."¹³

Here again, what Lenin said holds true. The Soviet Union, as its most senior leaders have said, will never allow the U.S. leadership "to negotiate with us from a position of strength, from a position of threats and pressures. We resolutely reject such an approach. And, in general, it is futile to attempt to engage in 'power diplomacy' with us."¹⁴

In his "Concluding Speech on the Report on Peace," Lenin vigorously rebuffed the imperialist "policy of strength." In the struggle for peace, he relied on the young Soviet state and the strength of the masses of people throughout the world, which, he believed, lay in their knowledge, conviction and ability to sort out questions of war and peace. We, communists of the Federal Republic of Germany, will continue to act in Lenin's spirit to keep the peace movement in our country as a factor of peace through its participants becoming aware of the nuclear war danger, and understanding who poses the threat of humankind's annihilation, and who carries peace to all people.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 538.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 478.

3. *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 383.

4. *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 249.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 254.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 249.

7. *Ibid.*

8. *Ibid.*, p. 251.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 250.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 249.

11. *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 541.

12. *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 365.

13. *Ibid.*, Vol. 42, p. 177.

14. *Information Bulletin*, March 1984, p. 7.

THE KEY CONDITION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

William Kashtan

General Secretary, CP Canada

Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence remain as valid today as when he first advanced them. Having recognized that a simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution was impossible in all the capitalist states, Lenin foresaw that for a long historical period capitalist and socialist states would have to exist side by side. The question was: would they coexist peace-

fully, or in constant armed conflict. Within a month of the October Revolution, Lenin warned: "It is highly naive to think peace can be easily attained and that the bourgeoisie will hand it to us on a platter as soon as we mention it."¹ Lenin never took the principle of peaceful coexistence for granted. Further prospects for maintaining peace depended, he said, on the ability of the Soviet people to uphold their revolutionary gains, on the further development of the world revolutionary process and the conversion of socialism into an international system capable of exerting a decisive influence on the whole of world politics.

Lenin pointed out that the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems means a sharp political, economic and ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism, between the working class and the bourgeoisie. It has nothing in common with class peace, and leaves no doubt about the right of the oppressed peoples to employ every means in their fight for liberation, up to and including armed struggle. Developments today bear this out.

The struggle over two lines in world affairs has become sharper — socialism's line of curbing the arms race, strengthening peace and détente and defending the sovereign rights and freedom of nations; and capitalism's line of disrupting détente, escalating the arms race, of threats and interference in other countries' affairs, and of suppressing the liberation struggle.

This latter, reactionary line is the one pursued by the Reagan administration, representing the most bellicose section of U.S. imperialism. It has gone over from acceptance of détente to cold war confrontationist policies, an accelerated arms race, a first-strike nuclear strategy, now exemplified in the deployment of Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles in Western Europe, a situation which has added to the threat of nuclear war. The most dangerous of the U.S. actions is the U.S. determination to gain nuclear weapons superiority over the USSR as a prelude to launching a "winnable" nuclear war against it.

The reactionary forces of U.S. imperialism do not conceal the fact that their aim is to destroy socialism as a social system. Their "crusade against socialism" includes economic sanctions. A stepped-up arms race and economic sanctions, these are two aspects of one policy directed at bankrupting and undermining socialism.

This policy, pursued by the Reagan administration, shows that imperialism has not changed its spots. It continues to be a constant source of war danger, and an obstacle to peace in today's world.

Opposition in Canada to the Reagan line of breaking with détente is growing in intensity. Canada's geographic position between the USA and the USSR has made it vulnerable to the effects of the adventurist U.S. foreign policy. There is growing recognition today that Canada and her people cannot escape the consequences of a nuclear war.

This has given an impetus to the peace movements in Canada and has in turn begun to influence government policy. The battle for an independent foreign policy based on peaceful coexistence is beginning to shape up and has in turn given rise to a growing debate in the monopoly camp over the direction of Canada's foreign policy. One line moves toward a more independent foreign policy and for détente, the other subordinates Canada's interests to those of U.S. imperialism. This is a reflection of the struggle also under way within the imperialist camp between the forces favoring the pursuit of a policy of peaceful coexistence, trade, scientific and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and the present course of the most reactionary forces of U.S. imperialism.

The line of support of détente is illustrated in the shift by the Trudeau government as in its warning that international tensions have reached a dangerous point which could lead to nuclear war. This shift away from the cold war confrontationist policies of the Reagan administration is seen as well in the government's implied criticism of U.S. military intervention in Grenada and its separation from U.S. policy in the Middle East.

The Trudeau government has followed up its appeal for measures to ease international tension with the Prime Minister's New Year message which calls for peaceful coexistence. This Mr. Trudeau spelled out as "learning to live together, if not in harmony, then with respect for each other, and to renounce violence as a means of settling disputes. We cannot recreate the world in our own image. We have to accept the necessity of coexistence with the countries of the communist bloc. After all, if we were to resort to war as the only means of settling differences, both East and West would be defeated."

The above position is in marked contrast with that of President Reagan. That is why the U.S. media have virtually blacked it out. Much more to President Reagan's liking are the views of Brian Mulroney, leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, who has declared his four-square support of President Reagan's foreign and economic policies, including his military adventures in Grenada and elsewhere.

The struggle over foreign policy issues and the arms race has become more bitter in Canada. Peace, peaceful coexistence, détente and disarmament may well become a central issue of the forthcoming federal elections. Any shift to the right in that election would add to the danger of war as it would create additional difficulties for the working people.

The adoption or restatement by the Trudeau government of a line toward peaceful coexistence is a welcome development. The Communist Party of Canada supports the position taken by the government toward easing international tension, its advocacy of peaceful coexistence of the two social systems, its declaration that there must be a settlement of differences by negotiation, not by violence. At the same time it must be noted that the Trudeau government, under pressure from the U.S. administration, has refused to annul Cruise-missile testing in Canada, has continued to support deployment of Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles in Western Europe, and has refused to declare itself against the first use of nuclear weapons. This inconsistent position has its source in ruling class hostility to the Soviet Union as well as in Canada's membership in NATO and in expectation that Canada would benefit from the huge U.S. armaments program.

The contradictory position taken by the Trudeau government is all the more reason why the Communist Party pursues an independent class policy. It gives support to those areas of foreign policy which merit support and criticizes and condemns those policies which veer away from détente and are directed against peace and against the working people. It takes fully into account Lenin's policy that peaceful coexistence of countries of opposite social systems is essential for maintaining peace while at the same time it means sharp political, economic and ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism, between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

The top Soviet leadership has justly stressed: "The historical contest of the two social systems and the battle of ideas is a perfectly natural thing following from the very fact of the existence of socialism and capitalism. But we are emphatically against this historical contest being directed at winding down peaceful cooperation, let alone translated into the terms of nuclear war."

The ever more dangerous situation today emphasizes the necessity of an ever stronger peace movement directed to compel the government to pursue a consistent policy of peaceful coexistence. This indeed is the essential characteristic of the peace movement in

Canada today, which embraces the New Democratic Party, religious groups, women, youth, scientists, workers in the arts and the organized labor movement. The organized labor movement has begun to play a more active role in the peace movement. Increasingly it is being recognized that the solution to the varied issues facing the working people lies in the prevention of nuclear war and the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the world.

Peace and peaceful coexistence is key to the orientation of the revolutionary struggle for democratic and social progress. The struggle for peace today in conditions of the threat of nuclear war ties together the class interests of the working class with national interests and the interests of all humankind.

Lenin stressed that one should never forget that wars are the handmaiden of capitalism, especially at its imperialist stage. He added that "an end to wars, peace among the nations, the cessation of pillaging and violence — such is our ideal."² This ideal of Leninism accords with the objectives and tasks of the working class and of all the other working people.

A clear class stand on the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence is an indispensable condition of success in the struggle for humankind's social emancipation and social progress.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 345.

2. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 293.

A REALISTIC OBJECTIVE OF TODAY

Seydou Cissokho
General Secretary,
Senegal Party of Independence and Labor

The validity of Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence flows from the essence and lasting significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the chief event of this century, a historic turning point in the development of humanity.

With the victory of the October Revolution, international developments ceased to be governed exclusively by the laws of capitalism. The imperialists and warmongers could no longer decide the destiny of peoples at will. The world broke up into two opposed social systems. Their coexistence is invariably influenced by the struggle going on between them and by class interests. This manifests itself in all spheres ranging from the economy to ideological activity in its entirety and affecting culture, the differentiation of social forces, relations between classes, home and foreign policy, and military affairs.

Having investigated the nature and essence

of our epoch, Lenin drew brilliant theoretical conclusions. One of them is that peaceful coexistence can and should be the rule in relations between capitalism and socialism as an historically inevitable peaceful competition between opposed systems; this competition takes the most diverse forms and in its course the new social system will demonstrate its vitality and its ability to assure people's happiness.

Lenin's conclusion reveals the significance of global factors in history. Peaceful coexistence is a result of the struggle between the two social systems, between antagonistic classes, and of the people's defense of peace.

No country is exempt from this confrontation, which constantly influences the balance of forces and the evolution of the class struggle in all countries. In this age of unprecedentedly rapid and far-reaching revolutionary transformations, the interpenetration of internal and external factors is intensifying and the role of the international factor, which Lenin saw as highly important, is growing.

Social revolution is always a cause of the people. It is only the people that can change a social system through struggle. But the international situation has a considerable impact on this struggle. Specifically, international solidarity, support from the socialist system and the possibility of drawing on the vast experience of the countries of the new world contribute to the gains of national liberation forces. All this benefits the struggle of the working people of all countries, including those in the area of the national liberation movement.

International events since World War II have confirmed the close connection between the increased might of the socialist system and the advances of the revolutionary struggle of peoples. It was when socialism had become the decisive factor for world development that national liberation revolutions triumphed in many Asian and African countries.

This interconnection shows why it is so essential for the growth of the anti-imperialist struggle of peoples that the socialist countries, whose development is the main line of social progress today, should build up their economic and defense power. The socialist community's achievement of military strategic parity with imperialism, a most valuable historic gain owed above all to the increased potential of the Soviet Union, adds to the major contribution which the peoples of the socialist world make to the communists' common cause and the fight against imperialism.

In a vain bid to alter the balance of world forces in its favor, international imperialism headed by the USA is trying to upset the exist-

ing military strategic parity and win a dominant position in every region of the globe, thereby heightening the danger of nuclear war. It is preparing physically for war by building up armaments, expanding its network of military bases and increasing its European arsenal of nuclear missiles targeted on socialist community countries. Some of these missiles, such as those deployed in Italy, can also hit targets on the African continent.

This policy is contrary to the interests of the people of Senegal and all other developing countries. The arms race is swallowing colossal resources which could have been used for ending hunger and combating disease and illiteracy in the world. It is only by guaranteeing peaceful coexistence that the urgent problems of developing countries, such as consolidating their national independence, establishing a new international economic order and extending mutually beneficial cooperation, can be solved.

The attitude to war and peace, currently the most burning issue, is the dividing line between those who consider nuclear war permissible and those who want to avert it. To preserve peace is the fundamental condition for social progress; it is an internationalist task facing all communists and progressives.

While the nature of imperialism is unchanged, to end wars is a realistic objective. The prospect of nuclear war is opposed by the socialist countries, communist and workers' parties, trade unions, numerous social democrats, peace organizations and other peace forces. On all continents, the movement against war involves workers and peasants, atheists and believers, sober-minded politicians and businessmen of capitalist powers. This is the peace front today.

In carrying on their Leninist policy for peace, the CPSU and the Soviet state are doing all in their power to revive détente and bring about mutually beneficial cooperation. The internationalist goal set by this policy — eliminating all survivals of colonial oppression, inequality, diktat and exploitation in international economic relations — is in keeping with the aspirations of the peoples of the world. The Soviet Union has demonstrated with deeds that socialism and peace are inseparable in the same way as the October Revolution and the world revolutionary process.

In Africa, which has gone through the trials of two world wars like other continents, the struggle for peace is not yet vigorous enough by comparison. Here, the coincidence of the interests of socialism and the democratic movement does not seem evident to everybody

whereas the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress are, in effect, drawing closer and closer together. International imperialism is bringing it increasingly into its plans for aggression. France has military bases in Senegal. This is turning our country into a military outpost of imperialism in Africa and may make it the target of a nuclear strike in the event of war. NATO has bases in various African countries, and so the peoples of our continent cannot stay out of the worldwide movement against war.

Experience has shown that more calls for peace are not enough. It is necessary to inspire the masses with hatred for the policy of war preparations and organize extensive anti-war actions. Our party is promoting a mass struggle in Senegal in defense of peace, cooperating with all national forces that can contribute to this. The eighth plenum of its Central Committee (August 1983), declaring in support of the Senegalese Association of Solidarity and Friendship with Peoples for Peace, called on the population, on all mass organizations and all citizens who cherish the independence and security of the country, to help expand the movement against war and for peace.

Peace is our common cause. We must preserve it if we are to pave the way for human progress.

Lenin's ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence show all the peoples the road which they must follow to remove the threat of nuclear disaster.

IN THE SERVICE OF HUMANKIND

Kattoruge Publis Silva
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Sri Lanka

When the communists of Russia, led by Lenin, established proletarian power in the country and decided to proceed to building socialism in a single country, the basic principles governing the outlook of Marxist-Leninists on the question of war and peace and revolution came to be defined. These principles have stood the test of time.

Lenin's Decree on Peace vividly illustrates the humanism and commitment of the communists to peace. Large sections of the working class in the capitalist countries met the October Revolution with great enthusiasm and mobilized solidarity in its defense. It is true that in the prevailing situation, despite their support, the international working class movement was not strong enough to thwart the aggressive actions of imperialism. But even in that tense historical period, the world's first socialist state under

Lenin's leadership did not waver in its drive for peace and normalizing relations with all states. The Soviet government repudiated secret diplomacy and acquainted the people with the main objectives of the foreign policy of the workers' and peasants' power.

Lenin was deeply conscious of the commencement of the new epoch in which socialist and capitalist states would exist side by side. He often reminded that the main adversary of socialism — imperialism — was more advanced and powerful. Yet, he was confident that the revolution would not be defeated and socialism would be built. In elaborating peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, Lenin upheld the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. While attaching much importance to the development of economic relations between socialist and capitalist states, Lenin also advocated arms cuts and controls directed toward disarmament and democratization of the world economy. At the same time, he had no illusions about the possibility of keeping the peace without much effort.

The young socialist state sought friendly relations with its neighbors. With many of them it signed treaties recognizing the principles of independence and territorial integrity. In practice, a new policy in international relations had emerged which was principally to serve humanity and its advance and defend the larger interests of the international working class and the subjugated peoples.

The commitment to peace and the practice of the policy of peaceful coexistence with the capitalist states was not to impede the performance of internationalist obligations. It was during the period which followed directly upon the Soviet people's victory over the counter-revolutionaries and interventionists that the prerequisites were shaped for a development of the working class movement throughout the world and the struggle by the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries for their liberation from imperialist oppression.

U.S. imperialism is making frantic efforts to unite all the reactionary forces for a "crusade" against socialism, and to achieve military strategic superiority over the USSR and the socialist community as a whole. But existing socialism will never allow imperialism to attain its objective.

The military strategic equilibrium objectively serves the interests of peace, and not least importantly induces the realistically-minded representatives of the monopoly circles to accept the position that the historical struggle

between socialism and capitalism cannot have any other form except peaceful competition.

Today, the development of mass destruction weapons using the most modern achievements of science and technology make nuclear war inconceivable. Such a war cannot be won. It would mean the total annihilation of humanity.

The Soviet Union, true to Lenin's ideas, has demonstrated in deed its urge to preserve peace. The USSR has taken many steps to ensure international security. Its unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has received universal recognition. The proposals it had advanced together with the other members of the Warsaw Treaty to lessen tension, to limit nuclear weapons and to resurrect and revitalize détente are rallying points of the peoples' struggle for peace.

The massive anti-war movement in the imperialist countries, the growing sensitivity to the threat of a thermonuclear holocaust and the socialist community countries' active policy in defense of peace are of tremendous international importance. Ever more important is the call of the non-aligned movement representing the majority of the world's inhabitants for disarmament, for a liquidation of military bases, and for the practice of peaceful coexistence.

Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence is today accepted by some non-socialist states. The non-aligned movement, for instance, requires that those seeking its membership should subscribe to this principle. The term "peaceful coexistence" is used by the United Nations and other international bodies.

Some imperialist circles state their readiness to support relations based on peaceful coexistence provided the USSR and other socialist community countries withhold assistance to the developing countries in their struggle for liberation from imperialist oppression. Peaceful coexistence, however, does not mean the abandonment of the class struggle nor an imposition of a ban on solidarity.

In the present context, peaceful coexistence means not only the right of nations with different social systems to coexist peacefully. It means also the right of nations to adopt a social system of their choice and to develop accordingly without external intervention or interference. This interpretation is now contained in several United Nations documents, including the Declaration for a New International Economic Order. The U.S. invasion of Grenada points to the importance of urging this principle, and the threat to peace such flagrant violations of the principle entails.

Facts in our day prove beyond doubt that the

maintenance of peace and the practice of peaceful coexistence in inter-state relations is the only way for saving humankind from annihilation and for advancing social progress.

KEY FACTOR OF FREEDOM

Moses Mabhida

General Secretary, South African CP

Prior to the Great October Socialist Revolution, when imperialism held unchallenged sway, the economic, social and political liberation of colonies and dependent countries was in principle inconceivable. It was only after the victory of the working class in Russia that the people acquired the possibility of smashing the vicious circle of imperialist oppression and breaking through to independent political and economic development. The emergence of the Soviet Union, the first state to put an end to man's exploitation of man and to proclaim a policy of struggle for the peoples' freedom and for world peace was a historical turning point in life on the globe; the October Revolution ushered in a new era in human relations.

Lenin foresaw that the way would not be an easy one. When formulating the principles of the foreign policy of the working class and its party, he said, in particular, that the settlement of world policy issues when "there is a system of nations with equal rights" is "much more complex"¹ than it is under an international order which is characterized by relations between oppressed and oppressor nations, or between two oppressor nations. He stressed that the communists should never forget that "we live not only in separate states but also in a certain system of states," and that unlike the anarchist or semi-anarchist "we are not at all indifferent to the *Staatenbau*,² to the system of states, to their mutual relations."³

Lenin and the other revolutionaries he led knew how to solve this difficult problem. The government of Soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers called on the belligerent peoples and their governments to start immediate negotiations for a just and democratic peace. A just and democratic peace, for which the working class and the overwhelming majority of the other working people stood, meant a peace without annexations and indemnities, without the seizure of foreign lands, without the forcible conquest of other peoples.

Lenin's Decree on Peace formed the basis of the internal and foreign policy of the Soviet state and its government; it became the pivot of Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. The assumption behind the policy was that the two

opposite systems — socialism and capitalism — would exist and function side by side over a long historical period.

Lenin's noble principles of peaceful development for all peoples had to be asserted in struggle. After the victory of the Great October Revolution, imperialism bared its fangs: it instigated a civil war in Russia; it organized a 14-nation intervention and mounted an extensive economic blockade of Soviet Russia. According to Churchill, imperialism wanted to "strangle the Bolshevik baby in its cradle." But the Soviet people withstood the onslaught by international capital and defended the gains of the revolution.

Imperialism created a mailed fist in the form of Nazi Germany in yet another effort to destroy the Soviet Union. But socialism proved to be stronger. By smashing Hitler's Reich, the USSR saved tens of millions of people from fascist slavery. After the Second World War, the victory of the state which supported the peoples' struggle for freedom, and the rise of the national liberation struggle and the revolutionary movement in the colonial and dependent countries, led to the collapse of the colonial empires. They gave way — above all in Asia and in Africa — to new independent states. The destiny of the world ceased to depend on the whims of a handful of imperialist powers. The forces standing for freedom and independence gained in strength and acted ever more vigorously for the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, because peace ensures independent development for the young states.

This policy creates the conditions for close cooperation between the peoples and further improvement of inter-state relations, promoting the development of economic ties and mutually advantageous trade and good-neighborhood. Peaceful coexistence takes into account economic relations and favors the exchange of scientific and technological achievements, which is extremely important, because not all the countries have yet reached the same level of technological progress.

Considering how the states then still under the yoke of colonialism and imperialism would develop in the future, Lenin stressed: "It is unquestionable that the proletariat of the advanced countries can and should give help to the working classes of the backward countries, and that the backward countries can emerge from their present stage of development when the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Republics extends a helping hand to these masses, and is in a position to give them support."⁴

Such is the objective requirement of progress, whose realization is blocked by imperial-

ism, which is still quite strong. The imperialist powers are still nursing the dreams of putting back the clock of social progress. In this context, Engels says: "All hitherto existing rulers and their diplomats have employed their skills and efforts to set one nation against another and use one nation to subjugate another," so as to "perpetuate absolute rule."⁵ That is the method on which contemporary imperialism still relies.

The imperialists have mounted political subversion against socialism, which supports the young independent states. With respect to the developing countries, they have pursued a blatantly neocolonialist, militaristic line, whose substance is to ignore the interests of the peoples and to try to secure dominant positions in the world for the United States. The United States and its cohorts are trying to suppress the national liberation movement in South Africa, the Middle East, Central America and other regions of the world.

U.S. imperialism and its NATO allies have been increasing their military budgets and stockpiling nuclear weapons. Another dangerous step along this way was the decision of the United States and other NATO countries to deploy technically improved first-strike weapons — Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles — on the territory of some West European states. Washington hopes that their deployment will give it a strategic superiority above all over the USSR and the socialist community, and will also enable it to threaten the freedom-loving sovereign countries and peoples in the Middle East and Africa. The start on realizing these plans has already increased the military and political tensions and has created an extremely alarming situation throughout the world. The peoples realize that the build-up of the nuclear arsenal in Western Europe poses a threat to humankind's further existence. That is why, virtually from day to day there is now a growth in the struggle to end the new missile deployment and to get the already delivered U.S. missiles out of Europe.

While spiralling the arms race, the imperialist powers intensify their intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states, including those which recently won their independence. This is fraught with international conflicts, and also hampers the independent economic and political development of the young states.

Those are the main factors behind the most vital tasks now facing humankind: to unite all the anti-war forces in order to defeat U.S. militarism and its allies, and to safeguard peace, progress and freedom for all the peoples of the globe. The genocidal regime in South Africa

should also be prevented from laying its hands on nuclear weapons, as this would turn it into a grave threat to the population of the globe.

Today, more than ever before in the past, Lenin's ideas of peaceful coexistence and their translation into life constitute the chief factor of freedom, progress and preservation of life on the Earth. For the sake of its own interests, imperialism is prepared to see humankind incinerated in the flames of a nuclear con-

flagration. But the crucial fact of our day is the growth and strengthening of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism. They are working for lasting and unbreakable peace in the world.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 273.
2. The German for "state construction." — Ed.
3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, pp. 273-274.
4. *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, pp. 243-244.
5. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 165.

Lenin's school of exactingness

Yegor Yakovlev
Soviet publicist

Clara Zetkin, a fiery revolutionary, wrote: "Lenin was indisputably the leader of a party which had consciously joined battle for power, showing the Russian proletariat and peasantry the goal and the way to it... Lenin was the leader of a great country which became the world's first proletarian state... His thoughts and will lived in millions of people beyond the boundaries of Soviet Russia."¹ This shows that Lenin's contemporaries were already aware of his role in world history.

The passage of time brings out in ever greater relief and scale the great significance of Lenin's works and struggles for this epoch of ours, in which the new world is being built.

In his writings Lenin was always prompted by concrete circumstances, be it polemics with his political adversaries or events in the life of the Bolshevik Party, crucial points in the revolutionary struggle, or plans for socialist construction. These always provided the impetus for his analysis and conclusion oriented far into the future. A harmonious blend of current tasks with those of the future is a noteworthy and perhaps definitive feature of Lenin's thinking. His contemporaries testified that what amazed them about Lenin's insight was his ability to see the present in the light of the future. That is why Lenin's ideological legacy, theoretical works and practical experience are of abiding importance even today. They are of equal importance for those who have been building socialism for decades, for those who have just entered upon this difficult endeavor, and also for those who seek to build a new society.

Not only Lenin's ideas, but also the principles of his activity as party leader and head of the socialist state in its early and most trying years continue to be meaningful today. There is much instruction in Lenin's school of business,

in the high standard of his exactingness and in his unwavering application of principle in the solution of any problem. Finally, there is always a great attraction in Lenin's personality as man and leader of the masses. Anatoly Lunacharsky wrote that "there is also tremendous human value in the biographical and intimate details about him."²

Building the new life: the crux

The first office of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) Vladimir Ulyanov (Lenin) in Petrograd was on the second floor of Smolny, in the old days an institute for the education of the daughters of noblemen. Lenin began to work there in October 1917, just after the second congress of Soviets adopted its historic decrees on peace and land, and with them the "Decree on the Formation of the Workers' and Peasants' Government." It did not occur to anyone to remove the brass plate on the door of the office which read "Class Mistress," and it is still there (now very much in place at the museum into which it has been turned). Only a large heavy table was brought in and placed in such a way as to enable Lenin to face those coming into his office at half-turn and to see them only by turning to look at them; during the government's sittings which were held in his office, he frequently had to turn round to the secretary who took down the minutes.

This did not seem to be very convenient, but it was Lenin's first office, the first in his 47 years. The arrangement apparently resulted from a well-established habit. The table was placed in such a way as to have the light fall fully on it: Lenin was in the habit of working with books and putting pen to paper. He was not accustomed to receive visitors and converse with them across the table; for him working

meant writing, and the table was a writing-desk. But here there was a long succession of meetings and the visitors came thick and fast. Everything was different.

Indeed, Lenin and those who took up government posts together with him had to change many of their habits, many of those which were usual for the underground revolutionary. They had emerged from the underground and into the world arena. They had switched from underground secrecy to state activity, from agitation and explanation, to organizing and running the country. They had to reappraise many a concept and change their attitude to a great many things, and above all to the new discipline.

Lenin says: "Keep regular and honest accounts of money, manage economically, do not be lazy, do not steal, observe the strictest labor discipline — it is these slogans, justly scorned by revolutionary proletarians . . . that are now, since the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, becoming the immediate and the principal slogans of the moment."³ He began to speak about responsibility and discipline immediately after the victory of the October Revolution, and later spoke tirelessly, urging people to concentrate attention "on labor discipline as the crucial factor in the economic development of socialism."⁴

Why is it that Lenin had to concentrate on discipline, and why did he see it as the "crucial factor" in beginning the construction of a new, socialist life? It was impossible to do anything at all without elementary discipline and the strictest sense of responsibility in a country that had been tormented close to death by the imperialist war and the imperialist predators. In the long term as well, he saw discipline conscious discipline, without threats and coercion, as an organic feature of mass behavior: "Everything now depends on the establishment of a comradely discipline, the discipline of the working masses themselves, which must take the place of capitalist barrack-room discipline."⁵ Such discipline is the first testimonial to a person's socialist breeding and a practical confirmation of his being involved in the country's affairs. It includes the scientific organization of production, which disciplines by its very existence, and the level of the society's democratic development, because discipline is the same for all.

The procedures adopted by Sovnarkom Chairman Lenin were a school of efficiency, asserting discipline and each person's responsibility literally in all things. The head of state found time to write the following to a person who had failed to show up at a meeting: "I

request you to submit right away an explanation for such a lack of punctuality, and to state what you intend to do to prevent it in the future."⁶ Let us put it bluntly: Lenin did not stand on ceremony when it came to what was an everyday, "creeping" indiscipline.

For Lenin, conscious discipline, as an established form of life and part of every person's character was both an urgent matter and a vision. "We must not forget that this is the first time that this preliminary stage in history has been reached, when a new discipline, labor discipline, the discipline of comradely contact, Soviet discipline, is being created in fact by millions of working and exploited people . . . We know that this task will take an entire historical epoch."⁷

In a letter to Nadezhda Krupskaya, Maxim Gorky wrote: "I recall very vividly my visit to Gorki in the summer, I believe, of 1920; I then lived outside politics, up to my ears in everyday problems, and complained to Lenin about the despotism of the trifles of life. I said, among other things, that in taking apart wooden houses for fuel, the workers of Leningrad were breaking up window frames, breaking glass panes, idly damaging roofing iron, while the roofs over their own houses leaked, the windows were patched up with plywood, etc. I was indignant over the workers' low evaluation of the products of their own labor. I said to him: 'You, Vladimir Ilyich, have to think in broad terms, the trifles do not come to your attention.' He was silent as he paced the terrace, and I reproached myself for having annoyed him with trifles. But after tea we went out for a walk, and he told me: 'You mustn't think that I attach no importance to trifles, nor is that a trifle at all — the underestimation of labor which you have noted is, of course, not a trifle at all: we are poor people and must understand the value of every log and copper . . . But how is one to accuse the worker of still failing to realize that he is already the master of everything there is? The awareness of this will not come soon, and it can develop only in a socialist'. "⁸

What Lenin said to Gorky was very much the same as what he had written a year earlier in his article "A Great Beginning." In it he spoke precisely of the shaping of the socialist consciousness: days of voluntary work, known as communist *subbotniks*, were an expression of the concern of rank-and-file workers for raising labor productivity and for the interests of society as a whole. Why then did Lenin, in his conversation with Maxim Gorky, fail to mention either the *subbotniks* or his article? One would think that the example of the *subbotniks* added strength to the theoretical reasoning.

One could say that there was the practical emergence of a new consciousness.

It would appear that Lenin spoke with Gorky about the immense field of the human consciousness which had to be cultivated, while the *subbotniks* were no more than the first few scanty shoots sprouting on it. Lenin paid great attention to the events which testified to the emergence of new elements, but he never tried to absolutize events and even phenomena, however encouraging they were, and to regard them as a recipe for solving all problems.

In April 1920, Lenin was 50 years old, and in a speech on his birthday he said that the difficult conditions of the Russian revolution had not yet given the Bolsheviks an opportunity to get down to tackling the most important and the most difficult tasks of socialist construction. This meant that there should be no conceit, no exaggeration of the achievements. In that same period, Lenin wrote his pamphlet for the forthcoming second congress of the Comintern entitled "*Left-Wing*" Communism — An Infantile Disorder. On its first pages we find the same ideas: Russia, but yesterday a backward country, is just taking the first few steps along the highly difficult and long road of socialist transformations.⁹

Lenin frequently found himself having to make much haste and to prod on the others. Thus, he had to prod the members of the GOELRO Commission to let him have the draft for the electrification of the country as soon as possible. Or, having once decided that the time had come to "produce a dictionary of the real Russian language . . . from Pushkin to Gorky," he immediately proposed the following: "What if 30 scholars were to set to work at this, and provided with Red Army rations?"¹⁰

But when it came to social phenomena and changes in the life of the society, we find him setting a quite different, historically long period. When considering, say, the drive against bureaucratic practices, Lenin said: "It will take decades to overcome the evils of bureaucracy."¹¹ Working to improve the state apparatus, he emphasized that "there can scarcely be anything more harmful than haste."¹² He gave reminders that "in matters of culture, haste and sweeping measures are most harmful."¹³ Dictating his last articles, he gave the following advice: "It is time we did something about it. We must show sound scepticism for too rapid progress, for boastfulness, etc."¹⁴ In the spring of 1918, when the expectations of a worldwide proletarian revolution were still so great, and when it appeared that it was only a short run to communism, Lenin wrote: "The

road of organization is a long road and the tasks of socialist construction demand persevering, long-continued work and appropriate knowledge, of which we do not have enough. Even the more developed generation of the immediate future will hardly achieve the complete transition to socialism."¹⁵

That was also his approach to the new discipline: "We know that this will take an entire historical epoch."

Reflecting on Lenin's character, Nadezhda Krupskaya remarked: "He had lived through a great deal, had thought things over and over again, and he had the ability of fearlessly facing the truth."¹⁶ An excellent quality which every communist needs! One must learn to take Lenin's exacting approach to what is going on. One must never forget his injunction that "it will take many years, decades, to create a new labor discipline, new forms of social ties between people, and new forms and methods of drawing people into labor."¹⁷

Compulsory for all

Those who knew Lenin remembered him as an unassuming man who displayed much good will in his personal relations. But the openness and good-heartedness of his character did not at all mean that he was always radiantly affable and perfectly polite with everyone. Even as a youth he had noticed that every enthusiast tended to speak and write "with fervor": "Only those who are accustomed to sitting between two stools lack 'fervor'."¹⁸ Lenin's temperament made itself known in literally every page he wrote and every speech he delivered. His temperament also quite naturally told in his contacts with other people.

What was the attitude to Lenin's remarks among those to whom they were addressed? Lunacharsky says: "It was extremely rare for Lenin to be angry, especially in the Sovnarkom. But when he was angry, it was tough. And he never minced his words . . . But no one was ever offended at having been 'taken to task' by Lenin." Is it quite true that no one was ever offended? Is it true that no one was ever hurt in his ambition and his self-esteem? No, Lunacharsky insists, "a communist or a Soviet citizen who is 'offended' with Lenin is . . . someone altogether lacking taste, or even simply an incredible figure."¹⁹

A large part of the explanation here is probably that the sharp words, caustic remarks and gibes we find in Lenin's documents (and to say nothing about them, incidentally, would, I think, be depriving Lenin's image of some important features), always had a precise target and a very good reason. Lenin directed his

wrath against acts and phenomena which even today, honestly speaking, do not permit any special choice of words. Lenin stigmatized bureaucracy and red tape as an "all-Russia logjam."²⁰ About mismanagement and breaches of discipline he says: "Whoever now departs from order and discipline is permitting the enemy to penetrate into our midst."²¹ On communist conceit, careerism and servility, he says: "One must not see 'intrigues' or 'counter-weights' in those who take a different view of matters or who have a different approach, but must value independent-minded men."²²

The way in which Lenin reacted, now wrathfully, now joyously, was determined only by the matter in hand, by how rationally it was being tackled, and never by personal sympathies or hostility, old attachments or sudden antipathies. Besides, according to former Sovnarkom secretary Lidia Fotieva, he held that it was "foul and unworthy of any Soviet citizen, let alone a communist, to be rude and impolite with anyone who was lower in status and so could not retaliate."²³

The latter assertion could be a matter of some perplexity: who, after all, could regard himself as being an "equal" of Lenin's? He was, after all, the "chiefest" of all, so how could anyone object or retaliate! That is not so at all. The atmosphere in which Lenin worked was totally different. Andrei Andreyev, at one-time a CC Secretary, recalled: "Everyone said just what he thought, without fear of being rudely called to order. One could argue with Lenin quite freely on any question."²⁴

Sharpness of tone is offensive when there is a hint in it of disrespect for others. But it is precisely what Lenin objected to most vehemently. One of the old members of the Bolshevik Party Yelena Drabkina wrote: "It was not the acts of the class enemies that aroused in him such a fierce and relentless indignation: for the class enemies there burned in his soul a flame of sustained hatred. He was brought to explosions of wrath most frequently by cases of heartless bureaucracy and inattention to the needs of the people."²⁵

And now for what is perhaps the main thing in understanding the relations with those whom Lenin guided in their work. At one congress of Soviets he declared: "It is not for me to object to harsh words . . . Only, in order to be harsh one must have the right to be so, and the right to be harsh is given by one's words not differing from one's deeds."²⁶

When setting the tasks ahead for the party, Lenin was always the first to start implementing them. That was so in all things. When after the victory of the revolution he began to speak

of punctuality, discipline and state responsibility which applied to all the communists, he made no exception for himself. With good right he demanded that "party members must set an example to all in labor discipline . . ."²⁷ That was so because he himself always set an example. He was scrupulously strict with respect to himself and gave this reminder to others: "If we are conscientious in teaching discipline to workers and peasants, we are obliged to begin with ourselves."²⁸ Gleb Krzhizhanovsky, one of his associates, says: "He could afford to make demands on others, because he made boundless demands on himself."²⁹

He displayed this trait not only as head of government but throughout the whole of his life: in the trying years of his exile, and in his contacts with party comrades and revolutionaries from other countries. When Clara Zetkin met Lenin three years after the victory of the October Revolution, she at once remarked: "I did not find Lenin changed in any way . . . I could swear that he was wearing the same modest and thoroughly cleaned coat which I saw him wear at our first meeting in 1907, at the world congress of the Second International in Stuttgart . . . Lenin behaved and spoke just as he did before."³⁰

The strictest self-discipline was such an organic strand of Lenin's whole life, of his every act that people stopped noticing it and took it for granted. Much has been said and written, for instance, about Lenin's personal modesty, his democratic approach in everyday life, and his constant rule never to differ in any way from those whom he met from day to day. When entering a hall, he would present his pass to the sentry at the first bidding. In a note to the head of the Sovnarkom Managing Department, he says: "I am paying personally for my library . . . the library of the Sovnarkom Managing Department is another matter."³¹ Was that modesty once again? On one occasion, he issued a reprimand for an unauthorized increase in his salary as Sovnarkom Chairman. He demanded that his driver, S.K. Gil, should be careful not to break any traffic rules when driving across Moscow, and made the following note: "Summon Gil and, for a start, only reprimand him (mildly), and warn him that . . . in the event of a repetition it would be bad for him."³² Was that no more than modesty once again?

Modesty — a quality we all cherish — will, of course, be found in every one of Lenin's acts and gestures. But if we are to pay tribute to his modesty on every occasion, will that not tend to obscure an equally significant characteristic of his, namely, his consistency and firm self-con-

trol? To believe that it was no more than modesty on his part to present his pass, to pay for his books, to rescind an unauthorized order from which he himself stood to benefit would mean assuming, contrary to the communists' moral laws, that someone can rise to an official position and take up a post in which he will no longer be bound by the generally accepted norms, so that the mere observance of them would already testify to his modesty. Each of the above mentioned episodes shows how strictly and very harshly Lenin required the undeviating observance of order, being convinced that the law is binding on one and all.

Little drops and mighty ocean

The head of an economic agency attending a Sovnarkom meeting once requested an appropriation of funds to build temporary housing for workers engaged in peat-cutting: the estimate was 4,000 rubles per house. However, an objection came from a man from the People's Commissariat of Finance, who claimed that 4,000 was too much, and that no more than 2,000 should be given. Each argued his own case, while Lenin kept writing notes to both. To the first: "Have you ever built such houses? Are you quite sure that you need 4,000 rubles?" The answer came back on the same piece of paper: "Of course I did." The next note went to the second man, from the financial department: "Have you ever built any houses?" The latter had to shrug his shoulders: he had never done so.

When the debate was over, Lenin once again repeated his question, this time for everyone to hear: "Has either of the two ever built such housing? Yes or No?" The first replied "Yes," and the other — "No." When putting the matter to the vote, Lenin formulated it as follows:

"We have here two proposals. The author of the first, who has experience, believes that it is necessary to appropriate 4,000 rubles for building one house, while the author of the second, who has no such experience, proposes the appropriation of only 2,000 rubles."³³

The members of the Sovnarkom naturally supported the first proposal, as evidently everyone would have done in their place.

This episode, I think, shows that Lenin's statesmanship always went right through to the very gist of every matter. He was not to be put out by any conventionalities, and he always ridiculed convictions which amounted to incantations: that is so, because it is so and cannot be otherwise. You insist on your standpoint — very well, let's have the economic grounding, and most importantly, show us that this will

truly go to benefit the working people, the rest being immaterial.

On one occasion Lenin said: "A piece of negligence displayed in a small but important matter."³⁴ He could be indignant over the poor work of the telephone system, or call account the person responsible for stalled elevators: "This is utterly scandalous. There are people with ailing hearts for whom it is harmful and dangerous to walk up."³⁵ Even the slightest matter is always highly important when it affects people. According to Nadezhda Krupskaya, Lenin "believed it to be necessary to pay attention to trifles, and that only attention to them will make the Soviet apparatus democratic, not formally democratic, but proletarian-democratic."³⁶ These words showed the social orientation and political substance of Lenin's style of work.

Much has been written about Lenin's attention to "trifles," which are always designated as "so-called trifles." Where do these quotation marks come from? They seem to come largely from bourgeois-bureaucratic administration. But Lenin's class position oriented him toward the human being, whom he was unable to regard as a mote, a trifle which merely diverted one from the "supreme goals" of administration.

"The machinery of Soviet administration must work accurately, smoothly and swiftly. Any slackness in it does damage not only to the interests of individuals, but to the whole business of administration, which becomes illusory and imaginary."³⁷ There we have the task: accurately, smoothly and swiftly. By the whole practice of his decision-taking and the whole style of his work, Lenin asserted respect for human beings, setting an example to those who worked with him.

The U.S. communist Albert Rhys Williams said that Lenin's office at the Kremlin was the greatest reception room in the world. He also witnessed the rare case when Lenin failed to abide by the appointed reception time. There was a crowd of people in the reception room and they had waited for a long time. When the door opened at long last, everyone was surprised to find emerging from it not some diplomat or other high-ranking person, but a bearded muzhik in sheepskin coat and bast shoes, a typical poor peasant of whom one saw millions in Soviet Russia at the time. When Williams entered the office, Lenin said:

"Please forgive me. That was a peasant from the Tambov area, and I wanted to know what he thought about electrification, cooperation and economic policy. He was telling me such in-

teresting things, that I quite forgot about the time."³⁸

Finally, there came December 12, 1922, the last working day for Vladimir Lenin. No one yet knew that Lenin would no longer be able to work in his Kremlin office. His health was getting worse and worse, but in everything he did he continued to be just as amazingly punctual. The day before, he wrote in French a letter to the Italian socialist Constantino Lazzari about the need for solidly uniting all the known revolutionaries in Italy. On the evening of his last working day, Lenin asked this letter to be sent over with a trusted comrade. And later inquired whether that had been done.³⁹

Everyone's responsibility

Dictating his last articles at the close of his days, Lenin remarked: "The practical purpose has always been important to me."⁴⁰ Indeed, he was always concrete in all things, and in his exactingness as well: "The most important thing is to secure personal responsibility."⁴¹ He believed that it was absolutely necessary to establish "the precisely defined responsibility of every person holding any Soviet post for the performance of definite, and clearly and explicitly specified, functions and practical jobs."⁴²

But is it possible — however clearcut the allocations of duties and however detailed the instructions — to cover the whole notion of responsibility in a person who is not indifferent, a person who is far from being concerned that "something may happen," but is, on the contrary, trying to the best of his ability to perform what he has been assigned? After all, among the numerous forms of the working people's struggle in the capitalist countries there are so-called work-to-rule strikes, when everyone remains at his work place and begins to perform with unflagging zeal all the rules, down to the last letter, without putting heart and soul into what he is about. As a result, railway timetables are disrupted, electricity and water supplies become erratic, and so on.

What was Lenin's definition of the non-formal responsibility, what was his view of it? Here is only one story to illustrate it. It began with an item in *Izvestia* on September 13, 1921, entitled "Pauper Billionaires": thousands of tons of non-ferrous metals, high quality iron and tools were lying about in the open in the Simonovskaya suburb of Moscow. Lenin demanded an explanation and sent inquiries into a number of departments: "I draw your attention to the item."⁴³ Step by step, he looked for those who were responsible for this crying mismanagement. When the head of the Central

Administration of State Warehouses declared that he could not accept the responsibility because the matter had been taken "through to the end nearly ten times, it seemed," but that no results had yet been achieved, Lenin wrote to him: "I took the matter through to the end nearly ten times, it seemed," you write. But the whole trouble is that not once did you take the matter through to the end, without any 'it seemed'."⁴⁴ What does Lenin mean by taking a matter through to the end? In his view, the head of the administration cannot be relieved of the responsibility, because "you gave up in despair, you did not fight, you did not exhaust all the means of fighting."⁴⁵

That is where Lenin saw the communist functionary making his mistakes: he had failed to use every means available to him, he did not do everything he could have done. But Lenin also held that if one is to develop a high sense of responsibility, one has to be able not only to make demands on everyone else, but also to convince them that useful initiatives will meet with support. Even in those days, Lenin took a harsh attitude to those who encroached on the possibility of businesslike criticism. One must be patient in asserting the sense of responsibility; Lenin was convinced that the man in charge of warehouses was wrong; still he did not hasten to call him to account, but found the time to write him a letter running to several pages.

Much more could be told about Lenin's school of management, but the main thing in it is the direct address to the masses, and this was fully done from the very earliest days of the October Revolution.

It is now even hard to imagine how they managed to run a vast country in which the old administrative machine had been broken up, while the new one was just emerging. Besides, the entrepreneurs, the share-holders and the boards of directors were still there. But at the very first meeting of the Sovnarkom, Lenin proposed a "Draft Regulation of Workers' Control": "Workers' control over production, storage, purchase and sale . . . shall be introduced in all industrial, commercial, banking, agricultural and other enterprises."⁴⁶ The old system has been destroyed. Those who used to rule the workers were now subordinate to them!

Peasant "walkers" were coming in to the Smolny to ask whether they could begin to manage the landowners' estates. The peasants were not in the habit of trusting words, while the Decree on Land published in the newspapers and the handbills was not a piece of paper addressed to them directly. So in his "Reply to Questions from Peasants," he says:

"The Council of People's Commissars calls upon the peasants to take all power into their own hands in their respective localities."⁴⁷ It was up to the peasant to dispose of the land. Lenin's "Reply" typewritten, stamped and sealed, as a government paper had to be, was taken away by every peasant who came to see Lenin at the Smolny.

The Soviet government issued its Decree on Peace. But the old army was still there, the soldiers subordinate to the officers. How soon would it be before a peace treaty with Germany was signed? Early on the morning of November 9, Lenin went to Novaya Gollandia (the location of the naval radio station in Petrograd) and addressed these words to all the soldiers of the revolutionary army and the sailors of the revolutionary navy: "Soldiers, the cause of peace is in your hands!"⁴⁸ The soldiers learned that they were authorized to elect their own representatives and to enter into armistice negotiations with the enemy. The soldiers were given the right to negotiate! The old army was exploded from within.

Vladimir Nevsky, a Bolshevik revolutionary, wrote: "Today . . . people who did not take part in the struggle do not understand how out of this universal chaos, ferment, countless crowds of people filling the Smolny, the factories, club halls and barrack-rooms, a truly mighty power was as if instantly created and was able to introduce order and organization into this turbulent human sea. These people do not understand the main thing, namely that we, the party of the revolutionary proletariat, expressed what was on the minds of the whole multi-million working people . . . Every worker, every soldier, all the working people saw and understood that we were fighting not for power for ourselves, not for our own narrowly egoistical interests, not for our own sweet food and drink, while tens of millions of people were hungry . . . They obeyed us and followed us not because we threatened them with jail, torture or exile, but because we were brought forward by these masses to put an end to the prisons, to the torture and to the exile."⁴⁹

Think of this and try to estimate, or even to imagine how many thousands or millions of men and women in the very first days of the Soviet power found themselves involved in running the state, about whose "undemocratic" nature our enemies have spoken so much and for so long!

Conversing with workers, peasants and soldiers at the Smolny and in the Kremlin, Lenin

kept saying: "Comrade, I have confidence in your strength." History has borne out the justice of these expectations.

1. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1969, p. 9 (in Russian).
2. Anatoly Lunacharsky, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, Moscow, 1967, p. 60 (in Russian).
3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 243-244.
4. *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 504.
5. *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 500.
6. V.I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 52, p. 89 (in Russian).
7. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 415.
8. Vladimir Lenin and Maxim Gorky, Moscow, 1961, pp. 296-297 (in Russian).
9. See V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 21.
10. *Ibid.*, Vol. 35, p. 434.
11. *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 56.
12. *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 491.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 487.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 488.
15. *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 301.
16. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1968, p. 523 (in Russian).
17. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 518.
18. *Ibid.*, Vol. 5, p. 388.
19. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1969, p. 234 (in Russian).
20. V.I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 37, p. 398 (in Russian).
21. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 71.
22. *Ibid.*, Vol. 45, p. 406.
23. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1969, p. 129 (in Russian).
24. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
25. Yelena Drabkina, *Black Rusks*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 131-132 (in Russian).
26. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 192.
27. *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 141.
28. *Ibid.*, Vol. 44, p. 80.
29. Gleb Krzhizhanovsky, *Thinker and Revolutionary*, Moscow, 1969, p. 24 (in Russian).
30. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 5, p. 9.
31. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, p. 327.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 368.
33. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 4, p. 53; V.I. Lenin, *Biographical Chronicle*, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1974, p. 412 (in Russian).
34. V.I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 51, p. 137 (in Russian).
35. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 306.
36. *Reminiscences of V.I. Lenin*, Vol. 1, p. 579.
37. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 423.
38. Albert Rhys Williams, *Lenin and the October Revolution*, Moscow, 1966, p. 69 (in Russian).
39. See V.I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 45, p. 470 (in Russian).
40. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 472.
41. *Ibid.*, Vol. 35, p. 529.
42. *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 349.
43. *Ibid.*, Vol. 36, p. 546.
44. *Ibid.*, Vol. 35, p. 523.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 524.
46. *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 264.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 300.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 312.
49. *Lenin. October 1917*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1977, pp. 276-277 (in Russian).

An indispensable condition of social progress

Athos Fava
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Argentina

Marxism-Leninism teaches us to analyze developments in their dialectical totality and mutual relationship. In order to assess the situation now obtaining in Argentina following the downfall of the dictatorship and define the immediate objectives of the Argentine communists we have to consider the balance of strength in the world and the international situation, for whose grave deterioration the Reagan administration is responsible.

The U.S. invasion of Grenada and occupation of that tiny island, whose people had ventured to invoke their sovereign right to self-determination, further revealed the reactionary nature of Washington's policy and showed that violence is essential to that policy. Also evident is the role that the USA aspires to play on the continent at all costs and whatever the means. In this situation there is an indivisible link between the establishment of stable democracy in Argentina and the struggle for peace in Latin America and the whole planet. It is obvious that neither objective can be achieved without militant efforts by the masses.

Two sides of one process

The future of the entire human race and of each nation, regardless of its economic and social system, and the possibility of reinforcing, developing and deepening the rule by the people and social progress depends to a large extent on the coordinated actions of the broad anti-Reagan front that is emerging in the United States and Europe and also in Asian, African and Latin American countries. Its task is to bridle the arms race and prevent U.S. imperialism from deliberately inflaming the situation, creating hotbeds of tension, and unleashing war in the Middle East, Southern Africa and Central America.

The most aggressive and reactionary elements of the ruling class of the USA and other imperialist powers have their sights on gaining control of the entire world, and to this end they are resorting to anti-communist blackmail and intimidation with the "Soviet threat" bogey. The refusal by the White House and its NATO allies to accept the series or any of the Soviet

Union's peace proposals is putting humankind in an extremely dangerous situation. The USA has begun to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe against the will of the peoples, of international public opinion, and even of influential circles in that country itself. These are seen as first-strike weapons. This is an exceedingly serious factor of the international situation, because under these conditions even an accident can push the world to the brink of total destruction. The steps taken by Reagan and his NATO partners are reminiscent of the irresponsible gambles of Hitlerism.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly come forward with constructive peace initiatives and declared that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. For its part, the USA torpedoed the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons in Geneva, placing before the Soviet Union the need to take defensive counter-measures to protect socialism's gains. By its policies the homeland of Lenin is safeguarding our planet's right to life, which may be menaced if imperialism achieves military superiority and succumbs to the temptation to launch a surprise attack against the socialist world that would inevitably erupt into a universal nuclear catastrophe.

It should be emphasized that the *struggle for democracy, national independence and socialism is inseparable from the struggle for peace, for cutting short the imperialist plans for a nuclear war, and for forming the broadest possible anti-war movement.*

The threat of a nuclear war hanging over the world is making it imperative to reassess the underlying purport of the activity of the entire communist movement. The thing is to expose the imperialist forces as the source of this threat and eliminate the danger of a thermonuclear war before imperialism is swept away by history.

The Soviet stand is based on the principles of the most consistent humanism. When the danger of humankind's total annihilation exists, it is unrealistic, in speaking of the historic mission of the working class, to deny

priority to the task of defending its right to exist, to life itself.

This applies fully to our country as well. The future of democracy in Argentina, more, the very possibility of coming to grips with and surmounting serious socio-economic difficulties, is inseparable from an independent foreign policy of peace. In fact, the destiny of the Argentines as a nation depends on the observance of the principles of peace and peaceful coexistence of countries with different socio-political systems and non-interference in their internal affairs.

The intensification of the nuclear arms race in the South Atlantic is being furthered by the existence of the military base on the Malvinas and the presence there of NATO nuclear submarines and by the stationing of U.S. missiles in Western Europe. The racist regime of South Africa has become imperialism's aggressive, strike force in the South Atlantic.

Not a single one of these facts is accidental. The present war hysteria fanned by Washington is part and parcel of the policy framed for Latin America and enunciated with rare cynicism in the so-called Santa Fé document.¹ It was written six months before the elections that installed Reagan in the White House. This overt scenario of blackmail and aggression urged invading Grenada and Nicaragua, the blockade of and provocations against Cuba, and other steps designed to turn the Caribbean into a "safe backyard" of the USA and gratify its ambition to control the republics of the Southern Cone. Stress was laid on keeping open the passage for big freighters and tankers along the deep waters off Grenada and gaining control of three oceans from bases on the Malvinas, in the Beagle Strait, and in the Antarctic.

Hardly had the constitutional government been installed in Argentina than the media began to speak of U.S. pressure on it in the spirit of the selfsame Santa Fé document. The Reagan administration is pressing the Radical Civic Union, which won the elections, to pursue a "balanced" policy, in other words, to support the USA's aggressive actions in Central America and enforce "demalvinization," meaning the muting of the natural patriotism and anti-colonialism demonstrated by the people during the Anglo-U.S. attack on the Malvinas. In exchange, as though giving oxygen to an ailing man, we are promised some economic sops, which will evidently boil down to an easing of the terms for repaying the external debt.

Small wonder that the Argentine government's stand in relation to Central America is becoming a sort of litmus paper making it pos-

sible to foresee Washington's further moves. In this context it is important to afford proper recognition to the statements made by President Raul Alfonsín in his speeches when the new cabinet took the oath of office. He said, in part, that the USA should modify its behavior in the region and pledged full support for the principle of non-interference and for the initiatives of the Contadora Group.²

It is quite evident that Washington will try to prevent the Radicals now in power from honoring their promises and acting on their statements about the situation in Central America, détente as the alternative to the arms race, sympathy for the non-aligned movement, and an independent foreign policy based on ideological plurality.

In the light of these factors it is important to note that on many points the views of the new Argentine leadership in this area coincide with the program of the Communist Party of Argentina. They are also close to the concepts of Peronism and also of the majority of political parties, including those belonging to the Multipartidaria.³ Of course, this is conducive to pursuing an independent foreign policy line reflecting our people's desire for peace and their determination to safeguard national interests. The anti-war struggle and the actions against U.S. interference in Nicaragua, Cuba and other Latin American countries thus coalesce with the Argentine people's drive for lasting democracy. It is precisely against democracy that imperialism is planning a new strike, so as by means of destabilization to keep our country in the orbit of its global strategy.

The experience of 1976-1982 allows judging the possible course of developments on the continent. Despite the projections and calculations of those who tried to tighten the noose of Argentina's dependence, its contradictions with imperialism continued to grow. Moreover, as was noted in the communiqué on the 1983 meeting of representatives of the fraternal parties of Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay and Chile, the whole of Latin America "is going through the process of struggle for democracy and the true sovereignty of the peoples, advancing along the path of national and social liberation."⁴ At this meeting it was declared: "We consider that it is a sacred duty to combine the contribution of our peoples with the efforts being made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the non-aligned movement, the world communist movement, many socialist and social democratic parties, and other democratic, pacifist and anti-imperialist forces and the mighty anti-war movement in Europe, the USA itself,

and the whole world to prevent Reagan and U.S. imperialism from carrying out their insane, inhuman plans."⁵

In the Western Hemisphere the beginning of the 1980s saw the triumph of the Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua, the heroic liberation struggle of the peoples of El Salvador and Guatemala, and the simultaneous activation of political forces and trade unions in the countries of South America upon which imperialism and reaction had imposed military regimes in the past decade.

The coming to power of democratic governments elected by the peoples of Bolivia and Argentina, the successes of the progressive and left forces in Peru, the recent elections in Venezuela, the new situation in Colombia, the upswing of the militant mass people's movement in Chile and Uruguay (where the working class plays a major role), the growth of the opposition in Paraguay, and the ongoing anti-dictatorship process in Brazil are evidence that changes have commenced in South America as well.

The situation in the world, the Latin American continent, and Argentina itself shows that never before have there been such a possibility and conditions for rapidly building up a broad anti-war offensive hand in hand with a powerful campaign against imperialist interference. The South Atlantic must be turned into a peace zone free of nuclear weapons. A condition for this is the dismantling of the "Malvinas citadel" (the British military base on the Malvinas used by NATO. — Ed.) and a just settlement of the frontier dispute between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Strait. Born out of suffering, such are the pressing demands of the Argentine people and their yearning to resolve the acute national problems created by the deposed dictatorship's militarist policy.

The Argentine communists are aware of the responsibility that the present situation devolves on all of them together and individually, whatever their post. As dedicated fighters for peace, we have to make the maximum effort to turn these cherished aspirations of our people into a broad, organized movement. It must be our aim that in no trade union and in not a single peasant organization, and in not a single student, cultural, professional, women's or other center should its specific activities fail to be closely linked to the struggle for peace.

The conditions thus exist for an all-out peace offensive against the adventurist policies of U.S. imperialism and its NATO allies. The direction of the changes that will be brought about by the upcoming actions of the masses will, of course, involve anti-war actions and efforts to defend democratic gains and cut short

the destabilizing intrigues of U.S. imperialism and its agents in our country.

*The dictatorship has fallen,
the struggle goes on*

Argentina's political life has entered a new stage that began with the restoration of constitutional institutions and the assumption of power by a democratic government.

Behind us are almost eight years of a brutal dictatorship that left a legacy of many grave problems. The nation has real prospects for steady progress but, at the same time, it faces many dangers. The further course of events depends on how actively our people will participate in them and on their efforts in the struggle for their economic and political rights, for saving humankind from a nuclear holocaust.

The ideological justification for the coup accomplished in Argentina by the ultra-reactionaries in March 1976 was the allegation that the world was in the state of an undeclared "third world war." This argument together with the theory about "ideological frontiers" and the doctrine of "national security" shows how close the bond was between domestic and foreign policies. The intertwining of the interests of, on the one hand, the oligarchy and big capital and, on the other, the U.S. transnationals, which are spurring the arms race and the creation of flashpoints of tension in Latin America and elsewhere in the world, was the prop of the repressive dictatorship that was set up in accordance with a prior scenario. This is what led to Argentina's militarization.

The purpose of this scenario, called the "process of national reorganization" by its authors and executors, was to make us more dependent on the USA and make Argentina serve imperialism's "vital interests" and global strategy. But the war in the South Atlantic revealed the total invalidity of these calculations. The aims pursued by reaction were in conflict with the tasks confronting the nation and this soon grew obvious to everybody. It became clear who were our enemies and our friends.

To assess the results and objectives of the present stage of the consolidation of democracy we have to analyze the principal lessons of the struggle against the dictatorship, toward whose dismantling a tangible and heroic contribution was made by the Communist Party of Argentina and the Communist Youth Federation.

We were able to recover from the heavy blows only because we pursued a correct policy and did not lose our links to the people. Imperialist reaction sought to destroy the CPA, isolate its leadership from the grass-roots organizations, striking chiefly at one of the par-

ty's most valued components — the thousands of activists — internationalists and ardent patriots — linked to the people and devoted to the working class and Marxism-Leninism.

The Argentine people have not forgotten that the military coup was made possible by the setbacks of the mass movement of 1969-1975. These setbacks were due to the inconsistency of the bourgeois-reformist leaders. Already then many people realized that it was possible to advance toward genuine democracy only if there was a lucid program, only if they knew how to put it into effect, firmly pursued a policy of unity (at the top and at the grass-roots) and possessed a capable and determined leadership.

The requirements remain in force. Instability (whose roots lie in dependence, latifundism and big associated capital) still permeates the nation's entire economic and social structure.

It must be noted that three mutually complementing factors contributed to the disintegration and downfall of the dictatorship. These were the popular struggle against the regime; the impossibility of further preserving the model based on repression and dependence; and, lastly, the contradictions that were laid bare by the war for the Malvinas and the consequences of that war.

Despite the assault mounted by the regime against the working class and the entire people in order to paralyze their actions and crush mass organizations, the working people were able to regain the initiative. They not only withstood this assault but took the offensive themselves, finding their bearings in the situation, striking at the enemy, and winning from him more and more political space that expanded considerably in 1981 and particularly in 1982. In the long run this led to the collapse of the dictatorship and to elections. Victory was won as a result of the people's actions along the hard road of gradually accumulating strength.

In the course of the struggle we had to stand up against a socio-political and economic regime whose structure differed significantly from traditional patterns. It articulated the interests not only of the ultra-right sections of society but also of the top military, and relied on support from U.S. monopoly capital. U.S. imperialism backed the repressive Argentine dictatorship in order to make our country serve its global policy of aggression and bring it into the neocolonialist division of labor in the world capitalist system. Transnational corporations tried to turn Argentina into their trading station. Their victims were all spheres of national production, industry in the first place. Repression was intensified, especially against the pro-

letariat. More than half a million workers were added to the million jobless. The decline in the social sphere, in culture, education, health care and other areas was unprecedented.

A mass democratic movement came to life gradually. Its participants put forward many demands relating to the social and economic needs of the working people, democratic freedoms and human rights, the peaceful settlement of the conflict over the Beagle Strait, the preservation of national wealth and sovereignty, anti-imperialist solidarity, and defense of world peace. This movement spread to all sections of society, chiefly to the working class, which ignored the conservative trade union leadership and, in spite of its interdictions, staged hundreds of work stoppages and several general strikes.

In the course of the struggle, which eroded the foundations of the dictatorship, we did not lose sight of the principal enemy in and outside the ruling military caste. The vicious suppression of the workers' and popular demonstrations of March 30, 1982 revealed that the country had matured for powerful nation-wide anti-dictatorship actions. The imperialist aggression in the Malvinas introduced a patriotic note into the thinking of the Argentine people and this acquired an anti-colonialist slant and deeply affected the armed forces.

It must be emphasized that from the outset we communists adopted a clear-cut stand that was simultaneously patriotic, anti-imperialist, and anti-dictatorial. This was expressed in our slogan, which the people adopted: "Malvinas — Yes! But Also Bread, Jobs and Freedom!"

By that time the regime had disintegrated completely. The nation found itself in deep crisis that affected all aspects of national life, all sections of society, including the armed forces, in which, after Malvinas, sharp contradictions that had been latent manifested themselves distinctly.

Looking back to these events we do not forget that the determining factor in bringing down the dictatorship was the struggle for civil and human rights, which received a powerful impetus from international solidarity. It should be noted, however, that the decisive battles were in the country itself and that, as always, our party was in the forefront and played its vanguard role in the struggle for democracy and its principles, for solidarity with political prisoners, and with the *desaparecidos* (missing).

As soon as the military seized power, the CPA focused its efforts on supporting the actions of all the democratic forces coming out against the regime. At our ninth national conference in June 1981 we analyzed existing op-

tions and came to the conclusion that the struggle for democracy was the basic task.

Today we understand that although the people overthrew the dictatorship, the process in which this took place suffered from a lack of unity among the workers and other left forces, with the result that a more radical denouement was ruled out. The regime was dying slowly: at first it grew weak, then broke and, finally, collapsed. It is important to caution those who believe that the very fact of elections will bring Argentina conditions that will benefit all areas of life. It should not be forgotten that sworn enemies of our people still hold key positions in the economy and that they are the mainstay of political reaction, both civilian and military.

Democracy is inconceivable without a new concept of defending national sovereignty, without a new, popular economic and social policy. In short, there is the alternative of democracy or reaction; democracy or chaos; stable democratic institutions or recurrent putschism. Lastly, as the quintessence of the aforesaid — *liberation or dependence*. This dilemma can only be resolved positively by a powerful mass movement under the leadership of the working class. Now that a constitutional government has been elected, reaction wants to force formal democracy upon us that will be no more than a new facade for a refurbishing of our dependence.

An important phase of change

These are some of the lessons of the anti-dictatorship struggle. Today it is imperative to take these lessons into account if we are to preserve and consolidate what has been won. Moreover, this will help to counter reaction's intrigues and imperialism's attempts to destabilize the situation in Argentina. The notorious "process of national reorganization" came to an inglorious end. But there are still many thorns in the nation's body. The dictatorship has fallen but there is still a very urgent need to unite all the healthy and organized forces of the Argentine nation in order to dismantle the repressive apparatus and the so-called "parallel" terrorist gangs — a task that the new government has pledged and has already begun to carry out. The democratization of the armed forces — and this is especially vital at this phase — likewise requires considerable and sustained political effort. The principal enemies, who still exercise economic power — the oligarchy and imperialism — must be seen clearly.

The bitter experience of the past years has led us to the important conclusion that the working class has the potential for asserting itself as society's main force, forming broad and secure

alliances with other progressive sections of the population. It has to be consistent in defending its gains, the living standard achieved by the working people, the interests of the entire people and national sovereignty, and repulse the plans hatched by imperialism. During the same years it became obvious that the working class can attain its longer-term objectives only if it orients itself on its revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party. For that very reason, with its sights on the future, the CPA has focused on work among the proletariat — not only in its propaganda work but also in its practical activity.

After the Malvinas gamble the regime had to loosen the reins. A new task faced the party, that of fighting for the right to participate in the elections. In the period from August 1982 to the election date (a period of less than 14 months) we had not only to acquire legal status but, rallying our enlarged ranks, assess the situation, try to form election alliances, and get our own election campaign going. This proved to be not easy, of course.

Our party emerged stronger than ever from the struggle against the dictatorship. Reaction was able neither to destroy nor divide the party although it inflicted serious losses on us. It would be wrong to obscure the CPA's successes in this period, for by ignoring them we might underestimate the new prospects. It would also be wrong to obscure our miscalculations, to fail to say what we did not achieve or what we were unable to do. Both these points are today extremely important for our work among the proletariat, especially at big industrial enterprises and in workers' neighborhoods. The experience of the struggle against the military regime and, later, the struggle to win voters provided further evidence that this was where the future was being made.

The election process deepened still further the death throes of the regime. The election campaign was a nation-wide process and this was what unquestionably decided its outcome: the dictatorship fell. The nation's profound and passionate discussion of cardinal problems of domestic life and some international issues continues to influence the new government. In speaking of the results of the people's expression of will we should correctly define and emphasize the significance of the immense work accomplished not only by our party but also by the Communist Youth Federation of Argentina, which merits special mention.

In considering the present situation we base ourselves on the conclusions drawn at the 15th congress of the CPA held on September 5, 1983. Let me explain that the congress was convened

in accordance with operating legislation, which we could not violate if we wanted the party's legal participation in the elections and the acknowledgement of its status as a juridical person. By that time it became necessary to define our own stand at the upcoming elections, a stand based not on situation considerations but on a look into the future, on an estimation of how subsequent developments would shape out. In other words, we had to pursue a course that could help to form a national anti-oligarchal, anti-imperialist democratic front for peace.

The congress was told in detail how we acted in trying to form an election front. There were two options — either the broadest coalition (together with the Multipartidaria) or a narrower one, depending on circumstances. But our efforts in this direction failed to get the support of other parties.

Both in the report and in the political resolution adopted by the congress we explained our motivations for supporting the presidential candidate nominated by the Justice Party as stemming from the CPA's consistent unity of action with the Peronist masses and many of their leaders. At the same time, the party reaffirmed its political independence and program, nominating communist candidates for thousands of posts of deputies and councillors of municipal councils and other self-administrative bodies. It was decided to combine efforts with the working masses influenced by Peronism so as together to surmount all difficulties and create a powerful front championing national and social liberation. We looked for mutual understanding with these people and for that reason went to the elections together, knowing that the Peronists comprised the main contingent of the working class with experience of socio-political struggle.

It must be said that in pursuing this course the party was almost sure that the Peronists would triumph. But even if we had been able to gauge more accurately the sentiments of the people and also the scale of reactionary propaganda and the organizational level of the Right during the elections — who laid obstacles to the victory of candidates supported by the workers — we would, of course, not have changed our tactics, for it was founded on principled considerations. Despite the outcome of the election campaign, which demonstrated the distinct polarization between the Justice Party and the Radical Civic Union — and this affected the voting for the other parties, including the Communist Party — this proved to be the correct course. Our links to the Justicialists rose to a new, higher level qualitatively and quanti-

tatively. An end was put to formalism, and in practice this meant that we established live contacts with more than a thousand grass-roots Peronist organizations — a result that the CPA would never have achieved had it gone to the elections alone.

Further, our deep-rooted and immutable link to the proletariat permits us to resolve with more confidence the task of ideologically and politically enlisting to our side workers in culture and people belonging to the middle strata both in town and countryside, who under working class leadership adhere to more consistent unitary and anti-imperialist positions. Our party is enhancing its prestige and influence among this section of the population with the successful use of other specific methods of work.

To sum up let me emphasize that the party's election strategy was and is based on consistent class principles and political necessity: our aim is to move the axis of political power toward a popular government. The participation in it of representatives of the working class and other exploited strata would be the decisive factor ensuring constitutional stability and the implementation of a program of far-reaching reforms.

The election results show that a huge majority of the people voted for stable democracy, for life under conditions of peace, tranquility, security and order. This was the vote of the bulk of the numerically large middle class and it brought the Radical Civic Union to victory.

In the face of new tasks

The new constitutional government, brought to power by the elections, entered upon its duties in Buenos Aires on December 10, 1983. This is a heterogeneous, reformist bourgeois-democratic administration consisting of progressive and conciliatory elements. The program announced in President Raul Alfonsín's first address and the measures that mark the beginning of his term of office mirror the legitimate aspirations of the Argentine people.

At the present phase of Argentina's political life the main aim will unquestionably be to preserve and consolidate the results of the victory won by the working class and all other working people and, at the same time, continue the struggle for a democratic, just settlement of pressing problems. Naturally, it will not be easy to surmount the difficulties confronting the republic, but it is making progress and much has already been accomplished. Everywhere there is a spirit of change, a will to cooperate and build a democratic society under the banner of Latin American anti-imperialist solidarity.

This should help to extricate the nation from the grave economic and social crisis. The nation's healthy forces have realized that it is vital to put an end to putschism once and for all. There is growing understanding that Argentina can successfully overcome the legacy left by the dictatorship provided there is unity among all true patriots and democrats.

The political resolution of the 15th congress noted that "nobody can desire the defeat of the future government because this would be a triumph for imperialism and a misfortune for everybody. On the contrary, we should together give effect to the action program advanced by the people in their unceasing struggles, a program reflecting both the setbacks of the past decades and the militant determination of the working people, of the rising generation and of women."⁶ This is precisely why, without abandoning its principles, the Communist Party of Argentina favors the new democratic administration. It will resolutely sustain and direct the actions of its members toward the maximum unification of forces capable of implementing the legislative measures or governmental decrees that accord with the Argentine people's will for democracy, changes and peace. Guided by this, we intend to be active in the struggle of the masses, particularly the struggle of the working class for its economic, social and political demands. This is the best way to counter the destabilization generated by the oligarchy and imperialism. However, the communists feel that it is their duty to tirelessly criticize any decree or step by the administration that runs counter or is prejudicial to the legitimate interests of the working people, compare its words with its deeds, and work for unity of action that can rectify the situation. This will simultaneously ensure the defense of the interests of the people, chiefly of the working class, and the needed stability of the constitutional system.

For our part, we expect the government to look boldly for ways of mobilizing all democrats and patriots who advocated similar election platforms in order to guarantee their actual and not only "consultative" participation in running the country, for this task is beyond the power of a one-party administration. At our party's 15th congress it was stated: "It is not enough to take the helm of power. Whatever forces win at the elections they will inevitably encounter serious problems. It will be necessary to take prompt steps to dismantle the criminal repressive apparatus brought to life by the 'national security' doctrine, cleanse and democratize the armed forces and the special units of the security forces, modify economic and social

policy, and repulse imperialism and its agents."⁷

It was stressed at the congress that there are new, better conditions for the fulfillment of these tasks. This is the result of the changes that have taken place in the past decade in Argentina, Latin America and the whole world on account of the new balance of strength in favor of the fighters for peace, social justice and national liberation.

In our struggle for genuine, lasting democracy the focus has returned to the role that will be played in it by the working class. The forces objectively desiring the return to power of the authoritarian myrmidons of imperialism and reaction are seeking to split the working class. It is only actual working class participation in the country's administration that can ensure the solution of the problem of the *desaparecidos* and civil rights generally, the abolition of the paramilitary gangs and the repressive apparatus, the democratization of the armed forces and their subordination to the constitutional government. Also, there are urgent economic and social problems, the external debt, and the question of an independent policy based on principles of peace, active non-alignment and respect for the right of nations to self-determination.

The government's first positive measures and its underlying program guidelines, enunciated in the address of the newly-elected president to the nation, have made it abundantly clear that the government needs powerful and militant massive political and material support that can counter the opposition of the reactionary circles, the landowning oligarchy and U.S. imperialism. They are at the moment quiescent but have already begun planning to torpedo the victory of democracy. Hence the dilemma that we spoke of during the election campaign: *liberation or dependence?* If we resolve it in favor of liberation we shall uproot the causes of our society's instability and move toward national development in the interests of the working people, of the entire nation, paving the way for social justice.

The Argentine people sincerely wish that the process that has started should develop in precisely that direction. In our drive to meet the people's hopes and translate their prospects and potentialities into reality it is our duty to help the people look soberly at things and shed false illusions. Nothing drops out of the sky. One has to fight for everything. The Communist Party has no intention of sitting with folded hands and indifferently gazing at the threat being created for the government by pressure from the reactionary anti-national and anti-

people forces of the oligarchy and imperialism. We know that a distinctive feature of the present stage will be the reshaping of society's political fabric, a new regrouping of forces acting for or against freedom and democracy. These changes will affect the life of the whole nation. As regards the government, processes of differentiation will inevitably take place in and outside it as the adopted program is put into effect.

Argentina's problems are so serious and our enemies so strong that we, and this must be re-emphasized, can win only if all the progressive forces unite. For that reason, in fulfilling its revolutionary duty, the CPA will fight unflinchingly for the viability of democratic institutions and, by promoting the unity of the working class, help it to discharge its historic mission.

Whatever the trials awaiting our country, we intend to regard as our paramount objective the

creation of the broadest possible anti-war front capable of fusing with the worldwide movement to prevent the nuclear catastrophe into which imperialism is threatening to plunge the human race. No promises or pressure will divert the Communist Party — vanguard of the working class of Argentina — from the path it has chosen.

1. This document is considered in some detail in Rodney Arismendi, "Global Madness Once More," WMR, No. 7, 1981. — Ed.

2. This group consists of Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico and Panama and urges a political settlement of the situation in Central America. — Ed.

3. This multi-party union was formed in 1981 and consists of the Radical Civic Union, the Justice Party, the Movement for Integration and Development, the Christian Democratic Federation, and the Intransigent Party. — Ed.

4. *Que pasa*, Buenos Aires, November 30, 1983, p. 3.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Todos juntos, por la liberacion contra la dependencia*, Buenos Aires, 1983, p. 73.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 30.



The main direction

Franz Muhri

Chairman, Communist Party of Austria

The 25th congress of the CPA took place in Vienna on January 13-15 in an atmosphere of exactingness and self-criticism. It considered key aspects of the party's activities, made a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the present situation and, on its basis, drew conclusions concerning the prospects for the party's work. Important decisions were adopted on making this work more effective, and these were included in a separate document, which, like the other resolutions, was approved unanimously.

The congress demonstrated the party's unity on all basic issues. The Austrian communists reiterated their internationalist unity and solidarity with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the international communist, working class and national liberation movements, and all other forces of peace and progress throughout the world.

The present international situation, it was stated at the congress, is characterized chiefly by the growth of the threat of nuclear war and the massive undermining of détente. This is the policy of the Reagan administration, which is

playing the role of an instrument of U.S. imperialism's most reactionary elements. A special place in this policy is accorded to the ongoing deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

As was noted at the congress, Reagan has lately been trying to mask his real intentions by posing as a "peace-maker." He is using this tactic on account of the upcoming presidential elections in the USA in order to blunt the peace movement. The struggle for peace demands the exposure of this deceit.

In their assessments the delegates based themselves on hard facts, which indicate that there has been no change in the reactionary, aggressive thrust of U.S. foreign policy. Reagan says that the USA is ready to negotiate with the Soviet Union, but it is his administration that bears the responsibility for the suspension of the talks in Geneva. All the proposals made by the USA at these talks were aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. The "readiness to disarm" vowed by Reagan is nothing less than hypocrisy. For he has already

launched a new stage in the massive arms build-up, including the militarization of outer space.

The aggressive policy pursued by the USA is spearheaded at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, at the international working class and national liberation movements and, in the long run, also at the USA's own allies. The ultra-reactionary imperialist forces putting this policy into effect are obsessed with class hatred for socialism, count on winning a confrontation with the socialist states, and are prepared to push the West European peoples into the flames of another war.

The USA's present course is a departure from the policy of peaceful coexistence and a violation of the Helsinki accords: instead of moving toward détente it is steering a course toward confrontation; instead of honoring the obligation, codified in the Helsinki Final Act, to promote economic, scientific and technological cooperation between countries it is having recourse to economic sanctions; instead of renouncing the use of force for settling outstanding international issues as proclaimed in the same Act, the U.S. President is not stopping short of using military force to achieve the aims of the USA; instead of observing the right, recognized at Helsinki, of each state "freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural system" the present U.S. government has proclaimed the objective of destroying socialism as a social system.

The analysis made of the international situation at the 25th CPA congress has been borne out by subsequent developments: at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe, the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz cynically declared that his country is not inclined to recognize the post-World War II European realities. This is nothing less than an attempt to ignore the existence of the German Democratic Republic and the entire socialist community of nations.

A point especially emphasized by the Austrian communists is that in the USA the most reactionary circles are not only threatening peace but assaulting the civil freedoms and human rights they are allegedly advocating. Evidence of this is the military invasion of Grenada and other actions by U.S. imperialism, which is coming forward as the mainstay of all the authoritarian regimes and fascist dictatorships in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The USA is flagrantly interfering in the affairs of El Salvador, Nicaragua and countries of the Middle East. When Reagan talks of "freedom" he means the freedom of the monopolies to reap

profits, to exploit and pillage not only the vast majority of the American people but also the peoples of developing countries and the population of other parts of the world.

At our 25th congress we noted that in the world today there is another, entirely different trend marked by the beginning of a new phase of the peace struggle. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries constitute the principal anti-war bulwark on the world scene. It is due to their policies that humankind has the possibility of preventing another world war, of averting a thermonuclear catastrophe. The proposals made by the USSR at the disarmament talks pursue the sole objective of halting the nuclear arms race and going over to disarmament on the basis of a military parity at the ever lower level that would lead to the creation of a nuclear-free Europe and a nuclear-free world. As the Soviet leaders have stated time and again, the USSR does not seek military superiority but it will not permit military superiority over itself on the part of the USA. This approach is consistent with the interests of the peace and security not only of socialist countries but also of all the peoples of Europe, of the whole world. This part of the world owes its four decades of peace largely to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, to their policy of peace. The stronger socialism is, the more dependable peace becomes. The 25th congress of the CPA stressed that peace and socialism are indivisible.

The development of the mass peace movement in Europe and in the USA itself, it was noted at the congress, is a new major phenomenon of international life. It has become a political factor that has to be reckoned with by the enemies of peace. In Austria, too, the past two years have witnessed the emergence of a broad anti-war movement in which socialists, Catholics, non-party people, and communists work side by side. It has been demonstrated that various forces can, despite their ideological and philosophical differences, cooperate for the sake of common interests, for the sake of the paramount objective of averting a nuclear war. An illustration of this has been the largest ever national demonstration in the history of the Austrian peace movement — it was held in Vienna on October 22, 1983.

Although it failed to prevent the deployment of new U.S. missiles from being started in Western Europe, the anti-war movement in the countries of that region has achieved tangible results. In Austria, for instance, hundreds of thousands of people have awakened to and joined the struggle against the threat of war. The leadership of the Socialist Party of Austria

has had to reconsider its initially negative attitude to this movement. It can now no longer forbid socialists from collaborating with the communists in the struggle for peace. However, practice shows that at each step new efforts have to be made to safeguard unity of action against its adversaries, particularly against the conservative elements of the Austrian People's Party and the Catholic Church, which subscribe to the Reagan policies.

The communists have made and will go on making a constructive contribution to the development and strengthening of the Austrian peace movement. A major task here is to draw the working class and the trade unions more actively into the anti-war struggle, to support the growing Austrian movement of solidarity with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America taking action against imperialism, for freedom and social progress.

The defense of peace is the central national task of our party. In this connection the 25th congress advanced three main demands addressed to the Federal Government and the parliament.

- stop evading a clear-cut assessment of the stationing of new U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, protest against their deployment, and support the demand for an end to this deployment and for a return to the situation existing before it was started as the condition for a resumption of the talks on medium-range weapons between the Soviet Union and the USA;

- take effective steps to prevent television and radio, which are state property in our country, from being used by imperialist propaganda centers as instruments of the ideological preparations for war;

- begin a gradual reduction of Austria's military expenditures and switch over the military industry to the manufacture of civilian goods and thereby allow for the preservation of a considerable number of jobs.

Much attention was focused at the congress on the political situation in Austria and on some new elements of this situation which the party should take into account in its struggle for the people's interests.

In Austria, as in other capitalist countries, the cyclical crisis is intertwining with capitalism's general crisis. On account of some special factors operating in the country, the consequences of this were felt by our working people to a far lesser extent than by the working people of other capitalist states. These factors include, in particular, Austria's permanent neutrality, the existence of a large public sector in the economy, the traditionally good relations with

socialist countries, and the large tourist industry. In the 1960s, in order to reinforce its position, the social democratic government made full use of these circumstances, which it portrayed as a success of its policy.

However, some time ago the crisis entered a new phase. For the first time since the crisis began Austria is witnessing the rise of mass unemployment, which has affected young people as well. It is estimated that in 1984, the number of jobless, which is tending to grow, will reach approximately 5 per cent of the labor force, and the economic growth rate will not exceed 2 per cent. The state debt will be in excess of 400 billion schillings, while the budget deficit will reach 100 billion. Under the state-monopoly system the room which the ruling class has for maneuver has diminished substantially. This is the phase when the shifting of the effects of the crisis to the shoulders of the working people will result in a very visible deterioration of the condition of many people. Prices and tariffs have soared, the taxes paid by the masses have grown, their socio-political advances are being eroded, pensions are being cut back, and rents are rising. The wage rises that the working people are winning through negotiation no longer compensate for the ever higher cost of living brought about by inflation. At factories labor intensification and exploitation have been escalated. As a result of the ruthless measures of capitalist rationalization and introducing new technologies a steadily growing number of jobs is being abolished. Instead of promoting the people's welfare, technological progress is increasingly boomeranging against them. More pressure is being brought to bear on the Austrian market by competing monopolies of the EEC countries.

The leadership of the Socialist Party is still pursuing a policy of "social partnership" with capital on the government level and in the Federation of Austrian Trade Unions. Moreover, the working people's fear of finding themselves unemployed is being shamelessly exploited as a means of pressure in order to split the working class, erode its solidarity, and curb its struggle for its interests. One of the characteristics of the situation in Austria is precisely that in large measure this policy of the socialists has hitherto been successful. But the aggravation of the crisis, whose consequences affect the condition of the masses, is undermining the faith of a section of the working class in the SPA's ability to slow down unemployment and safeguard the people against more troubles. Disaffection and readiness for resistance are growing. In some communities and factories it has been found possible to widen united action

by workers and to form anti-monopoly alliances of the working people.

Alongside the struggle for peace and in its context the 25th CPA congress defined as the second cardinal direction of our political work the task of surmounting the paralyzing influence of the "social partnership" policy by organizing effective action by workers on socio-economic issues at factories and in the communities. In this connection, the following are the most important demands:

- a reduction of working time with no cut in wages;

- the implementation of wages, prices, social security, and tax policies that would make it possible to raise the real incomes and purchasing power of the people;

- implementation of a planned structural policy in industry aimed at enlarging the existing and creating new industries turning out finished products; here priority to benefit by this policy must be given to state-run factories and privately-owned medium and small enterprises;

- fulfillment of a program of social housing construction and of reconstruction of old neighborhoods to offset the crisis in construction;

- an end to the one-sided harnessing of the Austrian economy to the requirements of the EEC monopolies; and the maintenance and further expansion of economic relations with socialist and developing countries.

Environmental protection is now acquiring growing importance. The maximum-profit-oriented capitalist system stands in the way of quick and effective measures in this area. The communists are active in civic initiative groups and various popular movements intent on combating noise and air pollution, protecting forests, and preserving the purity of water. Effective environmental protection measures funded from the profits of Austrian and foreign big capital could, given correct policy, help to preserve existing and create new jobs.

Jointly with the Communist Youth League of Austria our party is running a campaign against youth unemployment.

The communists have the important task of making the working people understand that there is a close link between the struggle for jobs, for an extension of socio-political and democratic gains, and the struggle for disarmament and peace.

With the aggravation of the effects of the economic crisis there have been significant changes in the political sphere as well. At last year's elections to the National Council, the Socialist Party of Austria lost its absolute

parliamentary majority. After 13 years of one-party cabinets the SPA has formed a coalition government with the Austrian Party of Freedom, which is more to the right on many political issues than the opposition Austrian People's Party, which represents the big bourgeoisie. There has thus been a further "creeping" movement to the right in government policy. "Social partnership" remains a specific form of sustaining the domination of state-monopoly practices.

The crisis and the exacerbation of the system's contradictions nourish the activities of neofascist elements and help to reanimate reactionary and anti-democratic trends. The 25th CPA congress reiterated that there is a need for an anti-fascist united action policy aimed at banning neofascist organizations and their propaganda, and guaranteeing compliance with the anti-fascist provisions of the State Treaty and our constitution in the spirit of the slogan: "Fascism Must Never Recur, War Must Never Be Repeated."

The Austrian People's Party is, in its drive to make political capital out of the people's disaffection, resorting to bare-faced social demagoguery, as a consequence of which it received more votes and mandates at the latest elections. As the party of the working class, the Communist Party of Austria sees a serious duty in exposing the political deceit practised by the APP leadership, whose true intentions are to place more burdens of the crisis squarely on the shoulders of the working people. It would like to give the public sector to Austrian and foreign capital, curtail the social and democratic gains of the working people more drastically, and ensure to big capital a further growth of its already high profits. In this context, by means of comradely discussions with their class brothers in the Socialist Party, the Austrian communists are trying to explain that the SPA leadership bears the responsibility for the policy which enabled the APP to advance at the elections, partly at the expense of the SPA itself. The ideology and practice of "social partnership" are blurring the class consciousness of the workers, with the result that many of them believed they were justified in voting for the APP. By shifting the burdens of the crisis to the working people, the government is giving that party a convenient pretext for its demagogic criticism. The anti-communism that is injected by the right-wing SPA leaders day after day into the minds of the workers is one of the main reasons that the disaffected working people are not moving to more left positions and vote for the APP instead of the Communist Party.

To sum up, it may be said that the political

situation in Austria is characterized by some new elements, which, while they are making new demands on the communists, are opening up new opportunities for us. The actual role played by the Communist Party in Austria's political life is unquestionably much bigger than can be gauged from the results of various elections. Much of the work of the 25th congress was devoted to a self-critical analysis of our activities, to the ways and means of improving them. The relevant conclusions cover three main directions:

— a dramatic invigoration of politico-ideological work in and outside the party and of the political orientation in the work of leading bodies and all party organizations. A major objective of the struggle to defend and extend socio-political and democratic gains and of the struggle for peace and social progress is to repulse all varieties of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. It is especially important to popularize our new party program adopted two years ago at an extraordinary party congress;

— a cardinal aim is to harmonize political

and ideological activity, reinforce organizational work and to orient our efforts toward united action and alliances — this makes it imperative for all leading bodies, beginning with the Central Committee, to develop a more effective style of work. It is of the utmost importance to strengthen the primary organizations;

— work among young people must be intensified. The enlistment into the party of young people, particularly young workers, and the training of new militant cadre for all levels of leadership are a key question of the party's life. The CPA needs its veterans and their experience, but it also needs young people, for they are our future.

The decisions of the 25th congress usher in a new phase in the work and struggles of the Communist Party of Austria. Developments are increasingly bearing out the assessment given in the party's new program: "The CPA exists not for its own sake; it emerged because it was needed by the working class; today it is needed more than ever by the Austrian people, by the Austrian working class."

A new situation and new prospects

Hermann Gautier

Deputy Chairman, German Communist Party

The German Communist Party held its seventh congress in Nuremberg on January 6-8 of this year. The constituent congress of the Communist Party of Germany was held 65 years ago, at the close of 1918 and the beginning of 1919. The founding of the party was a historic event, a noteworthy milestone of the history of the German and international working class movement: within weeks of the November Revolution the proletariat of Germany formed its revolutionary party of struggle for peace, employment and socialism, a party whose policy and activity were determined by the theories of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The latest congress reflected the continuity of the history of our communist movement. The atmosphere that reigned at it mirrored the great changes that had taken place on German soil, in Europe, and throughout the world during the past six decades and, in the first place, during the years that had elapsed since the liberation of peoples from Hitlerite fascism. What in 1918 was only embryonic has today become incontrovertible political reality: imperialism is historically on the defensive. The world is going through the epoch of transition from

capitalism to socialism inaugurated in 1917 by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. The imperialist system is in the vice of a steadily aggravating general crisis. At the same time, ever since the liberation of peoples from Hitlerite fascism the threat to peace has never been so great as it is today on account of imperialism's policy of nuclear confrontation, building up armaments, and stationing new American offensive first-strike nuclear weapons in the FRG and other West European countries.

The congress delegates considered the objectives being set the communists by the struggle for peace and jobs and by the struggle for the people's democratic participation in decision-making affecting the life of the country.

The congress had to answer questions posed by the changed situation and new prospects. These are characterized, on the one hand, by the mounting threat to peace in the heartland of Europe and the intensifying assaults by monopoly capital of the FRG on the social and democratic rights of the people. On the other hand, the working class and all other anti-

monopoly forces are getting new opportunities for effective action. Held under the slogan of "Peace Must Triumph! Jobs Now, Not Missiles!" the congress made a large contribution to the further unfolding of the peace movement, to the fightback of the workers of one of the most highly industrialized countries, where capitalism's vices have grown unprecedentedly acute as a consequence of the crisis.

In the situation stemming from imperialism's heightened aggressiveness, the GCP has demonstrated that it is a militant creative organization, a party of peace, labor and socialism, helping to unite the democratic and peace movements. It has always been prepared for dialogue with other democratic and left forces, without sidestepping pressing problems and without shedding the consciousness that far from diminishing the role and responsibility of the communists have now grown. In the light of the lessons and experience of the past, the party sees its paramount task in turning the FRG into a factor of peace and safeguarding the working people's social and democratic rights, which are threatened by big capital. In short, the GCP is working to achieve a turn from the build-up of weaponry to disarmament, from mass unemployment to the creation of more jobs, from restrictions on democracy to the democratic participation of the working people in decision-making affecting the life of the country.

At the Nuremberg congress a profound analysis was made of the situation in the Federal Republic. A distinctive feature of this situation is that with the approval of the federal government the Reagan administration has turned the country into a launching site for U.S. nuclear systems. The first action-ready U.S. Pershing-2 medium-range missiles that have been deployed can strike major centers in the Soviet Union within six to eight minutes. These missiles are offensive weapons, which the USA calculates will give it military superiority and the ability to strike the first "decapitating" blow at the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all.

The imperialist plans are adventurist and deadly dangerous. The deployment of missiles is increasing the war threat for all peoples. The most aggressive forces of U.S. imperialism can in fact drag our country, Europe, and the whole world into a disastrous nuclear catastrophe. The danger has grown of war breaking out again on German soil, of the Pentagon's irresponsible, anti-communist adventurists pushing the button and turning the Federal Re-

public of Germany into the seat of a global nuclear conflagration.

It was stressed at the congress that those who want peace should resist the policy of confrontation and build-up of armaments pursued by Reagan and the NATO leadership. The working class and peace movements must bear in mind history's lessons, which are acutely topical today. Hitler's "crusade" against the Soviet Union with the objective of destroying socialism was preceded by the suppression of democracy, by the persecution of communists in the country. This then erupted into an imperialist war to give German imperialism world hegemony. The current anti-Soviet "crusade" proclaimed by the Reagan administration envisages the use of nuclear weapons and can lead our people to destruction. For that reason, in their policy the FRG communists are guided by the principle that war should never again begin on German soil. As patriots and internationalists, the communists have reiterated at their congress that they will never reconcile themselves to the arbitrary action of missile deployment; we shall not rest until the U.S. nuclear missiles are withdrawn from our country.

The German Communist Party has stigmatized the right-wing conservative federal government, which subserviently accepts U.S. doctrines and has opened the country's doors to U.S. offensive weapons. We repeated that we are not indifferent to whether it abides by the U.S. strategy of war or by the national, European policy of peace. The GCP insists on the government pursuing a course consonant with the interests of our people, and this means a policy that precludes war breaking out on German soil.

We emphatically reject the assertions of government spokesmen that the stationing of missiles has changed nothing and that the situation is the same as that which obtained in the 1970s. The fact is that now everything is different.

The prattle of the ruling circles is deceiving the people. Its aim is to calm and lull public opinion. In Bonn they are counting on concealing from the people that against all reason they are backing the U.S. preparations for a nuclear war. The government is clearly afraid that more and more of our people will become increasingly militant in the fight for peace. It is for that reason that it is disputing the fact that the deployment of missiles has ushered in a dramatic change of the situation and is hoping to camouflage its sinister alliance with the Reagan administration obsessed with missile mania.

It is perfectly obvious that all people who cherish peace should know who is threatening them, who bears the responsibility for the new spiral of the arms race, and who wants to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war.

The war threat emanates, above all, from U.S. imperialism, from the Reagan administration, which is pursuing an anti-communist "crusade" policy, seeking to "decapitate" the Soviet Union, and ignoring all the constructive peace proposals of the USSR and other socialist countries. Not a single political leader with the minimum sense of reality and understanding of his people's national interests can approve of Washington's adventurist course. We shall continue to pressure the government of our country, demanding that it conduct a policy of reason and national responsibility in keeping with national interests, that it stop supporting the murderous plans holding out the threat of irreparable disaster for our people.

The GCP, with all the energy at its command, is fighting the lie about the "threat from the East," from the Soviet Union, that is being spread by statesmen and the mass media run by the big bourgeoisie. This invention is used to hide the horribly dangerous aggressiveness of the missile policy pursued by U.S. imperialism and NATO.

We tell the people that history is proving that war and the threat of war have never originated from the Soviet Union, that their source has always been imperialism. The latter will never be reconciled to the fact that the balance of strength in the world is steadily changing to its disadvantage, that it has had to suffer political, economic and military reverses on the international scene, that lately, especially in the 1970s, it has lost many important positions. Imperialism's growing aggressiveness is thus an expression of its own mounting crisis, a result of the fact that the advocates of the outworn capitalist system have been pushed out of positions they once held. They cannot deliver capitalism from the vices implicit in it and are afraid of the historical alternative to the capitalist system of exploitation of man by man. They fear socialism. Hence, as they see it, the new social system must be destroyed; motivated by their fear of the example set by socialism, by the world free of capitalists, unemployment and uncertainty of the future, they are calling for the eradication of what they term "evil." U.S. imperialism is clearly prepared to play with the destiny of humankind in order to escape the verdict of history. This was precisely the assessment given by the seventh congress of the class essence of the Reagan administration's policy of confrontation and war, a policy

that is backed, as if they were bent on suicide, by representatives of the ruling circles of the Federal Republic and other NATO countries.

Capitalism's development invariably reaches a point, it was noted at the congress, where for the ruling monopoly bourgeoisie a big war becomes necessary in order to get rid of what it sees as superfluous labor power and excess capital, so as to have new markets on the ruins left behind by war. To close this "road" for capitalism is a cardinal task of the FRG communists, of all the peace forces, because in the prevailing situation another war in Europe would develop into a world war that would imperil the existence of civilization as a whole.

We communists have stated once again that the peace forces are now strong enough to stay the hand of imperialism and save the world from a nuclear holocaust. Jointly with all the other peace forces, existing socialism can successfully uphold peace. The Washington adventurists and their reactionary vassals in the Federal Republic of Germany will have to realize that existing socialism has a large enough economic, scientific and technological potential to preserve the military equilibrium in any circumstances. The congress recorded its high appreciation of the constructive and active policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. Far from being interested in the dangerous stockpiling of weapons, the socialist countries are doing all in their power to stop the further spiralling of the arms race, to move to a worldwide process of limiting weapons and achieving disarmament. This would do away with the threat of a nuclear catastrophe once and for all. Socialism's entire record shows that it is a social system of peace. There are no social forces in it that would gain from an escalation of the arms race or would be interested in war. On the contrary, the whole of socialism's state policy is aimed at improving the people's life and reducing to the necessary minimum the funds allocated for military needs.

The communists of our republic see an important task in disseminating these fundamental truths in, among others, the peace movement. The community of socialist states is the most dependable ally of this movement in capitalist countries. We are therefore making a big effort to cut short the attempts of the anti-communists to split it; we are stigmatizing the attacks on existing socialism, seeing them as attacks on the vital interests of working people, of all the peace-loving citizens of our country. It is our unshakable stand that the peace movement should continue to abide by clear-cut demands and preserve its unity of action.

The congress stressed the necessity of paving the way for a genuinely national policy, a policy of peace, of European security and co-operation. A foreign policy course of the FRG that would meet the interests of our people must be a course toward détente; it must be oriented on full compliance with the Helsinki Final Act and the treaties signed with socialist countries. The communists of the FRG are strongly opposed to what is called "ensuring security" through a "positions of strength" policy, by an arms build-up, by seeking military superiority through nuclear intimidation. The GCP demands a new strategy for ensuring security that must be determined by the following principles: this must be a line toward preventing war, a line of energetic efforts toward reducing nuclear and conventional weapons; it must be anti-militarist and it must be founded on the people's participation in decision-making.

In keeping with these principles, the GCP is submitting the following suggestions in the discussion of the peace movement's political objectives:

- the peace movement should pursue the objective of preventing the further deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in the FRG and getting the systems already installed dismantled. In accordance with Sweden's recommendation, our country should, as the GDR has done, declare that it is prepared to include its territory in a Central European zone free of theater and tactical nuclear weapons;

- the Federal Republic of Germany should urge the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO to conclude a treaty on the non-use of military force, on renouncing the first-use of nuclear and conventional weapons;

- all of the country's peace forces should take action to make the FRG free of stockpiles of chemical weapons and toxic substances. There must be strict compliance with international understandings on the banning of bacteriological weapons and toxins, and an international convention must be concluded on the prohibition of all kinds of chemical and radiological weapons;

- the FRG should oppose the USA's plans for militarizing outer space and it should insist on a ban on the deployment of any kinds of weapons in outer space. The cosmos should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes;

- the peace movement in the FRG should subscribe to the American peace movement's demand for a freeze on weapons and urge the immediate implementation of that demand. It is vital to freeze and subsequently reduce the

stockpiles of nuclear and conventional weapons in order to strengthen peace, stop the social dismantling, finance the job-creation program, and help abolish hunger and poverty in developing countries;

- all the forces of peace and reason must be mobilized for determined action against the USA's aggressive military doctrine, which envisages an offensive war and the first-use of nuclear weapons. The Rogers plan and the "air-land battle" concept must not be allowed to remain the foundation of NATO's strategy. The objectives, training and armament of the Bundeswehr should serve exclusively defensive purposes. There must be determined action against its use outside the NATO zone;

- there must be compliance with and implementation of the treaties signed with socialist countries; these treaties have shown that they are a good foundation for peaceful relations. Our people can benefit not from the policy of confrontation, embargo and boycott pursued by U.S. imperialism, not from an economic war against the socialist states, but exclusively from a policy of peaceful coexistence with them, détente and cooperation, and a climate of mutual understanding and respect;

- untiring efforts should be made to hold the Federal Republic back from any neocolonialist expansion and blackmail relative to the developing countries. An end must be put to all support for reactionary regimes, whether it is economic or military aid (direct or indirect) or supplies of armaments.

Additional efforts have to be made, it was noted at the congress, to invigorate the peace struggle. There are new opportunities for linking the working class movement still closer to the movement for peace and ensuring the latter with broader support from the people of the FRG. Developments will very soon show that this movement will not go into decline, as the ruling circles would like, that it will not subside and ebb but, on the contrary, will be more intensive because with the deployment of missiles having begun the threat to our country and the life of the people has grown, not lessened.

The slogan of the congress — "Peace Must Triumph! Jobs Now, Not Missiles!" — pointed to the close link between peace and employment, between armaments and unemployment, between war preparations and social dismantling. That this is an unbreakable link is seen not only by us, communists. In the trade unions and among ever larger sections of the people there is growing understanding that the foundations of security and social well-being are undermined where preparations are being made for war.

In the FRG more than three and a half million persons are victims of mass unemployment, the switch to a shorter working day, and the shortage of places in the system of job training. The protracted unemployment, which is affecting millions of people, especially young workers, is in the 1980s the most vicious social scourge of the capitalist profit-oriented system. For that reason the demand "Jobs Now, Not Missiles!" is not only a political slogan but an expression of a program of struggle. We communists are complementing it with other slogans and demands, namely, "Education, Not Bombs!", "Reduce the Military Budget, Raise Wages and Pensions!", "A 35-Hour Working Week With No Wage Cuts!"

The ruling circles of West Germany who won the elections of March 6, 1983, not least as a result of their promise to bring about an upswing of the economy, are unable to cope with mass unemployment or provide young people with education and vocational training. Their policy is oriented toward increasing entrepreneur profits, accelerating the arms build-up, and shifting the entire burden of the capitalist crisis onto the shoulders of the working people. Already now every family of four is paying 5,000 marks annually for the purchase of tanks and Tornado aircraft and for the deployment of nuclear missiles.

The social degradation and the drastic reduction of appropriations for social requirements are acquiring increasingly dramatic forms. The millions living in poverty are falling into greater poverty. And this in one of the richest capitalist countries. Only those who are serving the interests of monopoly and military-industrial capital are making growing profits and running thriving businesses.

At the seventh congress we noted that the deepening of capitalism's crisis is leading to the creation of a new economic and socio-political situation for the workers. The conditions of the class struggle have changed. The associations of big capital are employing a strategy of provoking conflicts. As distinct from past years, today the working class cannot, without relentless struggle and solidarity, defend those rights and gains that it has already won, let alone obtain vital social and democratic improvements. In this situation the right-wing social democrats are finding it much harder to sustain among workers the illusion of "social partnership." It is becoming ever clearer that there must be a response to the intensification of the class struggle from above, with a fightback from below.

Among the working people there is a hardening determination to resist, not least as a result

of our work. This is exemplified by the major actions in defense of jobs at shipbuilding yards, steel mills, and many other enterprises. At the party congress we charted the strategy of the class struggle for peace and jobs, and drew up a concrete action program for jobs and social security.

The main points of this GCP program give the working people fearing for their jobs, pensioners, young people and women, whose social interests are brutally attacked, unemployed and all other people who are being pushed into destitution and social degradation, the answer to the question of how to defend common interests through joint action against capital.

The struggle begins at factories where the workers defend their own jobs and demand the creation of new jobs in order to restrict and end mass unemployment. Here it is a question of actions by the unemployed for their interests, of solidarity with immigrant men and women workers, of a demand for a radical change from a policy of building up arms and preparing for war to a policy of détente, disarmament and peaceful cooperation. The task is to secure a redistribution of social wealth in favor of the working people, a reorientation of state fiscal policy toward fairer taxation, an improvement of social and cultural services, effective participation of the working class in managing the economy, and the transfer of key industries to the state with democratic control exercised by the workers and their trade unions.

The GCP is wholeheartedly backing the actions of the trade unions for a 35-hour working week with preservation of the full wage. This would create 1,500,000 jobs. The demand for a diminution of working time by shortening the working week, lengthening annual leaves, and lowering the pension age without any reduction of pensions constitutes one of the main directions of the struggle to contain the growth of mass unemployment, preserve jobs, and create new ones. The associations of entrepreneurs and the federal government are doing everything to parry the demands of the trade unions for shorter working time and a job-creation program. Together with our class comrades, members of the Social Democratic Party, trade unionists, and other representatives of the democratic forces, we communists are pointing out that there is a possibility for a change toward ensuring employment. We believe that the strategy of the monopolies should be countered with the democratic economic and social strategy of the working class.

An alternative economic policy of the working class is a policy of peace and anti-monopoly fightback. Its objective is to be that the country's

large economic potential should serve not the interests of monopoly capital and its pursuit of profits and the arms build-up, but the social and cultural interests of the people.

It is our belief that the debate about an alternative economic policy will also evolve into a debate over the question of property and power in the FRG, that among the working class and young people there will be increasing understanding that the power of big capital has to be limited and ultimately ended. This is the goal of the communists, who see their paramount task in explaining the socialist alternative which leads to the reshaping of society.

Even in the bourgeois mass media the reports about our congress stated that the GCP is seeking unity of action with the social democrats and cooperation with the Greens, and developing ways and means of stepping up its work in the peace movement. The bourgeois press, which often does its reporting through the crooked prism of anti-communism, has on this occasion given the facts correctly: the congress has reaffirmed that the line toward unity of action of the working class, cooperation with the social democrats, the formation of democratic alliances, and strengthening the peace movement has been and remains the pivot of communist policy.

There are big new opportunities for cooperation with the social democrats and the Greens. We have in mind actions demanding a halt to the deployment of missiles, the withdrawal of the U.S. medium-range missiles already stationed, the conclusion of a non-aggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the struggle against the American policy of arbitrary actions and the Reagan course of high interest rates prejudicial to our economy. Moreover, we mean actions in defense of jobs, for a shortening of working time, against social dismantling and restrictions on democracy, against neo-nazism, and for the people's democratic participation in decision-making. The readiness for cooperation is not only a statement of our intentions but a political line that has been reaffirmed by the congress. We shall spare no effort to carry it out.

The congress approved the results of the work accomplished by the party. The party has grown stronger.* It now has deeper roots among the working people and the rising gen-

*The congress was attended by 778 voting delegates and guest delegates representing more than 50,000 members. Of these, 556 were under the age of 40 (280 under the age of 30) and 292 were women. Of the total, 578 were blue and white-collar workers, 58 were intellectuals, and the rest were students, pensioners and housewives.

eration. We are doing everything to extend the GCP influence dramatically over the next few years. This is the purpose of the Thaelmann Enrollment, which will be preceded by a campaign to enlist young people into the party and increase the readership of the GCP's newspaper *Unsere Zeit*. The congress passed a resolution to conduct this enrollment in the period from September 1, 1985 to April 16, 1986 in honor of the centenary of the birth of Ernst Thaelmann, who was an outstanding leader of the German and international working class movement. The GCP aims to enlist new members on a larger scale than ever before. This is a major militant task of the entire party. We plan to strengthen the party, extend its mass influence, enlist new members, and increase the readership of the party's daily newspaper chiefly by making our work more effective, setting up new party groups at factories, and drawing young workers and students into broader participation in our work. We are confident that this will be achieved.

It is unquestionable that the further development of the peace movement, the intensification of the struggle for jobs and peace, against mass unemployment, and for social and democratic rights depend largely on the strength and influence on the masses of the GCP, the militant party of the working people. The fact that we are endeavoring to strengthen the party is not a manifestation of "party egoism," but an expression of our constant, tireless efforts to consolidate the democratic movement and the movement for peace. As the GCP grows stronger and more influential, the more favorable become the conditions for the struggle of all other democratic and progressive forces. The party has set itself lofty aims. By acting intelligently and with initiative and foresight we shall attain them.

International Terrorism and the CIA

***Documents, facts,
eyewitness reports***

paper 264 pp \$3.75

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

The whole people wants the vanguard to act effectively

Dao Duy Tung

CC member, CP Vietnam, head of Propaganda
and Agitation Department, CPV CC

The Communist Party of Vietnam is more than 50 years old: it emerged at the beginning of 1930 as a small group of like-minded people working in the underground. Today, the CPV is the leading force in building the new life throughout the country and the universally recognized leader and organizer of the Vietnamese people's victories in the struggle for national independence, unification of the country and socialist transformations. It has 1,785,000 members, or 3.0 per cent of the population.

Since its establishment, the party has correctly formulated its strategic line in domestic and foreign policy at every stage of the national-democratic and socialist revolution. There have, of course, been mistakes in the practical solution of various concrete problems, but the general line has always been correct. Now and again there appeared the danger of a "left" or right deviation, but never has opportunism gained the upper hand. Because of its long-established traditions of unity and cohesion, factionalism has never manifested itself in the CPV. The Communist Party is the embodiment of the Vietnamese people's true patriotism and takes a firm stand on the positions of proletarian internationalism.

The CPV's history exemplifies the formation of the new type of party on the basis of Lenin's principles applied in a colonial, semi-feudal country which has not gone through the stage of capitalist development. In the late 1920s, the Vietnamese economy was extremely backward. Its industry accounted for less than 10 per cent of the country's output. The proletariat was small: in 1920, only 200,000 persons were employed in the mines, on the plantations, in transport, industry and commerce. Even today, at the stage of transition to socialism on the scale of the country as a whole, petty production is still prevalent and the material and technical basis of the new system is still insignificant. Indeed, a country with 60 million people annually produces only 50,000 tons of steel, 6

million tons of coal and 5 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. The working class is growing, but its skilled contingent numbers only 1.7 million, which is less than the number of members in the CPV.

In appraising the past and the present, one could say that the Vietnamese communists have not had an easy task in developing and strengthening the Marxist-Leninist party in such socio-economic conditions.

We think that it would be wrong to take too narrow a view of the well-known proposition that a Marxist-Leninist party is a blend of scientific socialism and the working class movement, especially when it comes to countries that have not gone through the stage of capitalist development. When the party emerged in Vietnam, the proletariat was really weak and fragmented, but then there was a broad and active patriotic movement. It helped many of our people to join in the struggle for socialist ideals. Among the first of them was President Ho Chi Minh, who wrote: "At first, it was my patriotism, and not yet communism in any sense that led me to Lenin and the Communist International. It was only gradually, in the course of the struggle, in the study of Marxist-Leninist theory and participation in practical work that I came to comprehend that socialism alone, that communism alone can emancipate from slavery both the oppressed peoples and the working people of the whole world."¹

In view of this specific situation, the founders of the party did not merely work to carry the scientific world view into the working class movement and to raise it from spontaneous protest to the level of conscious struggle, but also strove to conjugate socialist ideas with the popular patriotic movement and to lead it onto the way of revolution organically blending the goals of national liberation and socialism. Failing that, Vietnam's working class would have been unable to set up its own communist organization, which soon became the only leading force of the working people in their fight against imperialism and reaction. The revolutionary upswing in that period culminated in

¹ We continue the discussion of the prerequisites and criteria of party work effectiveness. See WMR, Nos. 1 and 9, 1983, and No. 2, 1984. — Ed.

the formation of Soviets in the Nghean and Ha Tinh provinces in 1930 and 1931. Summing up the lessons of these processes, Ho Chi Minh said: "The conjunction of Marxist-Leninist theory with the working class and patriotic movement led to the establishment of the Communist Party of Indochina at the beginning of 1930."²

This kind of situation, we believe, is characteristic not only in Vietnam. In many economically-backward, agrarian countries, the working class is numerically small and poorly organized, but there is a strong patriotic movement. Marxist-Leninist parties have already emerged and are active in some of them. That is why we believe that it would be useful to go on discussing on the pages of *WMR* the creation of such proletarian class organizations in countries which have not gone through the stage of capitalist development.

Our party emerged and has grown in stature, as I have said, in a country with an economy dominated by petty-commodity production, and with land-poor peasants and petty-bourgeois strata constituting a majority of the population. However, our party has always maintained its proletarian-class, Marxist-Leninist character. We regard this as a great success for party construction and as the result of elaboration and realization of the correct conception of the class spirit. This conception is based on the assertion that from the very outset the CPV has been and continues to be a working class party expressing the interests of the working people and of the whole people. It is a party doing its international duty.

At one time, we had to combat various deviations on this question. Some comrades saw the party as an organization of the poor, of all the working people generally. That error stemmed from a misunderstanding of the class character considered above. Others held that the crucial thing for a proletarian party was the numerical prevalence of workers among its members. That is an important factor indeed, and a Marxist-Leninist party must, of course, constantly see to having more members from the working class. But it is not right, we think, to regard this as the sole or chief criterion in assessing the party's qualitative make-up.

Workers now make up only 11.2 per cent of the CPV's membership, and we are aware that that is not enough. There was good reason why the CPV's fifth congress in March 1982 said: "We must carry on active efforts to admit into the party the best participants in the mass movements, primarily workers, dedicated to the party's ideals, well-versed and prepared politically, and with a good knowledge in culture,

science, technology and administration."³

While saying this, the party believes that its proletarian character is determined above all by its capacity to take a resolute stand for the positions of the working class, to remain loyal to our revolutionary theory, to apply it creatively in the country's conditions, and to conduct the correct political line. The principles of democratic centralism must be practised without fail, ties with the popular masses must be constantly consolidated, and patriotism and proletarian internationalism organically blended. Consequently, a party's class character is not an abstract concept; it is concretely expressed in the political, ideological and organizational spheres, and is constantly developed in accordance with the tasks arising at every new stage of the struggle.

That is the light in which ideological education is carried on within the CPV, because the party consists mainly of peasants and people from a petty-bourgeois milieu who joined the revolution through the patriotic movement. Whatever his social origin or post, every communist must reject the non-proletarian approach and must be guided by the world view of the working class. Let us say, by way of example, that if in the sharing out of land the communists took account only of the mentality of the poor peasants and failed to adhere to principle, the agrarian reform could have had negative consequences for the revolution.

What is one to do to develop the proletarian consciousness of party members and how is one to do it? That is a serious question, considering the continued existence of survivals of the old views, especially of petty-bourgeois views. These are expressed in trends toward "left" or right deviations in policy, in various types of individualistic mentality, and — from the ideological standpoint — in subjectivism. If the party is to preserve its proletarian character in these conditions, systematic efforts must be made to assert class consciousness, the Marxist-Leninist world view, and to carry on a struggle against survivals of the past, primarily against the petty-bourgeois ideology.

We can take pride in the fact that over these long years, a good contingent of communists has, on the whole, taken shape within the CPV. One cannot say that absolutely all our comrades have managed to overcome the residue of non-proletarian views or that some individuals have not degenerated. But it is the qualities of its members which accord with the party's line and serve the revolutionary cause that have become predominant in the party. Among them are loyalty to the homeland, self-sacrifice, an unhesitating readiness to fulfil party

assignments, and a sound and intelligent way of life. Much like the metabolism which constantly goes on in the organism, our communists must daily assimilate new qualities, Marxist-Leninist ideas, party policy, experience of the revolution, and high moral principles, while getting rid of the non-proletarian residue.

The communists' class consciousness is steeled in the living practice of the revolution and party work, and also by means of political and theoretical grounding through the system of study and the press. The first generation of our party members was seasoned in a peculiar way. Many of them came from petty-bourgeois strata. Upon joining the Vietnam Society of Revolutionary Youth, they went through a process of "proletarianization": they acquired the qualities of proletarians at the factories and plants, and learned to carry on propaganda among the workers. This "proletarianization" helped to consolidate the party's bonds with the working class. Besides, those of our comrades who found themselves in prison in the pre-revolutionary period turned their cells into schools for the study of Marxism-Leninism and the lessons of the revolutionary struggle. That was how our party activists — the leading contingent of the CPV — was molded. Ho Chi Minh, the founder of our party, and a worker for many years, also went through the process of "proletarianization."

Following the victory of the popular uprising in 1945, there was a rapid growth of the party ranks: from 5,000 to 760,000 in early 1951. During the war, the communists were educated mainly in practical combat, in the course of which much attention was given to raising the level of their political knowledge and revolutionary morality. Party meetings helped members to gain a better understanding of the party's policy. There were also short-term political and theoretical courses. In 1954, peace was established in the North of Vietnam, and in 1975 — throughout the country. The system of the communists' Marxist-Leninist training was developed accordingly. There are now 7 party schools under the CPV CC, 40 under the regional and city committees, and 400 schools and political courses under the district committees. Some members carry on their theoretical studies without leaving their jobs. More than one million communists have gone through various programs of Marxist-Leninist study in that way. At the same time, the level of their general, scientific and technical training has risen: 16.4 per cent of CPV members now have a higher and secondary specialized education, and 25 per cent have taken a full secondary-school course.

Our party's proletarian character is largely ensured by the election of ever more committed fighters from the ranks of the working class into the party committees, and the Central Committee in the first place. Not enough attention was given to this in the past, but now the situation is being righted. The report on party construction to the fifth congress of the CPV emphasized: "Party committees at every level must have a plan of measures for educating and preparing workers for election to party work."⁴

In consolidating its ranks, the CPV relies on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and makes use of the experience in party construction gained by the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. Of course, we also regularly sum up the results of our own work and draw the lessons suggested by our achievements and mistakes. The preliminary conclusions drawn by the CPV here were formulated at the party's fourth congress in December 1976, and could be summed up as follows:

First. The party must be built in such a way as to make it solid in all three aspects: political, ideological and organizational. These three aspects are connected with each other and exert an influence on each other. Party construction must be an organic blend of the ideological and organizational aspects; one must proceed from the party's line and its political tasks; at the same time, there is a need to ensure the formulation of the right line and political tasks, their comprehension and complete translation into life.

Let me clarify this point. It is perfectly obvious that the effectiveness of the party's efforts depends on the political line, for it is an expression of its Marxist-Leninist character. Political mistakes are fraught with the gravest consequences for any fraternal party, whether in power or fighting for it. That is why we attach primary importance in party construction to getting the communists to gain a clear comprehension of their goals and tasks.

The party's ideological and organizational activity is equally important. It ensures not only the correct formulation of party policy, but also successful pursuit of the mapped-out line. After all, both require clear-cut organization from top to bottom, and the shaping of a membership body with truly revolutionary features and a capacity to produce cadre for scientific leadership. In much the same way, theoretical study, the communists' Marxist-Leninist education, and a constant summing-up of their experience are a condition for mustering the party's collective intellect for formulating political guidelines. That is why it is quite wrong, we believe, to reduce party con-

struction to the fulfillment of some limited official functions, to try to separate ideological and organizational work, and to decouple it from the political sphere.

Second. The work of party construction must be carried on through the revolutionary movement of the masses, through the creation of a regime of collective economic activity by the masses: they must be involved in party construction and control, and in verifying the work and personal qualities of cadre and other party members.

The Vietnamese people's revolutionary movement has successfully advanced through 15 years of underground struggle and a victorious revolution in August 1945, through two wars of resistance, the repulse to Peking expansionism and hegemonism, and through socialist transformations. The party's leadership is the crucial factor in all these victories. On the other hand, the party itself emerged on the crest of a revolutionary popular mass wave. Thanks to the initiative of the masses, the party has been able to formulate the correct ways, forms and methods of struggle. The masses are the source from which the party ranks are formed and replenished.

An understanding of this has led us to draw the following conclusion: when the party is in power, it is highly important to create favorable conditions for the people's participation in party construction. The Vietnamese people love their party, knowing full well that it stands for their interests and that the life of all our men and women and the future of their children directly depend on its capacity to act and on the communists' personal qualities. The people want the party to be stronger, and its composition improved. The working people's participation in party construction is expressed in their criticism of the leadership of grass-roots party organizations, their assessment of the individual communists' work, merits and shortcomings, and the voicing of their opinions about who should be admitted to the CPV or expelled for unseemly behavior, and who should or should not be elected to the party committees.

Such an approach, we believe, helps to strengthen the bonds between the party and the masses and to overcome bureaucratic practices. General Secretary of the CPV CC Le Duan says: "The party can set up strong and efficient organizations only on the basis of the revolutionary movement of the popular masses fulfilling the tasks it has set. The party regards the involvement of the masses in party construction, in control of the work of its organi-

zations, in verification of the moral qualities of its cadre and rank-and-file communists as an important means for consolidating its ties with the people."⁵

Third. Party construction and efforts to enhance the party's militancy must be connected with the organizational consolidation and enhancement of the capability of the state, with the formation and consolidation of the mass organizations, and with the shaping of the united might of the proletarian dictatorship system.

Following the overthrow of the power of imperialism and its satraps, the Vietnamese people became the master of their country in the political, economic and cultural spheres. The structure of collective economic administration and management includes party guidance, the exercise of the functions of master by the people, and state administration. We seek to have all these three elements constitute a single whole, and this requires the establishment of a system of close ties between the party, the state and social organizations from top to bottom.

There is no doubt that the party is the leading element of this whole structure, because the efficiency of the other elements depends on its correct leadership. That is why we have always concentrated attention on strengthening the party. But the vanguard fulfils its role within the proletarian dictatorship system only by relying on the state and social organizations. The state carries out the party's policy in directing the national economy, and it does this well only when it itself is strong enough. Solid social organizations are also the basis of the party's strength and capacity to act. Consequently, party construction cannot be separated from the strengthening of state organs and social organizations. We have always fought deviations such as close attention only to the party, while the need to perfect the state apparatus is underestimated, such as the confusion of the functions of the party and the state, artificial priority to party work over state work, in short, we have fought against everything that tends to make the communists' efforts less effective and encroaches on the people's right to act as master.

Fourth. Enhancement of the personal qualities of cadre and rank-and-file communists must go hand in hand with a qualitative improvement of the party cells and primary party organizations, with a strengthening of the governing bodies, and an improvement of the organizational apparatus at every level and in every area.

This point concerns the relations between

the individual and the organization. The latter must never be regarded as a mere sum of its members. Our party attaches much importance to raising each communist's political training, revolutionary morality and capacity for work. We are aware that men and women are the living elements of the organization, whose strength lies in robust people. But on the other hand, the strength of human beings lies in the strength of their organization, which alone helps them to develop their capabilities and best qualities. That is why it is quite natural for the CPV to display constant concern for the grass-roots units. These now include 150,000 party groups and more than 40,000 primary organizations. There is a constant effort to set up and enlarge these units. We emphasize this because at one time, being carried away with the drive to improve the personal qualities of party members, we did not give enough attention here and there to improving the party organizations. Now and again each communist's record was considered outside the context of the functions, structure and responsibility of the organization in which he worked. This shortcoming is now being surmounted.

Fifth. In the work to develop the party, there is a need to give serious attention to quality, and there is a need to resist the drive for quantity; the party's development must run parallel to its consolidation. On the one hand, the truly best men and women fully meeting the requirements should be admitted to the party; on the other hand, those who have degenerated and do not have enough qualifications to remain communists should be expelled from the party ranks in due time. There is a need for vigilance and appropriate measures with respect to the negative elements, reactionaries, time-servers and mercenary-minded persons who have infiltrated the party.

This is, in effect, a question of relations between the party's growth and its consolidation, between the admission of new members and concern for the purity of our ranks. The organization's numerical strength should be up to the requirements of every stage of the revolution, but what is even more important is the quality aspect. We have made mistakes in the drive for quantitative growth, as a result of which we later had to face difficulties. There is a need here for the firm, principled, Leninist approach. Lenin says: "We do not need fictitious party members even as a gift. Our party, the party of the revolutionary working class, is the

only government party in the world which is concerned not with increasing its membership but with improving its quality, and with purging itself of 'self-seekers'."⁶

A lowering of party-admission standards is fraught with grave and long-term consequences. But the party tends to age and lose its vigor unless it draws fresh forces from the revolutionary movement of the popular masses. We made a mistake in the early 1950s when we effectively "closed" admission to the party for a certain period. Even today, when positive processes are on the whole developing within the CPV, the pace of its growth continues to be slow, and new membership in many areas adds up to an insignificant percentage of the communists.

In the recent period, much has been done to develop and strengthen the party. Since 1970, there have been several major drives for new members and purification of its ranks. In the just over five years between the fourth and the fifth congresses, 375,000 new members were admitted into the party, while tens of thousands of unworthy members were expelled. In the party-card-issue campaign in 1980 and 1981, we got rid of irresponsible and politically illiterate persons, those who broke party discipline, embezzled public funds, and degenerated in other ways.

Back in December 1974, the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Vietnam (now the CPV) said in a resolution of its 23rd plenary meeting: "The party believes that replenishment of its ranks with the best men and women and simultaneous purging of degenerates and unworthy persons is a law of its existence and development."⁷ This is still true today.

Those were five inter-related lessons on which the work of guiding party construction in the CPV rests. We continue to abide by these ideas at the new stage of the revolution in strengthening the proletarian character of the vanguard of the working class and of the whole Vietnamese people and in enhancing its capacity for militant action.

1. Ho Chi Minh, *Selected Works*, Hanoi, 1980, p. 176 (in Vietnamese).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 152.

3. *Tap Chi Cong San*, No. 5, 1982, p. 52 (in Vietnamese).

4. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

5. Le Duan, *Some Problems Facing the Ruling Party*, Hanoi, 1981, p. 109 (in Vietnamese).

6. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 63.

7. *Resolution of the 23rd Plenary Meeting of the WPV CC*, Hanoi, 1974, p. 10 (in Vietnamese).



The nuclear threat and politics

In political circles, among Marxist scholars, and in the peace movements the question is being asked whether it would be correct to regard nuclear war as a "continuation of politics by other means." This is by no means an abstract question. The answer requires an understanding of the sources and implications of the nuclear threat, the identification and effective ways of removing that threat, and the development of possibilities for a further mobilization of social forces in the anti-war struggle.

The following study of this question is by a working group of the WMR Commission for General Theoretical Problems.

The colossal potential for destruction now in the hands of the nuclear powers is a million times greater than that of the atomic flame in which 108,956 inhabitants of Hiroshima perished. Scientists estimate that this potential is enough to cut short the existence of civilization, if not all life in the world.

What influence has this terrifying potential for global incineration had on the relationship between war and politics? Has it dismissed nuclear war from state policy? Or, on the contrary, in the event a nuclear-missile war breaks out will its character and shape be determined and managed by politics, as has always been the case in the history of wars?

The replies to these questions may be grouped into four distinct viewpoints expressing the attitude of different social forces to the war threat — imperialism and socialism, and also the demarcation in bourgeois ideology on the question of war and peace.

First viewpoint: the nuclear threat does not in any way signify that politics no longer has access to war. A nuclear war can be fought at different levels — local or global, tactical or strategic; it may be "limited" or "prolonged"; it can be "won."

These are the basic tenets of present-day aggressive militarist doctrines. They do not in all cases entirely reject the new dimension introduced into war by nuclear weapons, namely, the possibility of the belligerents mutually destroying each other. But they dispute

that this outcome is inescapable and irrevocable.

Hence the quest for military solutions that would allow using the threat of mutual destruction to keep war harnessed to politics and compel the adversary to refrain from stepping across the deadly threshold beyond which war would inexorably become a universal catastrophe. The term "intra-war deterrence" has appeared in the militarist dictionary. This term implies the possibility of localizing or limiting a war that has broken out with the threat of raising it to a "more" destructive level. For instance, it is believed that by threatening to destroy key strategic targets it would be possible to prevent the "exchange" of nuclear strikes from going beyond the boundaries of a definite theater of hostilities.

The abstract theoretical quests for possibilities of fighting a nuclear war and halting it, winning (or losing) the battle at some level of escalation, are accompanied by practical preparations. In 1982 the Pentagon completed a strategic general plan for a "prolonged" (of a duration of up to six months) nuclear war. This plan envisions the deployment of the U.S. armed forces in a way that would ultimately enable them to emerge from a conflict with the resources and population allowing for the USA's "restoration." In parallel, preparations are in full swing for a "limited" nuclear war. The Pentagon strategists are endeavoring to create a situation in which they would be able to start such a war on Europe's perimeter or in Europe itself, calculating that the USA would escape retaliation or, at least, significantly reduce the consequences to itself. This is the purpose of the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe. This is a step to an aggressive nuclear war, an attempt to secure advantageous positions for making a first nuclear strike.

These are utterly adventurist guidelines. They are evidence that imperialist militarist thinking is in a gravely dangerous crisis. It cannot reconcile itself to the distinctive character of a nuclear war in that *objectively it cannot end with conventional, "traditional" results — the victory of one side and the defeat of the*

other. Where there is a military strategic equilibrium, nuclear weapons will give neither side an advantage: their utilization only threatens to bring about a global catastrophe.

In a nuclear war there can be only this disastrous outcome for humankind.

Imperialism's reactionary circles are not discontinuing their attempts to retaylor the nature of nuclear war in such a way that its cost on the scale of politics would, in spite of everything, be acceptable to them. Hence the mindless chase for the chimera of military superiority, and this is shaking loose the already fragile props of peace. The 26th congress of the CPSU cautioned that the development of new systems of fighting a nuclear war was not only eroding international stability but could make it doubtful that it would be possible to come to an agreement on limiting and reducing these systems.

A comparison of the military and military-technical potentials of the sides leads experts to the conclusion that the imperialist forces will not achieve superiority either by an arms race at the stage of preparations for war or by crippling nuclear strikes.¹ However, there is the probability of a strategic miscalculation triggering war. This probability is growing with the rise of the level of military confrontation and further military-technical advances.

The recently deceased American futurologist Herman Kahn wrote that this probability could only be nullified if there were a "doomsday machine" that would, in the event of a nuclear attack, automatically blow up our planet without any interference from human will. A "doomsday machine" is in the realm of fantasy. But even an absolute certainty that the world will not survive is no guarantee against the threat because there is still the political madness of those who, possessing nuclear weapons, are guided by the manhating credo that it "is better to be dead than Red."

This credo mirrors the objective content of the policy of sliding into nuclear war pursued by Washington. An expression of adventurism, this policy can lead to nothing but the annihilation of civilization. Of course, suicide is not contemplated in the subjective political intentions of imperialism's ultra-reactionary circles. Having proclaimed a "crusade" against socialism as a social system, they hope to crush it. They are seeking to weaken the socialist community economically — by means of the arms race; politically — by isolating it from the other revolutionary forces of the world; and ideologically — by psychological warfare. But what is particularly dangerous is that they are actually building a nuclear-missile base for their illu-

sory hopes of smashing socialism by military means.

However, the military strategic parity achieved by socialism and its determination to prevent this parity from being upset deny imperialism the very possibility of turning back the clock of history by war. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made this clear when he said that "we shall not allow anyone to upset the military equilibrium which has been achieved. Let no one be in the slightest doubt: we shall continue to show concern for strengthening our country's defense capability and for having enough means that would help us to cool the hot heads of the bellicose adventurers."² The decisive factor of the present world situation is that war cannot serve as the means for resolving the historical dispute between the two social systems. The further course of history and humankind's very existence are possible only under conditions of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems. There is no other alternative.

Second viewpoint: the nuclear threat has cut the link of politics to war, doing away with world wars in government-to-government relations, with the possibility of a state of peace or a "local conflict" resolved by bloodshed erupting into a world war. As long and insofar as this threat exists and is sustained, war will not grow out of politics whatever its character.

In this view the nuclear threat is seen as a guarantee against global war. Efforts are made to dissipate the fear of an accidental, i.e. non-political, advent of a nuclear conflict with the contention that it can be ruled out by tightening governmental control of the launching of nuclear missiles and perfecting the system of government-to-government telephone communication. The proponents of this viewpoint urge that rather than banning the atom bomb we should accommodate ourselves to it.³ Their logic is that the removal of the nuclear threat would make the violation of peace possible again. This is a rejection of the fact that disarmament is the foundation of peace, not war.

The arguments that peace can only be maintained by fear of the horrors of a nuclear holocaust are aimed at protecting militarism's general interests, undermining the anti-nuclear protest, and suppressing the growing opposition to the fanning of the war threat and the escalation of the arms race. The preaching of "nuclear peace" obscures the sources of the war threat implicit in the policies pursued by aggressive militarist circles and closes the door to disarmament. This is an ideology justifying war preparations. The designation of this

preaching is to mislead public opinion.

A psychological strategy designed to prevent a nuclear catastrophe by whipping up fear of it is deduced from the argument that no political aim can be reconciled to the risk of a nuclear war. What is meant here is a substantiated fear, kept alive not by empty rhetoric or bluff but by an actual deployment of armed forces, by military preparedness. This basic consideration is embodied in the concept of a "deterrence" to war evolved by the American bourgeois theorists of a "nuclear peace." This concept is founded, as everybody knows, on the presumption that there is a "Soviet threat to the West." In actual fact no such threat exists. Aggression and nuclear war are alien to the fundamental principles of Soviet policy. Consequently, the political basis of concepts of this kind is vicious and false. These theorists recommend constantly stockpiling and perfecting nuclear weapons, claiming that this will preclude their use. But the purpose of this strategy is not to remove the threat of a global cataclysm but to perpetuate it, and it offers no alternative to universal destruction.

Nevertheless, it must be remembered that these arguments have a paralyzing effect on people in the NATO countries. For more than 30 years the contention that readiness for nuclear war is the only way to avert it has been used by the ruling circles in the USA and other imperialist countries as a cover for military preparations and, having drawn the world into an unprecedented arms race, they have brought humankind to the brink of global disaster.

The most significant development of the past few decades has been socialism's attainment of military strategic parity with imperialism; this involved considerable effort and outlays by the Soviet people and the peoples of other socialist countries. In the face of this new international reality, the exponents of "nuclear peace" began to reconsider the "intimidation" strategy: they now see it as mutually directed, as "mutual deterrence." This concept contains, as before, the misconception alleging that there is a need to block the "Soviet threat to the West" with war preparations. But this is, at the same time, recognition of the military strength of the Soviet Armed Forces, a powerful factor deterring the aggressive ambitions of imperialist reaction.

In their evaluation of the situation created by strategic equilibrium, some bourgeois theorists acknowledge that far from bringing any political advantage nuclear aggression would be suicidal. They agree that a winnable nuclear war is objectively unrealizable. Although they subscribe to the biased belief about the sources

of the war danger, they recognize that strategic parity has to be maintained in order to avoid a nuclear war. They declare that parity takes the edge off the armaments designated and suitable solely for a first, "disarming" strike, in other words, for denying to the other side the ability to retaliate.

It is indicative that although all the U.S. administrations from Truman to Reagan pledged commitment to "deterrence," the recommendations of their theorists were embodied in military planning with considerable deviations. Theorists speak of retaliation as a counter-measure, but the military doctrine of the USA and NATO is based on the first-use of nuclear weapons. Theorists speak of a "balance of fear," but the ruling circles of the USA want military superiority. Theorists say that a nuclear war is inconceivable in political terms, but U.S. President Reagan dreams of "star" wars, not only of terrestrial wars. In its military planning and actual deployment of armaments the Pentagon bases its calculations on the hope of destroying opposing strategic forces and thereby avoiding an inevitable response.

The present U.S. administration advances the doctrine of "fighting a nuclear war" as a supplement to the "deterrence" strategy alleging that this is needed in the event the latter does not work and a "Soviet invasion" becomes a reality. This very surmise is false and absurd, for the threat of a nuclear war emanates solely from imperialism's aggressive, ultra-reactionary quarters. The Soviet Union is doing all it can to prevent a nuclear war. It has committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Its military doctrine is defensive. The USSR is thus not endangering humankind with the threat of a nuclear war. Such a war can only break out as a result of a nuclear strike by the USA and other NATO countries against the USSR and its allies.

The doctrine of "fighting a nuclear war" is, essentially speaking, expressive of the U.S. administration's drive to upset the military strategic equilibrium. Imperialism's ultra-reactionary circles continue to camouflage their policy of increasing the nuclear threat with talk about "dependable deterrence." They are modifying the "deterrence" theory in such a way as to justify their adventurist policies. The main thing that the proponents of a "nuclear first-strike" find objectionable in "deterrence" is that it implies a "balance of fear" rather than one-sided intimidation. What Washington wants is a situation in which it can engage in one-sided intimidation, in nuclear blackmail in order to get political and military concessions from the Soviet Union and other countries.

Some clear-headed bourgeois quarters, who are worried by the policies of the present U.S. administration, believe that the trouble lies only in these "deviations" and that the way out can be provided by a "deterrence" divested of the Pentagon's "extremes."

This belief coalesces with a view that influences quite a few anti-war protesters.

According to that view, while it cannot ensure lasting and secure peace, "mutual deterrence" with its "balance of fear" is not merely a "lesser evil" than the Reagan doctrine of "fighting a nuclear war" but can serve as a factor of transition to such a peace if it is coupled to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament.

There are thus signs of a distinct demarcation among the NATO countries over the implementation of the "deterrence" strategy. The debate is over whether to continue basing this strategy on the arms race, as has hitherto been the case, or to move toward a lowering of the level of military parity. In this context it is debated in the anti-war movement whether "mutual deterrence" is in principle compatible with a reduction of the nuclear danger. The answer lies in political practice. It can be affirmative if the ruling circles of the imperialist powers show a desire for disarmament on the basis of equality and equal security and renounce their unrealizable projects for attaining military superiority in order to dictate their will to other states. Of the steps that could reduce the war danger the most significant would be NATO acceptance of the Soviet proposals for freezing nuclear arsenals, for substantially limiting and radically reducing these arsenals up to their total destruction, for preventing an arms race in outer space, for renouncing the first-use of nuclear weapons, and for the non-use of force by the military groups now confronting each other.

It would be unrealistic to expect a reduction of the nuclear threat other than on the basis of strategic parity. But to achieve such a reduction it is vital to move toward ever lower levels of nuclear confrontation. This the road to the stabilization of the international situation and to détente.

Third viewpoint: the growth of the nuclear threat can only lead to a universal catastrophe. Precisely a catastrophe and not "war" because the all-incinerating calamity of nuclear battles will leave no room for politics.

This is the view of a large segment of the anti-war protest, who reject as barren scholasticism the argument that "nuclear madness" is the means of proving one's case.

The contention that a nuclear clash would

not be a war in the proper sense is by no means groundless. Indeed, the understanding of wars, even of those that assume extreme, total forms, always implies the defeat of the armed forces of the enemy, of the enemy's forcible disarmament. These include wars of attrition, when at stake are the political being and even physical existence of one nation or another. But does a nuclear collision fit into this, it would seem, absolute limit of the use of force? Analysts of the nuclear threat draw attention to a paradox of a possible nuclear war. Long before the sides exhaust their potential for military resistance, each will have nobody to defend and nuclear battles would continue over depopulated countries.⁴

A group of U.S. academics headed by the biologist Paul Ehrlich and the astrophysicist Carl Sagan believes that in view of the existing nuclear potential the threshold of a global catastrophe is ominously low. It is so low that a nuclear attack would be suicidal for the attacking side even without the inescapable retaliation. The use of only a fraction of the available nuclear warheads would, according to these academics, have the following long-term consequences: the smoke from conflagrations would cover the sky and block more than 90 per cent of sunlight; temperatures would remain below freezing point even in summer, giving bodies of water a sheet of ice up to a meter thick and bringing a "nuclear winter" that would cut short many vital processes sustaining life. Darkness and cold would be complemented by another disaster: the destruction of roughly 50 per cent of the stratosphere's ozone layer that protects life on earth from deadly ultraviolet solar radiation. Added to this would be radioactive contamination. As a result, the American ecologist George Woodwell sums up, the potential effects would extend even to the extermination of *Homo sapiens*.

Carl von Clausewitz once wrote that war has meaning in politics if it remains an act of violence solely for imposing peace terms on an enemy. But have not the instruments of nuclear war outgrown this objective? Who and on whom would there be to impose a will with civilization lying in ashes and human life totally extinguished?

One can go on endlessly asking questions in this vein. But what is the conclusion to be drawn? It is that war between the nuclear powers would have no political consummation. Having lost all rational political content, war would be a meaningless and aimless all-destroying nuclear rampage.

In other words, nations can have political relations only if there is peace between the

nuclear powers. Reason rebels against resort to nuclear war. This resort will yield nothing, for it will spell out the end of all government politics and the beginning of a universal catastrophe from which there will be no return to life.

On war that has become unmanageable. In considering the theoretical background of these views, it must be recalled that long before the appearance of nuclear weapons Clausewitz analyzed the possibility of a rupture between war and politics.

If, he philosophized, war were "a complete, totally uninhibited and absolute manifestation of violence, such as we defined it on the basis of an abstract understanding, it would from its outset directly take the place of the politics that had given rise to it, as something quite independent of these politics. War would oust politics and, in keeping with its own laws, would, like an exploded mine, not lend itself to any management, to any direction, and would be dependent on the organization given it in the period of preparation."⁵

The "ousting of politics by war" and "war independent of politics" — these products of Clausewitz's philosophical meditations seem to acquire real shape in the visions of a nuclear catastrophe.

It is appropriate to recall these points made by Clausewitz when relative to nuclear war doubt is cast on the credibility of his well-known formula that war is the "continuation of politics." These doubts and negations are evidence of a striving to separate nuclear war, on account of its distinctive characteristics, from the policies of governments and classes. As a result, the responsibility for creating the nuclear threat is shifted from imperialism's policies to, for example, scientific and technological progress, the invention of nuclear weapons, the existence of nuclear capabilities, and so forth.

Of course, nuclear missiles have significantly influenced the relationship between politics and war. For instance, the links of a nuclear war to politics would not have the flexibility inherent in "conventional" wars. In the latter case there could be modifications of the political objectives and even of the character of hostilities: just wars could evolve into unjust wars, and so on. There was the possibility of peace politically formalizing the results of the conflict. Here politics, which had prepared and sparked the war, would predetermine everything. But a nuclear war can be neither "rational" nor "manageable." It would get out of political control and direction, bringing about a universal catastrophe (and in this sense it

would be independent of the political aspirations of the belligerents).

Given everything that distinguishes it from "conventional wars," nuclear war is a political phenomenon in terms of its sources and essence. Its fundamental earmarks (catastrophic consequences, the impossibility of winning an armed confrontation) are programmed precisely by the policy pursued on the eve of a possible conflict and depend on a concrete deployment of armaments and not merely on the properties of nuclear weapons as such, in isolation of that policy.

After reading Clausewitz, Lenin remarked: "Seemingness is not reality. The more distinct a war is in political terms the more 'warrish' it seems to be."⁶

This remark sheds light also on a contradiction encountered by analysts of the nuclear threat. It is that the empirical vision that we have of a possible war — that it would be unmanageable, that it would invalidate all political calculations, that it would spell out catastrophe, and so on — may, on account of the sharp contrast with the character of "traditional" wars, be mistaken for its actual in-depth content. It would seem that since all the foundations of civilization and biological life would crumble, there is nothing political in the character of a nuclear catastrophe. What in comparison with this tragedy for humankind is politics with any of its objectives? Yet to show the essence of a nuclear catastrophe and understand why and how it can happen there is only one source to turn to, and it is present-day world politics.

In the anti-nuclear movement many people see the danger of war in the world's overkill stockpiles of weapons, the arms race, and the confrontation of military blocs. This vision is consistent with the true picture of international relations. But it does not give an understanding of the actual mainsprings of the war threat, for these are not always visible on the surface of world politics.

The nuclear threat was created by imperialism, nobody else. It is being escalated by the policies now pursued by the most aggressive, reactionary circles, chiefly of U.S. imperialism; they are openly proclaiming that it is their political aim to destroy the "entire" socialist community; they are endeavoring to retrieve the positions lost by imperialism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The course steered by the U.S. administration has led to a growth of the nuclear threat, to dangerous military and political tension in the world.

A nuclear war would signify not a change in the objectives of this imperialist policy but a

criminal attempt to attain them by violence. And the circumstance that this attempt would be suicidal and lead to the extermination of billions of people reveals the monstrous inner logic of the danger generated by imperialism and the policy it is pursuing today.

For the attainment of its political aims imperialism objectively no longer has the choice between peaceful and military means; the road of nuclear war can only lead to catastrophe. But this road still remains to be closed — the decision on war does not cease to be a continuation of imperialist politics: the threat of war is real, and disaster can be a fact. The question is, therefore, how to turn politics into a negation of war and the nuclear threat.

Fourth viewpoint: some of its basic propositions have been dealt with in our critical analysis of the first three viewpoints.

The nuclear threat has not changed the fundamental relationship between war and the present-day policies of imperialism. With U.S. imperialism at their head, the aggressive, ultra-reactionary circles continue to see nuclear war as an instrument of their policies. In this lies the whole essence of the problem we are considering. It can be resolved by getting all governments to renounce nuclear war, building this renunciation into the entire system of international relations, and reinforcing and guaranteeing it materially — by disarmament.

As regards the socialist community countries they unconditionally reject all variants of a nuclear war as a means of attaining socialism's political aims. Nuclear war is not a continuation of socialist policy, which is essentially anti-war, nor does it come from that policy. The continuation of the policies of the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries is peace, the peaceful coexistence of states. It is directed toward removing the nuclear threat, toward preventing a slide into war.

Let us note some specifics on this stand, which is shared by Marxist analysts.

Here, in the evaluation of the link of politics with war, the focus shifts from contemplation of politics "generally" to the identification of the actual political content of the present threat of war: whose and what policies are creating it? In this lies the essential distinction between the Marxist and the bourgeois formulation of the problem. In considering the relationship between nuclear war and politics, bourgeois ideologists emasculate politics of its class content, identifying it with the national interest, and so on. This is precisely why some of them do not see, or deny that the nuclear threat comes not from any policy but solely from that of imperialism's ultra-reactionary circles.

While others, by arguing that Clausewitz's formula is obsolete in the nuclear age, try to make people believe that imperialism has renounced war.

Take another important methodological factor. In defining their attitude to each specific war, the Marxists have always distinguished on which side this war was just or unjust. But they have never limited themselves to this. Such a limitation is inherent in, for example, the theological concepts of a "just" war, in which a formal, non-class interpretation is put on "justice." By contrast, the Marxists insist on an objective evaluation of the historical role of each war, an evaluation which reveals the class forces involved in the war and the progressive or reactionary character of its aims and outcome.

There have been reactionary wars, which, despite being just on the part of those compelled to repulse aggression, paralyzed social development for decades and centuries, and led to the fall of distinctive civilizations. However, nuclear war cannot be equated to even such wars, which had irreparably tragic consequences for entire peoples. Despite such wars the wheel of history continued turning. But a nuclear war would imperil not merely countries and social systems — imperialism and socialism — but the life of humankind. No matter what just counter-measures are taken, they will not change this anti-social essence of such a war once it breaks out. The nature of nuclear missile weaponry is such that it cannot be used only against some government, class, social system, or country. It hits all the systems sustaining life on earth. To reason along any other line in defending the attitude to nuclear war would mean to wander blindly in a labyrinth of untruth.

There is only one conclusion to be drawn, and it is that *nuclear war cannot be permitted*. On this issue there can be neither reservations nor vagueness. In the nuclear age the security of any state or people demands the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, the removal of the threat of such a catastrophe.

A significant factor for the preservation of peace in the present situation is to prevent the USA and the other NATO countries from upsetting the military equilibrium. This is the foundation on which the arms race, the nuclear arms race in the first place, can be stopped and the threat of nuclear war reduced and ultimately removed. That is why the peace movement is now insisting that the USA and the other NATO countries show a readiness to return to the situation existing before American medium-range missiles began to be deployed

in Europe. That would pave the way for a radical settlement by negotiation of the question of nuclear armaments in Europe and the world as a whole.

* * *

In assessing Clausewitz's famous words that "war is the continuation of politics by other means," Lenin wrote: "Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views on the significance of any war. It was from this viewpoint that Marx and Engels always regarded the various wars."⁷ This has always been Lenin's own stand.

This proposition remains the theoretical foundation of the views of Marxists in their assessments of the nuclear threat. This approach not only allows revealing the decisive role played by socio-political factors both in creating and in averting the terrible threat hanging over humankind. It also helps to see that the removal of the nuclear threat, which is imperialist in essence, has become the pivot of all world politics. The struggle against this threat is resolving the main political contra-

diction of the modern world — between the anti-social, narrow-class motivations of imperialist reaction and the inextinguishable human striving for life, of which socialism and all the other peace forces are the spokesmen in our epoch.

Working group of the WMR Commission
for General Theoretical Problems:
Gancho Ganev, Yevgeny Kazar,
Sarada Mitra

1. D.F. Ustinov, *Avert the Threat of Nuclear War*, Moscow, 1982, p. 11 (in Russian).
2. *Information Bulletin*, April 1984.
3. This is dealt with at length in WMR, No. 10, 1981.
4. J. Shell, *The Fate of the Earth*, New York, 1982, p. 198.
5. Carl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege*, Berlin, 1957, p. 33. Immediately following this passage, he notes: "This is how this has hitherto been seen every time a lack of harmony between politics and the conduct of war led to attempts at theoretical identification. But reality is different, and this notion is basically and totally misconceived." These words sum up the lessons of the history of the wars reviewed by Clausewitz, and can be applied to all the subsequent wars known to us.
6. *Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. XII, p. 397 (in Russian).
7. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 304.



Representative democracy at work

REALITIES OF SOCIALISM

Readers in many countries are asking for information about realities in socialist countries. They want not only theoretical generalizations of their experience but also details about the life of the new world — full-blooded, many-sided, with all its social advantages, achievements and unresolved problems. They want concrete examples so as to have a better understanding of the shape being acquired in practice by key propositions of scientific communism and the political economy of socialism.

In response to these requests WMR is herewith beginning the publication of selections of publicistic and information material about the realities, the day-to-day life of socialist society. The first of these selections is a reply to a letter from communist deputies of communal parliaments of the FRG Anjelika

Manzke (Hattingen) and Ulli Stang (Marburg) and city councillors Michael Plath (Hannover) and Willi Ebbinghaus (Gevelsberg), who have asked for information about local representative bodies in a socialist country.

Given the similarity of the basic principles underlying political life in the socialist world, its manifestations differ markedly, depending on the specifics of historical development, the national psychology, the country's size, the ethnic composition of the population, and many other important factors. For that reason information on the work of local representative bodies in only one country cannot give a full and exact picture. WMR offers four contributions: from the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary. We showed the authors the letter from the FRG and each in his/her own way, directly or indirectly, answers the questions posed in it. We give the full text of these questions in the first interview.

WORK AND PROBLEMS OF AN ELECTIVE BODY

Dr. Gunter Wirth (GDR)¹

1. In 1984 there were elections to the parliaments of five *lander* in the FRG and to local representative bodies in the GDR. How do the election campaigns differ in a socialist and a bourgeois country? How do the deputies report on their work? How are candidates selected and nominated? What are their meetings with their constituents like? How are election programs drawn up?

This is a wide spectrum of questions. To answer them exhaustively would entail showing in detail the profound distinctions between bourgeois and socialist democracy. This cannot be done in a short interview, but the point I shall make is that in fact, on account of the different understanding of democracy and, consequently, of the different way it is translated into life, it is hard to draw a parallel between elections in socialist countries and the election battles in capitalist states. The elections in disparate social systems cannot be measured with one and the same yardstick, just as this cannot be done in the case of the armed forces, the state apparatus, and other outwardly similar institutions.

How do the election campaigns differ in bourgeois and socialist countries? First, our society evaluates how democratic a political system is, not by the exchange of rhetoric between proponents of different parties or by whether the elector receives several ballot-papers (according to the number of political parties participating in the elections) or only one with the names of the candidates of several parties. Our judgment is formed chiefly by whose interests the deputy represents, by whether or not he or she expresses the will of the majority of the people, cooperates with and reports to his or her constituents, and whether or not a deputy who has not justified the trust placed in him or her can be recalled.

Second, in the representative bodies at all levels — in the People's Chamber (the highest legislative organ of the GDR) and local assemblies of deputies (municipal councils) — the mandates are distributed not only among the five political parties functioning in the GDR but also among trade unions, youth and women's organizations, and the union of creative intellectuals, the Kulturbund. The mass organizations have, for instance, 33 per cent of the seats in the People's Chamber and 25 per cent of the seats in the Berlin City Assembly of Deputies.

Third, our deputies are not professional politicians, but ordinary citizens from all walks of

life. They fulfil their public work alongside their main work. For instance, the Standing Commission for Cultural Affairs² of the Berlin City Assembly of Deputies includes actors, artists, composers, the General Director of the German State Library, the Director of the Bureau for the Annual Berlin Arts Festival, a woman factory worker, a lawyer, a physician, a saleswoman, a technologist and a newspaper editor. I have been chairman of this standing commission since 1968, and of the two vice-chairmen one is the secretary for cultural policy of an SED district committee and the other is a non-party authoress.

Fourth, our deputies are selected not as a result of any backstage manipulations, as is usually the case in capitalist states, but with the broadest participation of the people themselves. In our country freedom of choice and democracy spell out not only the right to vote for or against but also the opportunity to participate in the nomination of a candidate. After a party or public organization has nominated a candidate, the nomination is submitted for discussion to the collective where the candidate works and to the party, public organization, or creative union to which he or she belongs. Colleagues debate (sometimes at several meetings) the merits of the candidate and if the nomination is approved it is passed on to the National Front of the GDR.³ All nominations are then considered by the Front's committees at open meetings or conferences of representatives of constituents,⁴ who approve or decline them and establish the order in which they are listed in the ballot-papers. This is followed by meetings at factories and residential neighborhoods, and in parties and mass and cultural organizations, and creative unions, at which the outgoing deputies report on their work and new candidates are introduced. At this stage of the election process any citizen may, stating his or her reasons, propose striking a candidate off the list. In our country candidates are thus selected, nominated, and checked in public in the presence of such a large number of people that persons who do not have the confidence of constituents have practically no possibility of getting onto the lists of candidates. Election day witnesses only the completion of the election campaign — free, universal, direct, and equal voting by secret ballot. A candidate is recognized as having been elected upon the receipt of more than half of the votes. But since the ballot-paper always contains the names of more candidates than the number of the mandates a given electoral district can grant, the question of who becomes the deputy and who is named as his or her stand-in⁵ is decided by the order in

which the candidates are listed on the ballot-paper.

Fifth, and last, our democracy's cardinal advantage is that there is continuous close contact between constituents and their deputies *after* elections. Deputies solicit active assistance from citizens and the latter, for their part, are in most cases prepared to extend such assistance. Deputies are obliged to report regularly to their constituents, receive them, hear their questions, wishes and statements, and help to satisfy their requirements.

2. *What are a deputy's relations with the city administration? What is the class significance of the words: "The parliament is a working body" and "unity between the adoption and implementation of decisions and verification of compliance with them"? What basic principles of the socialist state does this practice of administration put into effect?*

We have good relations with the city administration, i.e., the Berlin Magistrat. The Chief Burgomaster and members of the Magistrat are elected by the City Assembly of Deputies and they are accountable to it. The meaning of "working bodies" and "unity between the adoption and implementation of decisions and verification of compliance with them" may be illustrated with the example of our commission. As deputies, its members are responsible for all aspects of the GDR capital's development: supplies for the population, health care, social security, road construction, development of the suburban communications network, public education, recreation, environmental protection and so on. As members of the City Assembly of Deputies we take part in discussing and adopting the budget, the plans of the capital's economic, social and cultural development and construction. We elect (or recall) the chairman of the people's court, judges and assessors, and approve the nomination of the chairmen and members of the workers' and peasants' inspection committee, etc.

Deputies have the right to submit draft decisions and put questions to the people's representative body, the Magistrat or commissions and, of course, send inquiries to all specialized administrative bodies and heads of factories and offices on the territory of the GDR capital and require them to answer all inquiries; by law an answer or decision to any question must be given within 10 days. Deputies thus take part in the decision-making process relating to the city's development and participate in verifying compliance with decisions.

Further, the prime duty of members of the Standing Commission for Cultural Affairs is to

facilitate the development of Berlin's cultural life. For this purpose a segment of the commission's members work in the *Aktiv*⁶ which systematically studies the state of amateur art activities at large enterprises and inspects houses of culture. Other members of the commission help to improve the work of youth clubs and make their activities more attractive. Nor do we ignore senior citizens: for instance, one of the commission's most recent conferences was held in a newly-built home for elderly people. It was decided to instruct city councillors for cultural affairs, health care and social security to draw up, in cooperation with the Berlin Concert Board, a varied program of functions for such homes.

We regularly hold away-conferences with the management and trade union activists of theaters, movie houses, the Zoo, the recreation park, the Brandenburg Museum, and the city library. The commission always makes sure to verify whether the problems raised at its most recent away-session have been resolved (as a rule, we have such away-conferences at each of these facilities once every two years). The discussion covers not only their work but also the living and working conditions of their staffs.

Further, the commission looks into some aspects of the city's development: verifies progress in building cultural institutions (current projects are the Berlin Concert House and premises for the Friedrichstadtpalast Variety Theater), paying special attention to the restoration of architectural monuments (during the past eight years this matter was considered at five conferences).

Our work has led to the settlement of quite a few urgent problems.

3. *Who delineates the duties of the commissions? Does anybody sanction their work and to whom are they accountable?*

Our commission decides its own area of work. Here it takes into account the plans of the City Assembly of Deputies and the Culture Department of the Magistrat, the regularity of its visits to cultural institutions (which I have mentioned earlier), and also nationally important social and cultural events. We work in accordance with the half-yearly plans that we draw up ourselves. The commission has 10-12 sittings annually, some with deputies of other standing commissions or with the chairmen of analogous commissions of the nine Berlin district assemblies of deputies.

We are accountable, first and foremost, to our own constituents. Deputies report on their work to meetings of Berliners in residential neighborhoods, at the place of work, and at meetings with members of political parties and

mass organizations holding representative mandates. The commission organizes collective reports from time to time (the latest was at the Maxim Gorky Theater). Meetings of this kind are held mainly before elections. Since the commission is an organ of the City Assembly of Deputies, its members are, naturally, responsible to the City Assembly and are accountable to it. Immense significance is attached to the work deputies are doing with applications from citizens and to the analyses they make of their talks with them during reception hours.

4. *Is compensation given for any loss in pay incurred as a result of the deputies spending their time for fulfilling their duties? Are deputies released from their main work for any length of time to enable them effectively to carry out their mandates as deputies?*

Yes. There is a special law safeguarding deputies against any loss in pay. In addition they receive a monthly remuneration of 50 marks (the commission chairman gets 70 marks).⁷ Deputies try to minimize the time they spend away from their workplace, doing so only when it is absolutely necessary. They fulfil their duties as deputies chiefly in their spare time.

5. *What rights or, perhaps, benefits do deputies have in public life and their workplace compared with rank-and-file citizens?*

None. As deputies they are entitled to use the capital's transport facilities free of charge, nothing more.

6. *How and where can deputies get the special knowledge so they can expertly discuss and decide the problems that arise?*

This is a very important question. First, in their public work they use the Magistrat's reports to plenary meetings of the City Assembly of Deputies and also special information material and studies. Second, on individual matters (in our case — cultural policy) the relevant department of the Berlin Magistrat issues information regularly on current affairs and on upcoming decisions. We discuss these documents, state our attitude to them and, for our part, likewise raise questions, which subsequently influences the work of the state apparatus. Moreover, in Berlin the district academy runs qualification upgrading courses for leading cadre at which deputies can study the problems they are interested in. Lastly, deputies, their stand-ins, and experts working in commissions are helped to obtain information and broaden their knowledge by the parties and mass organizations that had nominated them. In the case of our commission these are the SED, the Christian Democratic Union, the National Democratic and Liberal Democratic parties of Germany, the Kulturbund, and the

Democratic Women's Union of Germany.

7. *Do you have instances of a clash of opinions? How do you act in such cases?*

On specific issues and methods of work, opinions may differ of course. In our commission, for example, the debates between deputies and the talks with officials of the Culture Department of the Magistrat and with heads of factories and offices help to draw up joint draft decisions. These are then submitted to the City Assembly of Deputies and the Magistrat, for the commission is not empowered to pass decisions. Here account is also taken of suggestions from party and mass organizations.

Commission chairmen or representatives are sometimes invited to meetings of the Magistrat to state their attitude to a proposed project. However, there have been cases (rarely, let it be said) of opinions differing so much that no satisfactory decision could be found.

There is another side to this: it has become customary for us to exchange views on the international situation from time to time, especially during acute political situations. In this matter our views coincide. All deputies, regardless of ideological or religious persuasions, consistently uphold the peace policy of the GDR.

8. *How does the alliance policy of the party of the working class influence the work of deputies?*

Permit me to return to my first point. The work of deputies in commissions is one of the many sectors in which the SED's alliance policy manifests itself. In our commission this is seen, first, in the cooperation among all the forces united in the National Front of the GDR and, second, in the maintenance of the alliance of the Berlin workers with people following the creative professions and with other intellectuals. From this standpoint our city has noteworthy traditions. I feel it is symbolic that a political personality like Otto Nuschke, a bourgeois democrat who was a deputy in the Weimar Constituent Assembly, which in 1919 passed the constitution of the German Empire, substantiated at the first national congress of the National Front in 1950 the political expediency of the new election procedure (voting in accordance with a joint list of candidates) and thereby expressed the essence of our socialist democracy.

In 1951, remembering, on the one hand, the dismal experience of the Weimar Republic and, on the other, the cooperation among the communists, social democrats, members of bourgeois-democratic organizations and politically uncommitted people in the Resistance movement, the five parties and the mass

organizations of the GDR agreed that at elections they would no longer act in rivalry against each other. They go to elections with a common program and a common list of National Front candidates. What for those times was a bold attempt to practise democracy in a new way is now time-tested. In the GDR today there are no longer antagonistic class contradictions and opposing aims of social development and, hence, no foundation for political struggle. The common lists of candidates for deputies are part and parcel of the alliance policy and, at the same time, a dependable guarantee of the participation of all the working classes and strata of the GDR — under the leadership of the working class and its party — in the exercise of power, in influencing affairs of state and society.

As regards the alliance between the working class and the intelligentsia, let me recall two speeches: one was delivered on the eve of the First World War by Karl Liebknecht, deputy of the Berlin City Assembly and deputy of the Prussian Landtag; the other was made at the close of the 1920s by Wilhelm Pieck, deputy of the same assembly and a communist, who was to become the first President of the German Democratic Republic. Both spoke of communal cultural policy and both urged the satisfaction of the cultural requirements of the working population (to use the exact words spoken by Karl Liebknecht) and called for a democratic culture.

We see our work of strengthening socialist democracy and promoting socialist culture as an important task and a contribution to peace and the people's social confidence, welfare and happiness.

1. Deputy of the Berlin City Assembly of Deputies and Chairman of the Standing Commission for Cultural Affairs, Dr. Gunter Wirth is a member of the Presidium of the Central Board of the Christian Democratic Union and Vice-President of the Kulturbund of the GDR. He is editor-in-chief of the evangelical journal *Standpunkt*.

2. Commissions are organs of local representative bodies and they organize the work of deputies in the interim between sessions. Where long-term and systematic work is required of deputies, standing commissions are set up for the entire period of the powers vested in them. Single assignments are carried out by commissions formed for a short period with a specific aim. — Ed.

3. Historically, it grew on the basis of a bloc of anti-fascist democratic parties and mass organizations formed in 1945 of the five political parties which continue to function in the GDR as well as the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions, the Free German Youth, the Democratic Women's League of Germany, and the Kulturbund of the GDR. In the National Front they enjoy equal rights and have an equal number of representatives in the National Council of the National Front and also in the area, district, city and other committees of that organization. Moreover, it includes also 20 more unions (according to

interests, professions, and so on) and non-party people. The Front's 17,500 elective committees have more than 235,000 members. This is now the numerically largest and politically broadest popular movement in the country. One of its functions is to conduct elections, it draws up the final lists of the candidates of political parties and mass organizations and submits the election program for nation-wide discussion. — Ed.

4. Nominations are submitted for endorsement to conferences of representatives of one or several constituencies. Moreover, these conferences consider the issues on which the future deputy should focus attention. — Ed.

5. A candidate who has received the percentage of votes required by law but remains without a mandate becomes the stand-in for the successful candidate so as to take his or her place in the event he or she drops out for some reason. Stand-ins are enlisted into the work of commissions; as regards their pay and the time needed to fulfil their public work, they enjoy the same rights as deputies. — Ed.

6. The Aktiv consists of standing or temporary working groups formed by standing commissions and functioning under the leadership of deputies. Also, the Aktiv includes stand-in deputies and many other knowledgeable citizens, who are thereby drawn into direct participation in the work of the people's representative bodies. — Ed.

7. For the sake of comparison: the monthly pay of factory and office workers in the republic averaged 1,075 marks in 1982. — Ed.

WHO RUNS THE TOWN?

A total of 196,469 National Front¹ candidates were elected to local representative bodies in Czechoslovakia in 1981. The composition of the town, rural community, and district national committees is roughly consistent with society's social, ethnic and age structure. Almost two-thirds of the deputies are employed in material production, and of these over 40 per cent are factory workers and some 20 per cent are peasants. Roughly one-third of the deputies are women, and another third are young people under 35.²

Our report uses the example of a small town, which won the population center improvements contest in Czechoslovakia, to illustrate the day-to-day work of a town national committee and of its deputies.

The small town of Horovice with its population of some 7,000 is situated 50 kilometers away from Prague. Small and spruce, it is framed in the verdure of the surrounding woods and fields of wheat.

Jan Neruda, the celebrated 19th-century Czech poet, called this vicinity a place of poverty. In his day, both in the town and the district around it, all the men toiled from dawn to dusk making nails. The unceasing beat of their hammers, the poet wrote, was never broken by song. Songs had departed from this land.

Neruda's description became obsolete long

ago. The story of those days can only be found in the time-yellowed pages of documents on display in the local museum. This place of poverty has become a fertile, rich land, which is known far beyond Czechoslovakia. The diesel engines manufactured by CKD, the largest local industrial facility, are exported to 42 countries.

The years of socialist construction have been the period of the town's most rapid growth. The small bleak houses have given way to neighborhoods consisting of modern pre-fabricated apartment houses and cosy villas. In the past 15 years alone, Horovice has built a new hospital, a large sports complex with an indoor swimming pool, a winter stadium, tennis courts, and football pitches. The old central square has undergone a change. It is adorned with decorative bushes and in summer it is bright with flowers.

Horovice's residents are proud of their town and are constantly looking for ways of making it more attractive. Their suggestions are collected by the national committee, the local representative organ of the people's power through which citizens participate in the town's administration.³ The committee's chairman Zdenek Samec relates that the things that the inhabitants want for their town are numberless. Suggestions keep pouring in and if anybody thinks nothing is done about them he is wrong. The town national committee gives serious attention to what the people say. Hardly any of its plenary meetings (which may be attended by any citizen) goes by without a discussion and settlement of matters important for the work and life of the town's inhabitants.

These meetings are usually prepared by deputies together with commission members and other activists. The deputies explain to people the committee's concrete suggestions and together with them think of how to put them into effect. On the committee chairman's table are plans, mock-ups, and designs for the town's development. Architects, designers, and geodesists help to turn them into reality, but Horovice's future is being built by its inhabitants in the first place.

Deputies

The town national committee consists of 61 deputies. More than half work at local factories. Among them are members of agricultural co-operatives, doctors, teachers, managers and pensioners. One-third of the deputies are women and young people. Among the committee members there are communists and non-party people, members of organizations of the National Front. Some are serving their second or even third term as deputies (the term of

office is five years); these have won the esteem and confidence of their fellow townspeople.

One of them is Milena Vitova, a factory worker, who has been a deputy of the town national committee for nearly 15 years. She has considerable experience of representing her constituents in an organ of state power, of working to satisfy their needs in keeping with the interests of society as a whole. She has been a member of several commissions set up to verify compliance with the committee's decisions. These commissions consist not only of deputies but also of activists. They are a sort of headquarters for volunteers helping to run the town. One of the commissions of which Milena was a member was the school commission that deals mainly with matters relating to education and the building of schools. As a member of that commission she was kept busy by young mothers requesting nursery school accommodations for their children. She backed these requests at plenary meetings of the national committee and in its various commissions. In the end the committee resolved to build one more nursery school. There are now four in the town and these accommodate 320 children.

"In our town," says Milena, "we have all the conditions for the work of deputies. I, for one, get all the information and documents I need about the activities of the national committee and of the problems that arise at the factories — we cooperate closely with their mass organizations. When this is necessitated by the interests of constituents I send inquiries to the relevant town organ.

"I regard the powers vested in a deputy as being three-tiered. First come the relations between people. Deputies have to be constantly informed of what their constituents think, their problems and their needs, and they should act accordingly. This is rewarded with affection on the part of the people for their town. We give much of our attention to elderly folk: they are often visited by three paid social workers and also by members of the Youth League, who help these people whenever this help is required.

"Then there is the economic side to our work. I am now a member of the commission on trade. In the current five-year period our aim is to improve services by building and reconstructing several retail outlets because at public meetings and in the citizens' committees⁴ many people criticized the retail network. But my fellow townspeople not only criticize; they also act. For instance, citizens' committee No. 6 has undertaken to enlist townspeople to build a small retail outlet in the area under its jurisdiction. It is now almost finished.

"The commission makes sure that the retail network offers people better and more efficient services. Moreover, together with the consumers' council we are monitoring the work of retail outlets. Minor violations are examined on the spot with the manager. The council of the national committee is informed of the more serious offenses and it determines the measure of punishment.

"Lastly, the political influence brought to bear by a deputy is very significant indeed. At the elections constituents express their confidence in us, and we are accountable to them. They have the right to verify how we serve their interests. Deputies explain the aims and actions of the national committee, and heed the voice of the people. They attend public meetings, where people state their opinions. At these meetings deputies invariably take the floor to enlist the people into the fulfillment of the election program."

"This program," says Jaroslav Rehtacek, Chairman of the Horovice Committee of the CPCz (this is a non-paid office; he heads a department of the Jednota Consumers' Co-operative), "is essentially a political document. It says what has to be done and built for the town in the next five years. In all cases it is the product of suggestions from the townspeople about what the town needs. Such a program is adopted at meetings of voters, and each can join in carrying it out. The responsibility for many of the projects is borne by the staffs of enterprises. Compliance is verified at conferences of managers and chairmen of trade union committees and by party organs.

"The program attaches importance to the inculcation of a scientific world view, to the creation of conditions for molding the socialist individual. For that reason it contains points such as talks about books and meetings with foremost workers, production innovators, and artists."

The election program is regularly specified: in the socialist commitments we record what is to be completed in the current year. These commitments are not mere wishes: they rest on the commitments of individual citizens and entire staffs. This takes us to the work of the citizens' committees and mass organizations of the National Front.

Citizens' committees

They help the national committee, being metaphorically speaking, an additional pair of hands for it. It depends mainly on them how energetically the townspeople of Horovice fulfil the election program and their socialist commitments. Why do people undertake this

work at all? This question is answered by Josef Hampl, Chairman of Citizens' Committee No. 11 and a worker at the local engineering plant. He is neither a deputy nor a communist. He loves his town and is for that reason prepared to work voluntarily for its good.

"At the beginning of the year," he said, "the national committee sets us several tasks. They're not all that big, but they contribute to adorning our town and district, to concern for elderly and helpless people, and to reinforcing public order. Along with deputies we go from door to door, talking to every family, telling it of our plans, and asking whether it would join in carrying out what we have planned. In reply people usually take the paper with the commitments and write down how much time they are willing to devote to voluntary work on Sundays. Moreover, the citizens' committee keeps a list of people who will turn 65 or 70 this year, to say nothing of the jubilees of older folk. Together with the deputy we visit the person concerned to congratulate him or her and present a gift. People are deeply moved by this concern and attention from the public.

"At the beginning and end of the year meetings are held in the district and these are usually attended by a good half of the constituents. At these meetings, we explain how commitments should be carried out. For example, one of our streets was not paved and did not even have a sidewalk. It was proposed that these omissions should be made good. The national committee provided the curb-stones and we wasted no time in setting a day of voluntary work. Eighty people turned up. The curb-stones were laid and some time later the street was paved with asphalt and roses were planted. We are also helping at big town projects.

"But these voluntary work days are not our sole pre-occupation. The citizens' committees organize, for example, quiz contests about the town's past and present, musical events, and contests for the adornment of the town (everything is taken into consideration in naming the winner: the tidiness around his or her house, the state of the front garden, the trees, and the verdure in the streets). This unites the people and prompts them to take an active part in the town's affairs."

Key to the heart

This key always opens something new in people, and without it there can be no progress in life.

When schoolteacher Blanka Polakova, deputy of the town national committee, stood for re-election (it was by far not the first time), she talked to her constituents and reported to them

on her work. This is usual. Whenever she has to take the floor she is nervous, but the moment she begins to speak she is in full control. There is much that she has to say. In 1959 she was asked if she would like to work in the national committee's commission for civil affairs, of whose existence she had never before even heard. She justified the trust that was placed in her: it was due to her efforts and those of Vlasta Skrobakova, a staffer of the town committee who has been in charge of the Horovice register of births, marriages and deaths for almost 50 years, that the commission became one of the most active in the region.

Polakova's report to constituents was the speech of a person devoted to her work. Can one count the thousands of unregistered hours or measure the labor and nervous strain that have to be put even today, to say nothing of the early 1960s, in each seemingly ordinary project of the commission. But the results are in full view.

Some years ago the ceremony of welcoming each newborn citizen of the town was attended by only half of the 20 persons usually invited: today everybody attends. To the accompaniment of the measured notes of a march the young parents take their place in the ancient armchairs in Horovice Castle. The ritual symbolizes the concern that the socialist state shows for every newborn child and for its mother and father.

"This ceremony has become important to the people," Polakova said. "We write to the parents' workplace to inform the management when the ceremony is to take place. The management always sends representatives to join in the congratulations.

"Ceremonies also adorn events in the life of the rising generation as the presentation of the red Young Pioneer tie and a young person's passport, or when young men and girls take their first jobs.

"Warm concern is also shown for people who are in the autumn of life. For example, on Christmas eve, when the members of every family exchange presents, parties are organized for pensioners. Young Pioneers are always guests at these events and they bring gifts and recite poems. The pensioners tell them of their own young years, when life was not at all easy. For the young people these stories are a textbook of life."

It would be hard to list everything that the civil affairs commission does to help create new, socialist traditions. Blanka Polakova was returned as deputy of the town national committee at the latest elections. This surprised

nobody: people showed their appreciation of her work.

At the 16th congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in 1981 it was noted that "we see democracy's significance and content in the people's ever growing participation in the country's administration, in the administration of state and public affairs, in the day-to-day settlement of problems of factories and other enterprises, of towns and villages. This is true democracy, democracy of the working people, and we shall continue to consolidate and defend it."⁵

As in towns throughout Czechoslovakia, in Horovice these words of the party document get a tangible content. As soon as they appeared the national committees were given every attention from the Communist Party, which sees them as one of the pillars of the socialist system. The Horovice Town Party Committee regularly discusses the work of the communists in the national committee, helping to enhance the efficiency of this work to satisfy the needs of the townspeople more and more fully. Here, as everywhere else in this socialist country, the working people are the sole sovereign masters.

Vaclav Pergl
Czechoslovak journalist

1. The association of parties and mass organizations of Czechoslovakia reinforcing the alliance between urban and rural working people under the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. It was set up in 1945 to consolidate the anti-fascist forces. It organizes elections of representative bodies of all levels in the country. — Ed.

2. *Rude pravo*, June 8 and 9, 1981.

3. National committees sprang up in 1945 as organs of the new revolutionary power in the struggle for national and social liberation. — Ed.

4. Town self-administrative bodies whose jurisdiction usually embraces one or two streets. — Ed.

5. XVI. sjezd Komunistické strany Československa, Prague, 1981, p. 41.

REPRESENTATION AND THE LAW

In December 1983 the parliament of the Hungarian People's Republic passed a new electoral law that summed up the quests that began in this sphere back in the 1970s. Already then a step had been taken to improve the election system. It was prompted by the changes in society's socio-political structure: the foundations of socialism had been created, there were no longer classes and groups with antagonistic interests, and society had become more homogeneous and united around common aims. Moreover, there was a growing need to take the interests of the various classes and groups into fuller account to enable them to join in socialist construction more actively. The old system of

forming representative bodies fell short of this requirement. The significance of the election law reform was that it made good this shortcoming. In particular, the new law gave every electoral district the right to nominate several candidates for the post of deputy, and the right to nomination was given to meetings of electors.

An analysis of how this system functioned brought the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, at its plenary meeting in July 1983, round to the conclusion that it had to be further developed. A draft election law was drawn up, published, and broadly discussed in the Patriotic People's Front.* This discussion produced many invaluable suggestions and comments, which reflected the diverse opinions and views prevailing in Hungarian society. Thus, a decision of immense significance to society — the amendment to the election law — was passed after nation-wide consultation by direct democracy.

The underlying principle of the Hungarian election law — universal, equal, direct voting by secret ballot — has undergone no change. But it contains some important innovations.

The number of people enjoying suffrage has been increased. Suffrage is now denied only to mentally retarded people, criminals who have been sentenced and are serving their sentences, and also persons whom a court of law has, in addition to the main punishment, deprived of civil rights. But people on probation (those released before the expiry of their sentence, and others) retain suffrage rights under the new law.

The vast majority of the deputies to the State Assembly are, as formerly, elected by electoral districts. A different balloting procedure is introduced for 30-35 of the deputies (roughly 10 per cent of the total): these are entered in a national list submitted for voting throughout the country. The purpose of this innovation is, above all, that the heads of nationally significant state organs should be elected not by any single electoral district (for that would commit them to championing local interests that may conflict with basic functions) but by the whole of Hungary. By the very nature of their mandate they would thus be representing national interests. The right to draw up a list of candidates for deputies to be elected by the whole country is vested in the All-Hungary Council of the Patri-

otic People's Front, and it does so on the basis of recommendations from political and mass organizations. The new procedure gives more weight to the trade unions and other mass organizations as well as to young people, peasants and other groups in the formation of the highest organ of state power. It seems to me that the new elements in our election law can play an important role in the further development of representative democracy in Hungary.

Further, the country's division into territorial units has been reorganized over the past 20 years. Now an administrative unit consisted of several rural communities, and formally their number was roughly halved. In effect, many population centers saw no change, remaining without their own organ of self-administration — a rural or village council. It was found that this had adverse effects. Public activity in such population centers declined. It was vital to correct the situation.

Under the new law so-called rural boards are being set up in small rural communities. Each consists of the deputies elected by the given population center to the big rural council. Thus, all the population centers included in the enlarged administrative unit will now have their own representative body, which will later be invested with the necessary powers and allocated funds.

The law makes it a rule that there should be at least two candidates for every mandate. In every electoral district for the election of deputies to the State Assembly, several (at least two) meetings of constituents are to be held. At these meetings any elector may name a candidate. If the candidate gets one-third of the votes of those present he or she is included in the election list. Each candidate has the right to state his or her proposals and program to constituents, and every voter has the right to state any grievance to the election committee about the way the meeting is held, challenge the legality of the procedure of naming a candidate, and get an adopted decision annulled. The People's Front holds one meeting of constituents to nominate candidates for deputies to the local councils.

Under the law, stand-in deputies to the State Assembly and the local councils are elected for the purpose of taking on the duties of those members of these governmental organs who drop out for one reason or another. To become a stand-in deputy a candidate has to poll over 25 per cent of the votes. The purpose of this measure is to sustain the prestige of esteemed people nominated by the public to stand in the elections but failing to get a mandate.

The law establishes a new procedure for re-

*A mass socio-political movement embracing all the working classes and strata in Hungary, all who want peace and contribute to the building of socialism in Hungary. It organizes elections in the country. — Ed.

calling deputies. The right to propose such a move is accorded to voters (they must number at least 10 per cent of the total in the constituency) or to the relevant organ of the People's Front. As at usual elections, the voting is by secret ballot. The decision to recall deputies elected according to the national list is taken by the State Assembly.

The new election law mirrors the steady course of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party toward the extension of socialist democracy, the further all-sided development of Hungarian society, and the improvement of its political organization.

Professor Peter Smidt
Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest

LOCAL AUTHORITY — BEFORE AND NOW

In July 1983 the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic passed the Law on the System of People's Councils and Territorial Self-Administration. What does the expression "system of people's councils and territorial self-administration" mean?

Poland's constitution defines councils as local organs of state power, the basic organs of public self-administration and, simultaneously, the basic organs of territorial self-administration of the working people in villages, towns, districts, big towns and the voivodships (Article 43).¹ It thus vests the people's councils with a twin function — as the organ not only of state power but also of territorial self-administration. The point is that in Poland's political system some local problems (social, everyday life and cultural linked to the domicile of citizens) are handled not only by councils but also by town and rural organs of self-administration: meetings (or conferences of delegates) of residents of a neighborhood, block of apartments, or individual apartment house and the committees elected by them (correspondingly in neighborhood, block, house) and meetings of rural communities and the rural (communal) committees and elders elected by them.

Under the former, now defunct, law on people's councils (1958) these two elements of territorial self-administration existed independently of each other: the councils were in the general system of state power, while the self-administrative bodies of town and countryside were in the People's Unity Front.² This does not, of course, imply that the people's councils ignored the experience of the self-administrative bodies or disregarded their opin-

ion. But a firm legal link was created between them for the first time by the 1983 law, which decreed an integral system of territorial self-administration. Thereby, in tackling local problems the councils acquired a valuable and dependable partner sensitive to signals from the people.

Under the new procedure the urban and rural self-administrative committees function under the people's councils. The committees enjoy wide powers, have their own funds, and can use money allocated by the councils for socio-educational and social programs. This has enhanced the prestige of the self-administrative bodies and also their role in improving the life of the people, and it is making the people aware that they are indeed strongly influencing the development of their own town or village and the destiny of their country.

The law extends the social base of socialist state power and gives a more profound meaning to power of the people. It is not a momentary act of electing people's representatives. On the contrary, it brings citizens into active and conscious participation in deciding questions of their work and life continuing also throughout the period between elections. An important step has thus been taken toward the fulfillment of the directive of the ninth extraordinary congress of the Polish United Workers' Party, namely, that the "handling of the affairs of enterprises, rural communities, gminas,³ towns, and voivodships must be based on the principles of socialist public self-administration defined by law."⁴

In the new law serious attention is given to defining the rights and duties of deputies to local representative bodies. In the people's council, deputies express the interests of their constituents and are responsible to them. In order to maintain constant contact with citizens in the period between elections, deputies have to keep regular reception hours, answer complaints, statements and suggestions, and attend meetings of the self-administrative bodies. When a people's council faces an important and disputed question, deputies have to meet with constituents and learn their attitude to this question. The wishes and demands of citizens are passed on to the local people's representative body or its organs. As for deputies, although they are guided by the recommendations of their constituents, they have the right to adopt an independent stand since it is their duty to harmonize local interests with those of the entire nation.

The law gives deputies a high public status. All their inquiries must be answered officially within 14 days; the heads of state organs, fac-

tories and offices located in the territory of the given council have to receive the deputy for public affairs promptly, and give him or her all the requested information and the possibility of studying material pertaining to any specific question.

Deputies do not enjoy personal privileges, but under the law they have the right to some benefits facilitating the fulfillment of their public duties. For instance, they are excused from work in order to attend sessions of the people's council, commission meetings, or other business linked to the discharge of their duties. For this period they continue getting their regular pay. When deputies have to travel, their traveling expenses are paid and they get a daily allowance as all other civil servants. They can use the public transport free of charge in the territory of their council. If deputies find themselves in a conflict situation, the law gives them the right to legal defense and protects their labor status: they cannot be dismissed from work without the consent of the presidium of the people's council of which they are members.

The rights of the councils have been visibly enlarged. They can handle all matters related to the satisfaction of the needs of the population and they direct socio-economic and cultural development in their territories (with the exception of questions which special laws placed under the jurisdiction of some other organ of power or agency). However, territorial self-administrative bodies are not isolated from the state and do not enter into competition with it. They are a decentralized form of organizing the life of society that benefits by the participation in them of large numbers of people and by the development and adoption of specific legal norms conforming to the conditions prevailing in individual regions.

The new concept of territorial self-administration takes into account the principles of the economic reform now being enforced in Poland. The people's councils and their executive bodies now have the right:

- to draw up and approve short-term and long-term plans of socio-economic development for their territories;
- to establish local state enterprises to better satisfy the needs of the population;
- to permit nationally important enterprises to be set up on their territory (this concerns only voivodship people's councils);
- to suggest improvements in the work of public enterprises with the view of meeting the market demand more fully and making more effective use of local raw material resources.

These wide powers enable the local representative bodies to run their territories as masters in the true sense of the word, and they bear the full responsibility for the economic development of these territories in accordance with society's needs, for further industrialization, environmental protection, and the efficient utilization of land. In issuing permission for the building of industrial enterprises, the councils can set their terms to investors. For instance, that they should help to enlarge the network of roads or power transmission lines and build schools, hospitals, retail outlets and so forth. One of the channels through which the local representative bodies, as basic organs of public self-administration, will influence the work of enterprises within the framework of the economic reform is through cooperation with workers' self-administrative bodies.

The substantial increase of the funds placed at the disposal of local organs is enhancing their authority. Where sources of financing are concerned, the law distinguishes direct tasks of the people's councils and the tasks set them by higher organs of power. In the first case, the local representative bodies can freely dispose of their own funds, which they get chiefly in the shape of taxes.⁵ To these are added a set share of the state budget's revenues (the size is fixed once in five years) and also the profits from investments made jointly with state enterprises. Whereas formerly the people's councils' own funds covered only an average of 17 per cent of their expenditures, today it is estimated that this indicator will rise to roughly 80 per cent. To carry out the tasks set by higher bodies, the local organs are given special allocations.

Considerable importance is now being attached to the ability of the people's councils to use economic methods to influence the work of the enterprises in their territories, skilfully accumulate funds, and spend them rationally. This requires a serious change of the style of work and thinking of deputies and the apparatus of local people's representative bodies. Taking this into account the Sejm has resolved to make the law operational only in July 1984, i.e., a year after it was approved. This postponement was decided upon to give the staffs of the people's councils and the public time in which to acquaint themselves with the new procedure.

The law on the system of people's councils and territorial self-administration will unquestionably be of fundamental significance in promoting the political system of People's

Poland and strengthening socialist democracy.

Eugenia Kempara
Member, State Council of the PPR

1. In Poland the forms of public self-administration include workers' self-administration at factories, self-administration by individual peasants in the countryside, by members of professional unions, cooperatives, mass and cultural organizations, and territorial self-administrative bodies. Territorial self-administration includes people's councils of all levels and also urban and rural self-administrative bodies. — Ed.

2. The People's Unity Front (called the National Front

prior to 1957) was a movement of organizations forming the system of people's power in Polish society, and also of every Polish citizen. The Front disintegrated during the crisis of 1980-1982. — Ed.

3. Gmina is an administrative-territorial unit of the first instance in rural localities. As a rule, it has an area of some 8,000 hectares and a population of up to 7,000. — Ed.

4. IX Nadzwyczajny zjazd Polskiej Zjednoczonej partii robotniczej, Warsaw, 1983, p. 658.

5. Wage tax (about 85 per cent of all the cash revenues of the budget of councils), real estate tax, turnover tax, and income tax from individuals and enterprises of the public sector, land and equalizing taxes, inheritance and gift taxes, seal dues and so on.

Strategy of radical change in Africa

Many African countries, having cast off colonial tyranny, took the road to anti-imperialist, democratic changes. They are thoroughly restructuring their society — an activity going on in difficult conditions and demanding much effort to overcome the onerous legacy of the colonial period. The following articles tell about the experience of political, social and economic changes in the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and of agrarian ones, in the People's Republic of the Congo.

GUIDELINE: THE WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE

Vasco Cabral
Political Bureau member,
Permanent Secretary, PAIGC CC

The Republic of Guinea-Bissau is observing this year the 60th anniversary of the birthday of Amilcar Cabral,¹ founder of our party and nation, outstanding thinker and fighter, strategist and diplomat. Personal credit is due to him for the formation of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC),² which led the national liberation struggle against centuries-long Portuguese colonial rule. The rise of an independent state on our native soil was a logical result of this struggle.

Amilcar Cabral made a great contribution to Guinean statehood. Even at the stage of armed struggle, he proposed setting up people's power institutions to ensure the declaration of independence. On discussing his proposal, the party leadership decided to hold elections in the liberated areas, which encompassed three-fourths of the territory of the future state at the time. In this way the first legal organ of power by the people, the National People's Assembly, came into being. It was made up of representatives of the population of the liberated areas, including PAIGC members. On Sep-

tember 24, 1973, the Assembly proclaimed the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which was recognized by most countries of the world in a matter of months.

Amilcar Cabral did not live to see that radiant day. He was assassinated in January 1973 on orders from the Portuguese colonialists. Notwithstanding this great loss, Cabral's associates and followers carried the struggle through to victory and won independence.

The new republic has gone through certain stages since then. The first stage (till November 1980) was marked by the completion of the armed struggle against colonial rule, the establishment of the political power of the PAIGC throughout national territory (largely made possible by the downfall of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal in April 1974) and a further consolidation of national sovereignty.

Deliverance from foreign tyranny is not the end of the struggle for liberation. After winning independence, Guinea-Bissau had to continue its fight in peace-time conditions, the next goal being political, economic, social and cultural development, improved conditions of life for the people and promotion of their well-being, and the provision in line with the PAIGC program of the prerequisites for the gradual abolition of exploitation in any form. We came up against enormous problems left from the period of Portuguese colonial rule. The main economic field, agriculture, was in a state of extreme neglect. The republic had neither modern industries, nor a developed infrastructure. Recurrent droughts, widespread illiteracy, the lack of skilled personnel and the inadequacy of the educational system and health services made the economic situation still more deplorable.

In the 1974-1977 period the masses showed their creative energy and their enthusiasm for constructive effort, being heartened by freedom. The capitalist economic system was

struck a first blow when the domination of colonial banks came to an end. All financial transactions were put under the control of a newly established National Bank. The state took over large foreign capitalist enterprises. The third PAIGC congress (1977) evolved a strategy for socio-economic transformations.

However, serious departures from the correct line adopted by the congress came out shortly after, with repercussions in various spheres of national life. Due to underestimation of the leading role of the party, its ideological and political militancy declined, its links with the masses loosened and the masses moved farther away from what had become amorphous party organizations. Shortcomings in ideological work produced negative phenomena in the PAIGC, such as irresponsibility, self-seeking, nepotism and indifference to politics. Technocratic trends gained ground among statesmen. What came to the fore on the political scene was not the party but government bodies.

The overall result was that the PAIGC lost its role as the leading force of society. It forgot one of Amílcar Cabral's main recommendations. The dissociation of the leadership from the people and the inaction of party branches stripped the party of the ability to mobilize the masses for socio-economic construction and this necessarily affected the economic situation. The miscalculations of the time still make themselves felt.

In November 1980, against the background of the danger threatening the revolution, there sprang up and triumphed a movement³ aimed at correcting past mistakes and restoring the role of the party as the real political leader of Guinean society. Late November saw the beginning of a second stage in the development of the republic. It was then, and more particularly after the first extraordinary PAIGC congress (November 1981), that we adopted a line which benefited the entire activity of the party and the state apparatus and the fulfillment of socio-economic development plans.

In effecting changes and extending the fight against imperialism, we carefully take account of the conditions prevailing in the republic. This is what Amílcar Cabral counselled us to do. It was by taking account of objective reality, the general backwardness of the country and its historical and national specifics that we were able to work out an up-to-date strategy for socio-economic development; first defined in 1977, it was reaffirmed by the extraordinary party congress. This strategy serves the PAIGC program, which calls for the construction of a just society ruling out all exploitation of man by

man and all subordination of people to the selfish interests of individuals, groups or classes.⁴

The economic renaissance is taking place in a country with a multistructural economy. This requires constant attention to cooperation among its sectors and to the need to stave off the danger of going too far too fast in implementing the policy of change. According to the party program, minerals, the main sources of energy, forests and water resources, industrial plant, public transport, banking and insurance must be controlled and used by the state as national property.⁵ We have nationalized land, for we could not allow it to remain the property of big landowners. We are now drafting a law that will restrict the size of privately owned land. When it comes into force we will have taken a step toward preventing a revival of the activity of capitalist elements. The state is not going to let them buy up landed property and own vast tracts, for this would seriously jeopardize our revolutionary achievements. There is a cooperative sector already, if a small one as yet. We are not forcing its growth; we do not want to make the peasants or other working people do what they have not yet arrived at by themselves. There is a definite distance between a natural economy, or what we call a subsistence economy, and higher forms. Cooperatives should gain strength as a result of the peasants' realization of the advantages of this form.

The Guinean economy also has a private sector inherited from colonial times and there are still elements of capitalist relations. We cannot get rid of this legacy at one stroke, nor do we set ourselves such aims. Our experience is highly instructive in this respect as well, for an excessive tightening of controls at the beginning concentrated all economic activity in the hands of the state.

Here is an example showing what going too far too fast in this matter is fraught with. At a certain stage, the trade turnover was fettered by the fact that trade was fully dominated by two state enterprises, *Armazens do Povo* and *Socomil*. Their commercial transactions assumed such proportions that both companies became a kind of monster whose activity defied all control. Private commercial initiative found itself paralyzed.

By now we have taken steps to remedy the situation. One of the two companies will concern itself with export and import operations and remain in charge of foreign trade; the other will be responsible for wholesale trade at home. This system will enable private traders to play a greater part. The result should be brisker trade in the countryside helping increase agricul-

tural production and encouraging the peasants to produce more for export and more foodstuffs. This liberal treatment of private initiative does not mean, of course, that capitalism is our goal and capitalist relations will dominate. The adopted measures will make it possible to run the economy more efficiently, end underdevelopment and rid the country of its colonial heritage.

With due regard to objective conditions and the actual potentialities of the country, the PAIGC is following a strategy geared to financial and economic stabilization and the accumulation of funds needed for socio-economic development in general and for greater satisfaction of the requirements of the population, especially for foodstuffs. These guidelines underlie the first four-year plan (1983-1986).

We are going to bring about dependable and lasting cooperation between agriculture, industry and trade, the three key spheres of the economy. This task has faced us from the outset; after winning independence, we had to accumulate the requisite funds and use resources for industrial progress while putting the emphasis on agriculture.

The Guinean people have been engaged in farming for centuries. They are used to traditional, outdated implements, which is due to the underdeveloped state of the productive forces. Immense tracts of land were uncultivated. Of the 990,000 hectares of land on which diverse crops could be grown, only one-third is used. Very much needs to be done yet in the area of agriculture. We plan to extend irrigation and the use of modern farming techniques and to diversify agricultural production with a view to achieving self-reliance in foodstuffs.

Our strategy also provides for the gradual advancement of manufacturing and trade, which should, in turn, foster agricultural production.

Lastly, we consider it highly important to create an infrastructure, build roads and railways, equip our seaports with up-to-date facilities and modernize communications. And we devote increasing attention to the training of national personnel and the consolidation of the material base of society, to important social spheres like education and the health services. However, the party leadership and the government are aware that many sound decisions aimed at correcting mistakes in economic policy are still a dead letter. This is due to internal shortcomings as well as to the protracted crisis of the world capitalist economy, now in a state of chaos. Inflation, worsening conditions of foreign trade and extortionate prices on the world market are only some mani-

festations of the crisis, which has a ruinous impact on the Guinean economy.

To manage the economy better means laying a dependable groundwork for the implementation of the party's social policy. In fighting for liberation, the PAIGC gave leadership to all oppressed classes held down by the Portuguese colonialists and exploited by foreigners. Now that it is operating as the vanguard of the Guinean people and as a national liberation movement in power, it is defending the interests of the working people, primarily the peasantry and the working class. And while the peasants make up the bulk of the population (87 per cent), with the industrial proletariat still in its formative period, we have always realized that the latter is destined to operate as a class which is the most active, conscious and consistent one from the revolutionary point of view. We know this from the past and present experience of the PAIGC.

The party is defending the interests of the peasants and workers as well as those of office employees, commercial personnel, civil servants and intellectuals. It opposes all those who would like to exploit the people, who deceive them and strive to secure a dominant position in the state, being concerned solely with their own interests. The more effective the struggle against dangerous anti-social elements, the greater the people's confidence in the party and the closer their mutual relations.

The November 14 movement reinstated the PAIGC as the leading political force of the Guinean society. This binds it in many ways. Anticipating the gradual transformation of the PAIGC from a national liberation movement into a party, Amilcar Cabral stressed in his pamphlet *The Party Must Be Composed of the Finest Sons and Daughters of the People* that new members should be admitted on a strictly selective basis and should be people possessing high revolutionary moral standards and deep political convictions and prepared to respect the rules without fail. It is in this spirit, as the PAIGC sees it, that party building should go on.

After November 14, 1980 and the first extraordinary congress, steps were taken to correct past mistakes and strengthen the party and its branches. The PAIGC assumed control of the activity of the state and other public institutions. The congress resolved to apply everywhere the principles of democratic centralism and collective leadership, unity and struggle, revolutionary democracy, criticism and self-criticism. The party has made headway in intensifying political and ideological work among its members with a view to raising their political, ideological and cultural knowledge.

The role of the Amilcar Cabral National School, which trains people for party branches and leading bodies throughout the country, shows a noticeable increase.

The extraordinary congress approved measures for a restructuring of the party and formed its leading bodies — the Political Bureau and the Central Committee. Besides the office of general secretary, it set up that of permanent secretary of the CC (for the first time), whose duty is to coordinate the activities of the CC Secretariat. To emphasize the party principle in the leadership of the country, a section of the PAIGC membership fully devoted itself to party work.

Carrying out the decision to improve the organizational structure and the functioning of the PAIGC leading bodies, we reinforced the CC Secretariat. We now have regulations on the duties of each member of the Secretariat, which is composed of secretaries in charge of the following activities: organization and control; information, propaganda and culture; contacts with the masses and their organizations; international cooperation; defense and security; administrative and financial matters.

To heighten the efficiency of the party apparatus, the extraordinary congress resolved to form CC commissions. We also have, for the first time ever, four territorial (interdistrict) commissions: northern, eastern, southern and central.

A very important fact is that since 1980 ties between the party and the armed forces have become stronger. Members of the party leadership were active in them previously as well. However, there was no direct organizational link with the CC and its Secretariat. We have now taken a step forward; the CC has a secretary responsible for defense and security matters. For the first time in the history of the country, a national army party conference was held. Operating in all armed units are party committees; party members organize regular party meetings and round table discussions, seminars and other undertakings.

PAIGC control over mass organizations is stronger now. Their work is making progress. The Women's Democratic Union of Guinea-Bissau, which has branches all over the country, has become a genuinely national force. This is also true of the Amilcar Cabral Youth Organization.

These organizations concern themselves with economic development problems and contribute in various ways to production. Youth work teams formed in Amilcar Cabral's lifetime and on his initiative take part in the construction of schools and other public build-

ings as well as of highways and see to cleanliness in urban and rural communities. To be sure, activities of this nature are also taking place in many other countries but as far as our country is concerned, this is the first time that it has engaged in them.

The working people have been enabled to develop their professional organizations. This is a field in which we still encounter difficulties. But in the north of the country, in Bissau and other cities, enterprise trade union committees have been set up. Preparations are on for the congress of the National Union of Workers of Guinea-Bissau due in the foreseeable future.

It is more than 10 years since the heart of Amilcar Cabral, a devoted revolutionary, founder of the party, stopped beating. His manifold activities added to the prestige of the PAIGC, our country and the struggle of the peoples of the former Portuguese colonies and the whole of Africa for freedom and independence. Cabral was loved by the people. A national hero who has gone down in our history, he set an example to both today's and future generations.

The imperialists and Portuguese colonialists who engineered an infamous crime, miscalculated by imagining that Cabral's death would lead to the disintegration of the party and doom the national liberation struggle to failure. The victories achieved since his death have shown again that the PAIGC is an inseparable part of the nation, a movement which owes its strength not only to the greatness of one man but to close unity with the people whose interests and aspirations it expresses.

Amilcar Cabral played a historic role as an exemplary leader who paved the way for victory. Furthermore, he left a theoretical legacy relating to political, ideological, military strategic and cultural problems. It is of particular significance to us who are following the path charted by him and doing our best to prevent all distortion of his ideas. Needless to say, we must act on the advice of our leader, to whom dogmatism was alien, in a creative spirit. Today his legacy serves the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, who are carrying on a difficult yet necessary struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

I have said that the year 1984 has a special meaning for the PAIGC and the people of Guinea-Bissau. The program for celebrating the 60th anniversary of Amilcar Cabral's birthday provides for the convocation of an international scientific conference devoted to his theoretical legacy and his practical struggle. Besides, there will be a major exhibition and a full-length feature film on the life and work of Africa's

outstanding son, and a museum of the national liberation struggle will be opened.

We attach great importance to the coming celebrations. They will make for a new upsurge in every sphere of the political and socio-economic life of the republic and help strengthen and perfect the leading role of the party in society and state. This is the only way in which we can pay proper homage to the memory of Amílcar Cabral and live up to the proud name of continuers of his cause.

1. Amílcar Cabral was born on September 12, 1924, in Bafata, Guinea-Bissau. — Ed.

2. Founded on September 19, 1956. — Ed.

3. On November 14, 1980 all power in the republic passed into the hands of a Revolutionary Council under João Bernardo Vieira. After this the PAIGC in the Republic of the Cape Verde Islands constituted itself as an independent organization called the African Party for Independence of the Cape Verde Islands. — Ed.

4. See *I Congresso Extraordinário do PAIGC*, Memória do Congresso, Bolama, pp. 117, 137.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 141.

RESTRUCTURING THE AGRARIAN SECTOR

Jean Royal Kississou-Boma

CC member, Congolese Party of Labor (CPL);

Director, Higher Party School;

Chairman, National Social Sciences
Commission

Agricultural problems have been fundamental at every stage of human history, but they have become especially pressing in our epoch. Solution of the agrarian problem depends directly on the political, social, economic and cultural conditions in a given country. No society can now afford to ignore it. Everywhere efforts are being made to improve agriculture, because on its state largely depends the future of industry and, in a wider context, socio-economic progress as a whole. In other words, the development of agriculture is a task of exceptional importance.

When considering the agrarian problem, one has to reckon with this obvious fact: in view of the different socio-political systems, there are no simple ways and means for raising the rural economy. One has to bear in mind that the imperialist monopolies are trying to have the agrarian problem, above all in the former colonial countries, solved in their own way by means of various programs produced by the well-known Club of Rome and other similar institutions. Seed and food aid is also frequently used by the monopolists as an instrument of political diktat, which is usually "supplemented" with subversive action by the CIA.

That being so, we believe that the agrarian sphere is a sector of the class struggle where the enemy still manages to do us considerable ideological, economic and political harm. The revolutionary forces are now fighting in this sector with some success. In our country, we seek to make a concrete contribution to the correct understanding of the situation and propose a solution of the problems in agriculture to accelerate its development.

The bourgeois approach to the agrarian question is typically limited and inconsistent because of the emphasis on the private self-seeking interest which harms agriculture both in the capitalist countries and — most importantly — in the young developing states. It is common knowledge that the agrarian sector in the industrialized capitalist countries suffers from economic operations which are traditional to the capitalist system.

These methods have an exceptionally negative impact on agriculture in the countries of the Third World. The much-vaunted "green revolution," "agrobiology," "intensive development" and other similar recipes have far from yielded the effect which the advocates of the capitalist way of development had expected. Tunisia, Senegal, Zaire, the Ivory Coast, Kenya and the Central African Republic have demonstrated capitalist methods of agriculture to be limited and frustrating. The world's press and even some bourgeois specialists have frankly admitted the failures of agrarian capitalism. On the one hand, it has ruined these countries, impoverished their peasant masses, depleted their soils under foodcrops, and kept large masses of people in a state of semi-starvation. On the other, it has fattened the foreign monopolies buying up agricultural raw materials for the former metropolitan countries at throw-away prices. That is why there is such indignation among the peoples which have been plunged into poverty. It is indicative that the press called the recent mass demonstrations in Morocco and Tunisia "food riots."

Meanwhile, the record of history testifies that socialism has been steadily overcoming the difficulties in agricultural development, with the USSR, Bulgaria, Mongolia, Cuba and other socialist countries eloquently showing how to limit the damage being done to our agriculture and to remove the obstacles to our advance. The peoples which have set themselves the goal of effecting radical transformations and bypassing the capitalist stage can confidently follow the example of existing socialism.

The countries oriented toward socialism do have some achievements in agriculture. Congo, for instance, with an annual income per head of

over \$600, as compared with \$210 in neighboring Zaire, has been supplying foodstuffs to that country and also to Gabon.

It is true that at the socialist-orientation stage, difficulties may appear in the agrarian sector, especially when the principles of scientific socialism are practised inconsistently. Even greater difficulties are faced by countries where the movement has gone into reverse or where the progressive line has been abandoned (Ghana after Kwame Nkrumah and several other countries). Here and there, the re-establishment of the oppressive order confronts the people with the threat of starvation.

The socialist countries' experience teaches us that there is a need to take into account the concrete local conditions of agrarian development and to work out, in the light of the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, the right line along which backwardness can be eliminated once and for all.

Marian N'Gouabi, the late leader of our revolution, wrote: "Like every science, Marxism enriches itself with new achievements . . . It is an open book and not a dogma. But this idea is frequently used as a pretext for rejecting Marx and his science, and for propounding harmful notions which are totally at variance with Marxism."¹ Analyzing the concrete state of Congo's agriculture from this angle, let us first consider the existing forms of production and the social structure of the agricultural population.

Diversity of structures

The difficulties in agrarian transformations in the socialist-oriented countries, including our republic, spring from the fact that agriculture is the most backward sector of the economy with a low productivity of labor. The agrarian sector has a patchwork socio-economic structure consisting of a mix of archaic and modern elements of relations of production. An imprint on the situation is also left by the peasantry's social mentality, above all its political immaturity. The rural masses are still ill-prepared for adopting modern agricultural methods.

But the point is that the majority of Congolese are employed in the agrarian sector, and the peasantry make up 70 per cent of our economically active population. If economic backwardness is to be surmounted, and poverty and privation eliminated in the Congo, as in other socialist-oriented countries, the agrarian economy must be raised through deep-going reforms as a key plank of our agrarian policy. They should help to solve two inter-related problems: first, to raise agriculture and to radically restructure it on a modern scientific and

technical basis, and second, to create the conditions for going on to modern collective forms of landownership and land-tenure.

In the Congolese countryside, there are several closely interwoven modes of production, some being the vestiges of old ones, and others the embryos of new, emergent forms. Among the former is the traditional communal mode among the pygmies, subsistence farming, and feudal and semi-feudal forms, and among the latter, capitalist and pre-socialist (transitional-to-socialism) forms of agriculture (state farms and cooperatives).

Apart from the "classical" type, the feudal and semi-feudal mode will also be found in the form of "clerical feudalism" (meaning the use of farmland owned by Catholic and Protestant missions). Together with agrarian capitalism, these forms lead in the exploitation of the countryside.

While the feudal and semi-feudal relations are tenacious, they objectively have a tendency to disappear, being gradually ousted by capitalist forms, and also by the emergent pre-socialist forms in the recent decade. But the feudal lords rely on the traditional instruments of exploitation and use superstition and prejudice to maintain an important influence.

Under the feudal and semi-feudal mode of production, the land is, for all practical purposes, at the uncontrolled disposal of its owner, who is in a position to levy duties on the peasants. For his part, the peasant can either be relieved of the duties or ordered to pay them by his clan (tribe). Such is the effective arrangement on the lands of the former slave-owners. Other survivals of archaic ties are also tenacious, although they are gradually giving way to new forms and relations.

Since the colonial period, a trend has been developing in the Congo toward the replacement of feudal relations by capitalist relations, and then also by relations transitional to the socialist types of economic management. Land has become the object of speculation, and its owners have frequently sold their farmland at much profit into private hands or to the state. This was to some extent promoted by the retrograde policies of Alphonse Massamba-Débat, chief of state and leader of the ruling National Revolutionary Movement Party after the August 1963 revolution, which overthrew the hated regime of Abbé Fulbert Youlou.² Thus, on his personal orders, the state paid out one million African francs to the owner of an estate in Kinsoundi, where a textile mill was subsequently built.

In areas with clan (tribal) property, the right of ownership is partially handed down by in-

heritance, through marriage, and in certain other ways. And while clan members have equal rights, the chief has the prerogative of taking the decisions, which are effected with the consent of the other members.

Primary forms of agricultural cooperation now involve a population inhabiting 3 per cent of all the farmland: there are 1,062 such co-operatives, with over 28,000 members. Pre-socialist cooperatives first originated on the lands which were abandoned by the French colonialists and transferred to the state. These were mango and citrus orchards and a banana plantation in Mayumba. However, the experiment failed because of a lack of implements, low fertility and the alkali-depleted soils, and sheer mismanagement.

However, the primary forms of cooperation set up by the peasants themselves have continued to develop, and there are many positive signs that the system of cooperation is being improved.

Social structure

A study of our countryside shows that the patchwork social structure of the agricultural population corresponds to the existing economic structures.

There are not many capitalists in the Congo investing in agriculture, and the methods of exploitation they use are highly archaic. They frequently pay their workers in kind. Some government officials retiring on pension buy up land and hire peasants to work it. These peasants are often paid no wages at all, but receive some second-hand consumer goods in return for their labor, a relatively new arrangement which has spread to some areas.

The bureaucratic clerical bourgeoisie in the Congo is represented by the chiefs of the Christian churches, who are not engaged in any productive labor. They live off the donations of believers, Sunday church collections and monies coming in mainly from Western Europe (Scandinavia) and the United States.

The exploited masses in the countryside consist of agricultural laborers and forestry workers, above all those employed in the private sector of the economy. The conditions of the workers in the state sector (farms, sugar refinery, and forestry enterprises) are being steadily improved thanks to the measures being taken by the state.

The non-exploited section of the agricultural population consists of members of primary co-operative associations which own their implements and other property in common. It is true that the slow development of co-

operation does not yet promote any broad involvement of the masses in it.

While living in poverty, the bulk of the peasant masses is exploited sporadically, especially when semi-subsistence-type family farms enter into market relations with traders buying up their produce, and also selling manufactured goods to them.

The old classes in the Congolese society are disintegrating and new ones are taking shape with the emergence of new economic forms, the further assertion of the socialist trends, and the efforts of the revolutionary party. There are changes in the positions of the exploiter strata, and in the consciousness of the exploited strata. The more active the revolutionaries' pressure on the bourgeois elements, the greater the support for our party's struggle by the exploited classes. A hostile policy is, by contrast, being conducted above all by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, which ever more frequently comes out in support of the reactionary tribalist and regionalist urges.

The forms of production relations which have taken shape in the agrarian economy, the structure of the rural society, and the social mentality of the peasants are the exceptionally important factors which have to be taken into account in determining the ways and methods of transformations.

Vanguard party's role

The overcoming of the backwardness of agriculture is one of the vital issues in the Congolese revolution. Our analysis of the situation gives us a knowledge of the numerous difficulties facing us: political and administrative, those stemming from the organization of agricultural production and the marketing of its produce, the arrangement of cooperation, the establishment of a statistical service and the start of relevant research, the need for capital investments, marketing, plant protection measures, etc. We constantly bear in mind that the vulnerability of the agrarian sphere keeps having a negative effect on the prospects for socio-economic progress. Our efforts to restructure agriculture — some of them very considerable — have proved to be inadequate because of the numerous obstacles.

Still, as early as October 1963, a decision taken in the Congo determined the new basis of class relations in administering rural communities. A number of other measures were also taken and bold plans were worked out. Some hopes were inspired by the positive though not always fully-valid results.

Relying on the experience gained after the winning of independence, the Congolese Party

of Labor got down to reorganizing the institutions connected with agriculture. In particular, it invigorated the activity of the Rural Renewal Organization, which deals with the development of the cooperative movement. These matters were subsequently handled by the Local Collective-Farms Administration set up in the spring of 1977, under the leadership of the Organizational Department of the CPL CC. A Cooperative Service was set up under the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock-Breeding. Our economic development plans have also given much attention to the agrarian problem.

Guided by the decisions of its extraordinary congress in 1979, the CPL has continued to take more measures for the benefit of the popular masses: the procurement prices for peasant produce have been raised, credits for the development of agriculture and forestry have been allocated, and the countryside is being given technical support. We are certainly doing our utmost to stimulate the creative activity of the masses.

Five-year-plan strategic guidelines

The difficulties in agriculture have been described in the current five-year development plan (1982-1986) as follows: the weakness of the productive forces' system and the low level of labor activity; the socio-economic limitations of the relations of production system; the inadequate infrastructure and the weakness of industry; the low technical equipment of the social forms of production organization; and the problems in inter-sectoral and intra-sectoral coordination.³ One should also bear in mind that Congolese agriculture now has insignificant material and technical facilities, that mainly primitive implements are used, that farming methods are obsolete, and that the use of manpower is irrational.

The plan envisages a rapid growth of the agricultural sector. The goal is to make the country self-sufficient in food by the year 2000. Important tasks have to be tackled along this way in the near future. The budget allocates 73.5 billion African francs for agrarian development. These large appropriations constitute nearly 10 per cent of the total planned funding of economic measures in the five-year period.

The positive advances we expect of these measures will include: the creation of a national stock of agricultural produce; the development of mechanization; the spread of agricultural knowledge and skill training; the invigoration of research; the stimulation of the

creative approach and initiative in the localities; the conduct of a price policy for the benefit of the producers; a marked improvement in the regular supply of the prime necessities to the countryside; and the strengthening of ties between cropping and livestock-breeding.⁴

The state is the most active and concerned protagonist in tackling all these tasks. Being best qualified to do so, it has the duty of combating various obstacles, like abuses by private middlemen and landowners, all kinds of survivals from the past, the relatively low level of management and technology, unfair prices, the obsolete and inadequately organized system of distribution, the flaws of cooperation, the effects of natural disasters, etc. Although the various disproportions cannot be instantly eliminated at the present stage, they need to be combated systematically. We intend to revolutionize the conceptions and methods of production, exchange and distribution, and to train young skilled personnel.

It is exceptionally important to organize extensive and detailed accounting of the material and human potential and to have party members, together with the most talented people committed to the revolution, take an active part in putting through the party's agrarian measures. This, for its part, will provide the basis for introducing the most effective methods of organization, coordination and control over the activity of workers in agriculture.

It is advisable to set up model production associations provided with trained personnel and having the necessary equipment at their disposal. At the same time, we shall retain and improve the system of state farms, which provide schooling in new farming methods. We intend to stage the first experiments in collectivization where collective labor has some traditions, including religious traditions.

For objective reasons, we still cannot do without credits from the capitalist countries. However, the party is intensifying its control over the terms on which credits are received and used, and this includes funds going into the restructuring of the agrarian sector. These forced measures do not cast any doubt on our ideological commitment, and do not conflict with scientific socialism. We are willing to use the experience of competent international bodies dealing with agricultural matters, and especially the experience of the socialist countries.

Well-considered implementation of these measures will help to fulfil the tasks facing our people successfully. Agriculture should make a valid contribution to increasing the incomes

now coming along the tortuous and volatile ways of the oil boom. The agrarian sector's contribution to industrial development could be even larger than that which the Congo receives from its exports of oil and timber. The strategy of agrarian development implies the pursuit of a consistent business line, as has been repeatedly emphasized in his addresses to the people by Denis Sassou-Nguesso, Chairman of the CPL Central Committee and President of the Congo.⁵

For us, the socialist transformation of agriculture is an imperative without which it is exceptionally hard, not to say altogether impossible, to build a new society. That is something no one committed to the cause of eco-

nomic, social, political and cultural progress can afford to forget.

1. M. N'Gouabi, *Vers la construction d'une société socialiste en Afrique*, Paris, 1974, pp. 32-33.

2. After the winning of independence by the Congo in 1960, the country was ruled by the neocolonialist regime of Fulbert Youlou, which was overthrown in 1963. But the Massamba-Débat government, which took over, only paid lip-service to the socialist orientation, while actually conducting a policy of concessions to reaction. In 1968, Massamba-Débat was ousted from power, which passed into the hands of the National Council of Revolution, headed by Marian N'Gouabi. — Ed.

3. See *Plan du développement économique et social de la République Populaire du Congo (1982-1986)*, Brazzaville, 1982, p. 44.

4. See *ibid.*

5. See, for instance, *Le Redressement Economique*, Messidor/ES, 1982, p. 24.

Election tightrope-walking

COMMENT

The nearer the presidential elections, the more frequently the U.S. President appears before world public opinion in what for him is the unaccustomed role of a great peace-maker.

In Soviet-U.S. relations there is nothing really dangerous, Ronald Reagan asserted in his New Year interviews, as though he had forgotten that it was his "offensive against socialism" that led to the unprecedented tension.

Peace has been and remains the objective of my foreign policy,¹ he said calming the Europeans, who have still to recover from their shock over Reagan's own description of the prospects for a limited U.S. nuclear war in Europe backed up with the appearance of Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles on the European continent.

Asked by a *Time* magazine correspondent whether he still regarded the USSR as the "focus of evil,"² he replied that he would not say things like that again, as though it was not he who had only recently urged a "crusade" against that "focus."

What is happening? What is behind the U.S. President's mercurial political twists and turns?

I believe there are some circumstances explaining them.

First, the President and his immediate associates are worried that their bellicose policy is becoming unpopular in the USA and this, from the standpoint of pre-election tactics, is extremely dangerous. According to Gallup opinion polls conducted in October 1982, 62 per cent of the American people were seriously

worried about the job situation and only 6 per cent about the "threat of war." A year later, in October 1983, these percentages stood at 42 and 23 respectively. And within only a month, in November 1983, after the intervention in Grenada and the blowing-up of the U.S. marine headquarters in Lebanon, the "threat of war and international problems" worried 37 per cent of the American people, and even the job situation receded into second place. Although American Presidents are usually not particularly inclined to pay heed to their own electorate, they cannot ignore the mood of the electorate in an election year.

The second circumstance compelling the U.S. President to engage in political tightrope walking most likely consists of considerations of a broader, one might say, strategic context. Let us recall that one of the first steps in his administration was its deliberate departure from everything linked to the development of détente — the refusal to ratify SALT-2, the steep escalation of the arms race, and so forth. During the very first year of his term in office Ronald Reagan signed the secret PSDD-13 military-strategic directive that gave the green light to preparations for a nuclear war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The objective of such a war, as Colin Gray, now an aide of the U.S. President, said at the time, was to destroy the Soviet political system and establish a post-war world order in tune with "U.S. values." In the Pentagon's "defense directives" for 1984-1988, it is stated bluntly that the preparations for a nuclear war would serve to develop the capability for "defeating" and compelling the Soviet Union to seek the speediest

possible cessation of hostilities on terms favorable to the USA.

To upset the strategic balance that had taken shape in the world, the Reagan administration did not spare money squeezed from the American taxpayer. As soon as Reagan was installed as president he approved the allocation of 222 billion dollars for a program to bring the USA nuclear superiority. During the Reagan presidency military spending has grown by 57 per cent, and the recent demagogic declarations of commitment to peace have not prevented the USA from increasing the outlays for militarist purposes in 1984 by roughly another 30 billion dollars. The deployment of Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Europe and the development of the MX missiles, the Trident submarines, and the B-1 and Stealth bombers are all links of one and the same chain. Military superiority — if it did not lead to the fulfillment of the hopes of the nuclear fanatics among imperialism's extreme reactionaries, namely, to realizing the possibility, as the U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger declared, of fighting a victorious global nuclear war against the USSR — then in any case, in the view of Reagan, it would force the USSR to political surrender and, in addition, renounce its solidarity with revolutionary and national liberation movements.

It then suddenly turned out that all these many and costly efforts were for nothing. Instead of making the USSR accept dictation from the White House, as the President thought it

would, the U.S. build-up of military strength compelled the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to take counter-measures to prevent the military strategic equilibrium from being upset.

The Soviet Union stated in no uncertain terms that the start of the deployment of U.S. missiles in some European countries had made it impossible to continue the Geneva negotiations on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

The fact that no negotiations are going on with the Soviet Union is increasing the friction within NATO and making more and more of Reagan's own supporters question his foreign policy. In an election year this has to be reckoned with by the President and his party.

This is what, from time to time, forces Reagan to disclaim his own pronouncements, shift and dodge, and try to make public opinion believe he is a champion of peace and constructive dialogue.

The only trouble is whether these attempts can be believed. Whatever political subterfuges are used they cannot conceal the fact that it was precisely the policy and actions of the present U.S. administration that did more to erode the cause of peace and security than the policy and actions of any other U.S. administration of the latter third of the 20th century.

A. Land

1. From a speech on television, January 16, 1984.
2. *Time*, January 2, 1984.



The way to justice is hard

A survey of literature on the new international information order.

On the eve of 1984 the USA declared it would withdraw from UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). Compared with the White House's other tricks, this one does not seem to be overly dramatic. Besides, in itself this decision of the Reagan administration was not particularly unexpected by international opinion. Official U.S. spokesmen had for a long time made no

secret of their hostility for this prestigious international body and demonstrated their dissatisfaction more and more often, voting, in many cases as a lone voice, against various of its resolutions and programs.

One of the USA's gripes is that this organization is not abandoning its attempts "to curb the free press," the USA's definition of UNESCO's attempts to end the glaring inequities and inequalities in the international information structure and set up a new international information order.¹

Let us briefly recall the substance of the problem.

It is universally known that the international climate, the level of mutual confidence (or non-confidence) among states and peoples, the public mood, and the political activity of the people depend to no little extent on the kind of information disseminated by the press, radio and television. The fundamental principles concerning the contribution of the mass media to strengthening peace and international understanding, to promoting human rights, and to countering racism, apartheid, and incitement to war were spelled out in the UNESCO Declaration adopted at the 20th session of its General Conference in 1978.

UNESCO is not a directive body and the character of the above-mentioned document is recommendatory. Nevertheless, even this Declaration with all its looseness and some compromise wording became already at the stage of preparation a bone in the throat of the proponents of the "free flow of information," meaning "information imperialism."

The Western response to the first steps toward establishing a new international information order was a sharp attack, the so-called Declaration of Talloires.² It stated the opinion of imperialist information monopolies, which mounted an assault on UNESCO and its initiatives.

One of the architects of the Declaration of Talloires was Leonard R. Sussman, Executive Director of Freedom House³ in the USA. He is one of the contributors to *The Communications Revolution in Politics*, a volume brought out by the New York Academy of Political Science. Sussman's contribution bears the title "Information Control as an International Issue,"⁴ and in it he advocates an unrestricted "free flow of information," which, he alleges, is threatened by UNESCO. This is, in essence, the distortion of facts, for an attempt to bring into international usage some legal norms governing the collection, processing and dissemination of information founded on observance of the sovereignty of states is by no means a striving to "curb the free press," as people in the capitalist countries are being led to believe. The UNESCO Declaration urges the mass media to act in and not against the interests of humanism and progress. Is this recommendation an encroachment upon the freedom of the press?

An argument often used by the adversaries of the new information order is that the rules proposed in it would benefit dictatorial, authoritarian regimes that would thus be less vulnerable to world democratic opinion. This argument is

untenable if only by virtue of the aims of the new information order. Anybody accepting its principles cannot misuse the mass media with impunity, without coming under fire from the international community. The whole point is that the new order is in fact aimed against reactionary regimes, for it spells out the broadening and deepening of democracy in information, and the struggle for its democratization is inseparable from the efforts to ensure freedom of speech where today there is not even a hint of such freedom.

As Sussman acknowledges, "perhaps the most significant aspect of the present worldwide flow of information is its disorderliness" (p. 180). The leading capitalist countries produce almost all the advanced information systems. The largest bourgeois agencies that have monopolized the news market in the non-socialist part of the world are stronger than the news agencies of the newly-free nations. This cannot be denied. And it allows them to implement "information imperialism." It is hard even to speak of a balanced information exchange until the developing countries have sophisticated communication equipment.

However, it is not only a matter of having such equipment, as Sussman tries to make out. The content of the information being disseminated is of immense significance. But this aspect is studiously avoided by Sussman. Yet the very motivation of the demands being made by the developing countries is that they should be judged by the outside world not only by reports about natural disasters, political coups, and exoticisms (this is precisely the "image" created by bourgeois journalism), but that the world should know about the objectives and course of the development in key areas of life.

Sussman's rhetoric about freedom of the press conceals the fear of the capitalist system's apologists of losing the ideological struggle with socialism. It is not accidental that he writes nonsense about the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, asserting, for example, that the latter regard the demands for a new international information order "as the opportunity to generate political capital in the Third World" (p. 179).

Sussman subscribes to "the understandable desire of moderate Third World spokesmen for greater participation in the world communication system" (p. 182) and declares that those "who have vast stores of information and the equipment to manufacture and distribute still more should share . . . with those who do not possess them" (p. 188). That, he says, would balance the "free flow of information." In short, he is only repeating the Trojan Horse

idea of the industrialized capitalist countries giving modern information equipment to developing countries.

That this is an attempt to confuse matters is seen from the writings of another, incidentally, bourgeois researcher in mass communication, the Canadian academic Thomas L. McPhail. His book devoted to the international debate in UNESCO over the information order and published simultaneously in Britain and the USA is titled *Electronic Colonialism*.⁵

It must be noted that while it viciously attacks UNESCO, the bourgeois press of capitalist countries has written little about the substance of the debate. McPhail's book merits attention if only because it gives, as the author himself writes (and we agree with him here), "an overview of the major events which surprisingly have gone largely unnoticed by many Western countries and students of communication, sociology, political science and journalism" (p. 10).

The book's title should not, however, create any delusion about McPhail's attitude — he is a proponent of a "free press" in its bourgeois interpretation, although he reckons with the fact that world opinion's traditional ideas about the "free flow of information" have undergone a change.

In particular, he substantively examines the idea of giving modern information equipment to developing countries and significantly calls this "electronic colonialism." As he sees it, electronic colonialism is "the dependency relationship established by the importation of communication hardware, foreign-produced software, along with engineers, technicians and related information protocols, that vicariously establish a set of foreign norms, values and expectations which, in varying degrees, may alter the domestic cultures and socialization processes" (p. 20). He aptly calls the personnel needed to service the imported communication infrastructure "an integral instrument of cultural imperialism." "These technocrats are usually loaned from the West or trained there and bring to developing countries value systems and attitudes, associated with professionalism, about how communication systems should be run that may deflect the purpose or goal of broadcasting in the LDC's (Low Developed Countries)" (pp. 78-79).

Much of McPhail's book discusses the role of UNESCO. He slightly raises the curtain that for the reader in the West had been hiding the machinations and pressures of the capitalist powers aimed at hindering positive steps by UNESCO toward a new information order. However, he in no way criticizes this practice,

only takes note of it. His attitude of an abstract humanist, a bourgeois liberal, who, while trying not to distort the facts, is unable to draw correct conclusions from them, is exemplified by the words: "The new order is rhetorically harsh on colonial domination, neocolonialism, racial discrimination, apartheid, and violations of human rights. Although the goals are indeed lofty, they blur the attempt to shift international power from the Western nations to a loose coalition of LDC's — Arab, nonaligned and socialist (namely the USSR) countries" (p. 106).

The real purport of the USA's attacks on UNESCO, namely, its striving to dictate its will to the international community, clearly comes to light in a book by the UNESCO Director-General Amadou Mahtar M'Bow, *Where the Future Begins*,⁶ which presents his reflections about the problems confronting humankind and the role UNESCO has to play in resolving them. His arguments are permeated with the faith of a humanist in humankind's creative strength and ability to surmount obstacles to further progress. The prime condition for this, he writes, is that there must be peace, which cannot be ensured without compliance with the basic principles of international relations. UNESCO abides strictly by these principles, as is borne out by its plan of work for 1984-1989 unanimously endorsed at the fourth extraordinary session of its General Conference. Thereby, M'Bow noted subsequently, the international community (UNESCO has 161 member-states) approved the ideas put forward in the book.

M'Bow focuses much of his attention on communication and information problems (a whole chapter is devoted to these problems). He points out that there are "very great disparities" in this area between various countries and feels that the development of national information structures in the new states is "a prime prerequisite for the advent of a world of greater equity and solidarity" (p. 55). If the developing countries, M'Bow writes, were better able to communicate they could "not only make their voices heard more effectively in international affairs but could also make more progress in education — particularly in the struggle against illiteracy — and could develop their scientific and technological potential, improve their health systems, promote rural development, and be in a better position to deal with natural disasters" (p. 55).

M'Bow avoids the terms "new international information order" and "information imperialism," does not name those responsible for the existing injustices, and prefers to sidetrack the content (ideological) aspect of information.

However, when he does express alarm over the growing export by "some industrialized countries" of "a sort of standardization" of information and mass cultural production that undermine the distinctive cultures of developing societies (p. 54), it is clear who he means. It is a well-known fact that in the non-socialist part of the world information is entirely in the hands of news agencies of three imperialist powers: the Associated Press and United Press International of the USA, Reuters of Britain, and France Presse of France, while the USA is the major exporter of television programs.⁷

Despite the obstructionist stand taken by the Western powers, some headway has been made toward a new international information order. UNESCO has proclaimed, for instance, an International Program for the Development of Communication (IPDC). Its Inter-Governmental Council, which consists of representatives of 35 countries, has been functioning for more than two years. Underlying its work is the above-mentioned UNESCO 1978 Declaration. Of the results that have been achieved, the most important is that many key programs of aid to the mass media of developing countries, both regional and national, have been removed from the uncontrolled activities of the monopolies and placed under the aegis of UNESCO.

Thanks to the International Program for the Development of Communication (the media are more frequently and correctly calling this the International Program for Development of Communication Infrastructures in the Developing Countries) its Inter-Governmental Council and other agencies are able to study and objectively analyze the actual state of the mass media in the developing nations; keep a vigilant eye on the attempts of the former colonial powers to interfere in the internal affairs of these nations relative to information and communication; extend assistance to the shaping of the information policy of developing countries in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and cooperation among nations; influence the distribution of international assistance in the sphere of information and communication and neutralize the intrigues of transnational corporations; and facilitate the establishment of a new international information order on an anti-imperialist foundation.

In the USA the ruling circles have begun to worry that the International Program for the Development of Communication is not oriented toward the aims and objectives which official Washington would have liked to impose upon it. Evidence of this is to be found, in particular, in a "study" written by Thomas G. Gulick for the Heritage Foundation,⁸ a neocon-

servative organization that has close links to the CIA and U.S. President Reagan. When the International Program was adopted, this "study" states, the West hoped that there would be an end to UNESCO's "war against press freedom" raging for over a decade but now it looked "as though the IPDC were yet another battlefield for the enemies of press freedom."

Incidentally, in this "study" we find one of the reasons for the USA's decision to withdraw from UNESCO. It says that "when UNESCO decided to back the NIIO (New International Information Order) and the New International Economic Order, the UN agency became, in effect, a propaganda arm for the enemies of independent press freedom and as such betrays the communication mandate described in the UNESCO constitution."

In its assault on UNESCO the Heritage Foundation did not by-pass the International Organization of Journalists, which is based in Prague. What nettles the author is the very fact that there is a close "consulting partnership between UNESCO and the International Organization of Journalists."⁹

These attacks should in fact be seen as recognition of the contribution that this progressive organization of journalists is making to the struggle against the inequities in the sphere of information.

The writings of Sussman, McPhail, and Gulick mirror the thinking of those who are, so to speak, on the other side of the barricades of the ideological struggle. Needless to say, there are many books and articles in which this problem is dealt with from genuinely scientific, Marxist-Leninist positions. One of these is, for instance, *The Mass Media and International Relations*¹⁰ by the Soviet scientist Yuri Kashlev, Dr. Hist., published by the International Organization of Journalists in English. This book contains valuable information about the history of the media and the tensions of the ideological struggle in the world, explains the phenomenon of "information imperialism," and gives a detailed account of the debate over the new order. Kashlev shows how and why objective factors of life — the scientific and technological revolution, the escalating battle between ideologies, and so on — have led to an unprecedented growth of the role played by information and propaganda in international relations.

Polemicizing with some non-Marxist academics, Kashlev notes that "it would be wrong to say that the whole phenomenon of the increasing role of information in public life and international relations is the result of the pro-

gress in science and technology alone (as a matter of fact, this is what is said by most of the contributors to the above-mentioned *The Communications Revolution in Politics*. — A.B.) ... The awakening of hundreds of millions of people to political life through victorious socialist and national liberation revolutions, the more complex controversy between different world outlooks, the increased social activity and literacy of the masses, and the ever broader economic and cultural ties being established between nations are some of the factors that affect most of all the role and place of exchanges of information in modern society" (p. 9).

A distinctive feature of Kashlev's book is its lucid ideological stand and its systematized exposition of a highly intricate range of problems. Kashlev shows that the controversy over the new information order boils down, on the one hand, to the desire of the developing countries to break out of imperialist dependence altogether and, on the other, to the efforts being made by imperialism to preserve and increase its ideological domination in Asia, Africa and Latin America. "Control over the developing countries' mass media," Kashlev writes, "is of vital importance for Western business. Without the conditions for disseminating their information and ideology, without the possibilities for manipulating the multi-million-strong audiences abroad, and without the most extensive advertising of American goods, the United States' aim of global expansion would face considerable difficulties. That is why the transnational corporations and Western politicians react so sharply to any interference aimed at changing the status quo in the present international mass communication structure" (p. 80).

Kashlev gives a convincing reply to the new order's adversaries, who champion the bourgeois "free flow of information" slogan with references to the UN Declaration on Human Rights (as is done, for example, in the above-mentioned Sussman article). He justifiably notes that the relevant provision of the UN Declaration refers "only to personal freedom and the right of the individual to air his views on one problem or another, and not to the disseminating of mass information (let alone by a state), which may, in particular, damage relations between countries and peoples, in violation of the generally recognized rules of international law, the principles of the UN Charter, etc." (p. 155).

In carrying out the mission given them by the ruling circles, the spokesmen of the information monopolies try to prove that from the

standpoint of international law, information exchanges cannot be regulated. Yet, as Kashlev points out, international law gives forcible arguments in favor of a new international information order. For instance, the preamble of the UNESCO Declaration of 1978, which formulates the basic principles for the mass media, contains many references to earlier UN documents that have the status of international law (pp. 160-162). The attempts of the "information imperialists" to prevent the legal regulation of international information exchanges are due to nothing less than their striving to camouflage their ideological expansion.

The socialist countries are the natural allies of the developing nations in their anti-imperialist struggle, and they do not stint support for the idea of a new international information order, and are helping to translate it into reality. In Yuri Andropov's reply to the UNESCO Director-General Amadou Mahtar M'Bow, a tribute was paid to the role played by the mass media in establishing understanding and cooperation among the peoples, in the struggle for peace and the elimination of the war threat, and emphasis was put on the fact that in this connection the Soviet Union "understands the attention that UNESCO is giving to creating a new international order in information that would help to end 'information imperialism,' the domination of Western monopolies in this sphere."¹¹

The works surveyed in this article reflect the substance and character of the struggle for a new international information order. Imperialism's reactionary circles, chiefly of the USA, have made a big effort to worsen the situation in the world. Their intention to continue exacerbating it is exemplified by the U.S. declaration about its withdrawal from UNESCO. Washington, as was noted by the Chairman of the Czechoslovak Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO Ladislav Smid, will unquestionably continue using pressure and blackmail in order to diminish the progressive character of this important world body.¹²

All in all, there are no grounds for hoping for a quick realization of the idea of a new international information order. However, the response of progressive world opinion to the U.S. action, which reveals the total hollowness of the reasons given by Washington for its decision, and also UNESCO's firm resolve to go forward with its humane mission create the confidence that the just idea of such an order will see the light of day.

Professor Alice Bunzlova, Ph. D.
(Czechoslovakia)

1. This is discussed in "On the Way to a New International Information Order," Material of an International Symposium in Prague, WMR, No. 10, 1982.

2. Talloires, a small resort town in southern France, where the overlords and managers of bourgeois mass media held a meeting in May 1981. — Ed.

3. Freedom House, a non-governmental agency specializing in anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda, was founded in New York in 1941. — Ed.

4. Leonard R. Sussman, "Information Control as an International Issue," *The Communications Revolution in Politics*, Edited by Gerald Benjamin, the Academy of Political Science, New York, 1982, pp. 176-188.

5. Thomas L. McPhail, *Electronic Colonialism*, Sage, Beverly Hills-London, 1981.

6. Amadou Mahtar M'Bow, *Where the Future Begins*, UNESCO, Paris, 1982. This book has been published in six languages: English, Arabic, Spanish, Chinese, Russian and French. The quotations in this article are from the English-language edition.

7. More information on this is given in James West,

"The Monopoly Octopuses' Tentacles," WMR, No. 5, 1981.

8. Thomas G. Gulick, *The IPDC: UNESCO vs. the Free Press. Background*, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, March 10, 1983.

9. Quoted in *The Democratic Journalist*, No. 11, 1983, p. 15.

10. Yuri Kashlev, *The Mass Media and International Relations*, The International Organization of Journalists, Prague, 1983.

For understandable reasons no mention is made of the book by the author of this survey, Alice Bunzlova, devoted entirely to the new international information order. We would recommend this book: Alice Bunzlova, *Mezinárodní informacní rád*, Novinar, Prague, 1982. Mention must also be made of a substantive article by a Polish researcher Jadwiga Patecka, "Nowy międzynarodowy ład informacyjny," *Nowe drogi*, No. 5, 1983, pp. 165-180. — Ed.

11. *Pravda*, February 1, 1984.

12. *Czechoslovak Digest*, No. 1, 1984, p. 8.

In thrall to old notions

Harold Brown, *Thinking About National Security*, Defense and Foreign Policy in a Dangerous World, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, 1983, 288 pp.

On being relieved of a public post, many U.S. politicians seem to feel that it is their duty to oblige their countrymen by telling them what they would do if they found themselves in office again. Harold Brown, former U.S. Secretary of Defense, is no exception. And while he is merely a private person now who has been visiting professor at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, anyone who reads his book might imagine that he is back at the head of the Pentagon.

The author's purpose is "to help establish a better framework for thinking about national security" (p. xii). But why is a "better framework" needed? Is anything wrong with U.S. national security? Is anybody endangering it? No, it is simply that "the United States has lost its clear military and economic dominance of the world" (p. 269). And so, in changed world conditions, Brown undertakes a search for ways and means of restoring that position. The reason why he considers this necessary is obvious since, according to him, U.S. "national security" means the ability of his country to lord it over the world.

We must say from the outset that Brown's search for a "better framework" has failed. His reflections have resulted in subscribing to the anything but original imperialist and imperial stand in favor of achieving military superiority taken by the present U.S. administration, which American analysts describe as the most

reactionary ever. Nor is this surprising, since Brown made his career in intimate association with the military-industrial complex and his book shows this only too clearly.

Brown is for the United States retaining the doctrine of first use of nuclear weapons, for an anti-satellite system, for still more biological and chemical weapons. He considers Reagan's "zero option" proposed at the Geneva talks with the Soviet Union as "reasonable and fair" (p. 196).

The book is dominated by the idea of planning for overall military strategy. Brown views international relations from the angle of U.S. military confrontation with the Soviet Union and the socialist community of nations and distributes the roles among countries accordingly, unembarrassed by the fact that these are not the 50s (which make him feel nostalgic), but the 80s. Thus, he, in effect, tells France to stay out of the Western Hemisphere because it can better serve U.S. interests by taking care of its former colonies in Africa (see p. 168). He sees relations between Washington and Peking as not simply the "China card" but a "full deck of cards," not only against the USSR, but against the entire Southeast Asia region (see p. 136).

Brown wants the West European NATO countries to keep their promise to increase military spending in real growth (with due regard to inflation) by three per cent a year and to build up their conventional forces more vigorously. He wants Japan to increase military spending to six per cent of its GNP.

Brown sees trade as a weapon. He urges a

continued policy of pressure on U.S. allies to prevent them from exporting up-to-date technology to the Soviet Union and make them control availability of spare parts. He demands a review of trade with the Soviet Union every two or three years, with a U.S. right to veto (see pp. 31-32).

In regard to developing countries, Brown offers the McCarthyite formula: "Adherence to Soviet views in international affairs . . . should be considered as negative in forming U.S. attitudes toward a particular government" (p. 165). And, of course, to ensure "non-adherence," first place goes to a U.S. military presence or even armed intervention. This has occurred more than once in modern history and the latest case in point is the invasion of Grenada.

In short, the author presents the reader with Washington's hoary positions-of-strength policy.

We could have dispensed with commenting on the ex-secretary's book but for his attempt to deal with problems, difficulties and contradictions which have frustrated U.S. imperialism's smooth sailing to world domination. It does not make him very happy, of course, but he is compelled to admit certain facts. He frankly notes, for example, that it is not easy to sell the world on the myth of a "Soviet threat" (see pp. 105, 111, 130, 148, 269). But does he believe in it?

Listing the fears of the capitalist world, Brown writes: "Environmental problems, social tensions, conflicts between various segments of the population, economic dislocations, and other domestic difficulties of the industrialized (e.g., capitalist. — S.M.) democracies are by no means the result of some monster Soviet plot" (pp. 7-8). "But even if the Soviet Union were . . . to subside into unimportance as an international factor (surely, his wish is father of this thought. — S.M.), that would by no means cause the disappearance of all the international complexities, problems, dangers, or even potential disasters with which the United States must cope . . ." (p. 6). Brown's conclusion: "United States policy toward the Soviet Union must recognize that U.S.-Soviet relations are adversarial by virtue of the respective political systems and historical conditions and that they are almost certain to remain so, at least for the rest of this century" (p. 268).

True enough, the two countries have diametrically opposed social and economic systems

and ideologies. But what is there in this relationship that requires rivalry to the point of military confrontation? Brown does not answer this, nor is the reason hard to guess.

Imperialism, unlike socialism, has no confidence in the future. It dreads peaceful competition with socialism. Hence, its concept of "adversarial relationship" takes with the more rabid reactionaries the form of military confrontation (and now even a "crusade").

Brown is most consistent as a militarist. He is concerned because he thinks Western Europe has had peace for too long. To his mind, this period of peace, uninterrupted for nearly four decades, is a "complicating factor" which makes the capitalist countries "fragile in the face of adversity," with people not seasoned enough to bear up under the hardships of a future war. War to do what? To "preserve the democratic system and the market economy" (p. 25). A fine ideal, sure enough. Why, isn't it the same Brown who questions the very governability of bourgeois democracy in the face of single-issue constituencies? Doesn't he name as some of capitalism's problems the existence of colossal structural unemployment, dissipation of national resources, the collapse of public education, loss of public confidence in the national leadership and, speaking generally, in political, religious and economic institutions (see pp. 4-5 and 262-263)?

In contrast to his meticulous planning on military matters, Brown has nothing to offer for the solution of the problems and difficulties pointed out by him. This is understandable, for militarism in the nuclear age is, to say the least, irrational, if not absurd. When the militarist mind comes up against reality it has no rational answer even when it recognizes some facts.

Neither "détente" nor "peaceful coexistence" is to be found in the book. Its author never mentions any one of the numerous proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries aimed at staving off nuclear war.

While Brown is no longer in power, his views generally square with the policy of the ruling U.S. clique, whose members our General Secretary, Gus Hall, described at the recent 23rd convention of the CPUSA as the most insensate and rabid warmongers pushing the world to the brink of the most dangerous crisis.

Steven Mark
U.S. journalist

He did not bow down

Bobby Sands, *One Day in My Life*. With an Introduction by Sean MacBride, Lenin and Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Dublin and Cork, Mercier Press, 1983, 118 pp.

Robert Sands, M.P. (Northern Ireland), "wrote the present work on sheets of toilet paper with biro refills in a small filthy cell covered with excrement" (Publisher's Note, p. 23).

In March 1981, Bobby Sands became a household name the world over after he was elected to the British Parliament from Fermanagh-South Tyrone while on hunger strike as an inmate of the Long Kesh prison camp near Belfast¹ in pursuance of political status for himself and all other Republican prisoners in Northern Ireland. He died 66 days later.

The hunger strike was the culmination of five years of protest by these prisoners. The origins of the campaign for political status stem from an attempt by a British Labour government to criminalize the prisoners in order to be able to claim to the world that the issues involved in Northern Ireland were not political but of a criminal nature.²

The protests in the H-Blocks of the Long Kesh prison camp took the form of the prisoners refusing to don the prison garb; this eventually led to their refusing to voluntarily leave their cells, due to the extreme acts of brutality meted out to them by the prison warders. Thus began the "dirty protest," with the men excreting and urinating in their cells. It is this part of the protest that Sands' book focuses on, giving the reader a harrowing account of a day of his life naked in "a filthy concrete tomb" (p. 86).

It is a vivid picture, which, as Sean MacBride writes in his Introduction, portrays "frighten-

ing examples of man's inhumanity to man" (p. 7).

Every minute of every waking hour, Sands was surrounded by dirt, disease and violence, a living nightmare that even in sleep was difficult to escape from. And when this was achieved it wasn't for long. "I woke up and my blankets and mattress were a living mass of white maggots. They were in my hair and beard and crawling upon my naked body" (p. 52).

The nakedness of the prisoners left them particularly vulnerable to the sadism of their jailers, anal searches being the pet technique to try to humiliate and break the protesters. For the jailers, Sands writes, "it was great fun; everybody was killing themselves laughing, except me, while all the time a barrage of punches rained down on my naked body" (pp. 28-29). This treatment was a daily occurrence throughout the prison.

Every evening the protesters from the other blocks would shout across the "horror reports": "Several men severely beaten during a wing shift . . . three men scalded in another wing . . . forty-four men beaten . . . two men in hospital and two more missing, probably on the boards"³ (p. 107).

Despite all these tortures, hundreds of men resisted the will of imperialism to criminalize them. Whatever the political differences one might have with these people over their adherence to the counter-productive military struggle,⁴ admiration for their fighting spirit, for their firm intention not to bow down to the diktat of imperial Britain must be forthcoming.

As the book shows, locked up 24 hours a day, these prisoners, who seldom saw anyone except their tormentors, survived. Defenseless but with a tremendous courage, they learned the Irish language. "The teacher" would "shout out the lessons at the top of his voice from behind his heavy steel door . . ." (p. 53). The Irish tongue, which throughout the centuries the British have tried to destroy through different methods, was being used as a weapon against their jailers. A form of resistance but also of comfort. Succor was also found both in the singing of rebel songs and the saying of prayers.

The great courage and endurance of these prisoners and the considerable support they had inside and outside of Ireland did not win them political status. Instead, they only gained a few concessions for which they paid so dearly, with 10 protesters dying on hunger strikes. The blame for this must lie at the door of the

Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Contradictions of Capitalism

cloth 660 pp \$11.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

Westminster parliament and its intransigent imperialist leader, Mrs. Thatcher. But criticism should also be levelled at those who dominated the "H-Block campaign" in Ireland and equated support for political status as backing for the IRA's armed struggle. This inevitably narrowed the base of the campaign and helped to lead to its defeat.

As for the book, it is not just a tale of human suffering and great courage. It is much more. It is an indictment of British rule in Northern Ireland and therefore further exposes the British government's pretensions of democracy.

The true face of British justice and democracy continues to operate in Northern Ireland as the following news item shows: "... Two sol-

diers accused of the murder of Derry man Eamon Bradley last August have been found not guilty on the grounds that they believed that he was going for a gun when they opened fire. Mr. Bradley was not armed at the time and died shot in the leg and then in the head when he was lying on the ground."⁵

Nial Farrell
CP Ireland representative
on the journal

1. Sands spent altogether nine years in prison out of his 27 years of life. — Ed.
2. For details, see Niall Farrell, "'Law and Order' the British Way," WMR, No. 1, 1983.
3. Punishment cells.
4. For details, see Michael O'Riordan, "Conclusions Borne Out by Events," WMR, No. 12, 1982.
5. Morning Star, September 10, 1983.



Communist youth leagues

In response to reader requests, WMR presents this item as the first of a series about communist youth leagues. This series will give an idea of their history and organizational structure and also of the character of their activities on the basis of material from the party press and information received from the youth organizations themselves.

All-Union Lenin Young Communist League

The YCL, or Komsomol as it is called by its acronym in the Soviet Union, is an independent public organization founded in 1918. Its 42 million members are between the ages of 14 and 28 and they make up 60 per cent of the rising generation in the USSR. In the Komsomol there are young men and women of the more than 100 nations and nationalities inhabiting the USSR. Of the total membership, 57.9 per cent work in the national economy.

The Komsomol is the reserve of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Almost three-fourths of the people admitted to the CPSU come from the Komsomol. There are 1,500,000 communists working in the Komsomol. The YCL operates under the party's leadership, and this is institutionalized in its own rules and in the rules of the CPSU.

The Komsomol helps the party to bring up young people in the spirit of the ideas of communism, proletarian internationalism, and strict compliance with the USSR constitution and Soviet laws, training all-sidedly developed people. Millions of young men and women are studying in the YCL system of political and economic education. On YCL initiative the Young Pioneer organization was founded in 1922, and the leadership of this organization the party assigned to the YCL.

The YCL sees the whole purport of its activities in carrying out the decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet government, in fulfilling the program for building a communist society. The YCL is part and parcel of the history of the USSR. Some 200,000 Komsomol members defended the revolution with arms in hand during the years the Soviet power was established, the intervention, and the Civil War. Komsomol members contributed significantly to the country's industrialization, the collectivization of its agriculture, and the cultural transformations. During the Second World War members of the YCL and all other Soviet young people rose to defend the country in response to the party's appeal. More than 7,000 YCL members were conferred the title of

Hero of the Soviet Union. Members of the Komsomol put in an enormous amount of labor restoring the war-ravaged economy.

In organizing young people for the fulfillment of economic development plans, the YCL constantly directs their efforts toward the attainment of the cardinal socio-economic aims facing the country. In the 1950s more than 350,000 members of the YCL developed huge expanses of virgin and disused land in Kazakhstan, Siberia and the Altai. Currently, the YCL has the stewardship over the building of 135 key economic projects. One such project was the Siberia-to-Europe natural gas pipeline. Along the route followed by the pipeline there were 197 primary YCL organizations, and 250 YCL-led youth collectives worked in the most important sections. The pipeline has been built in record time for this type of project.

The services of the YCL have been highly appreciated: it has been decorated with six Orders.

The YCL plays a noteworthy role in public life and has wide powers. Under the USSR constitution it has the right of legislative initiative. Invoking this right, it has in the past five years submitted some 200 suggestions to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on new draft laws and normative acts. All these suggestions were approved and acquired the force of laws. YCL organizations take part in discussing and raising before party bodies questions related to the work of industrial facilities, collective farms and offices, and are represented in many organs of state administration. More than a third of the People's Deputies are young people under 30 years of age. In the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, 15 per cent of the deputies are Komsomol members.

Democratic centralism is the principle underlying the YCL's organizational structure. This structure is based on the territorial-production principle. The YCL at present has 14 republican, 6 territorial, 151 regional, 10 area, and several thousand town and district organizations. Its basis consists of primary organizations, which are set up at the place of work or study of its members: at factories, collective and state farms, units of the Soviet Armed Forces, offices and educational institutions.

The YCL's highest organ is its congress. The latest, the 19th, was held in 1982. All activities in the interim between congresses are directed by the Central Committee, which elects a Bureau and a Secretariat.

The YCL runs 247 periodicals with a total printing of nearly 80 million copies. Its central organ is the newspaper *Komsomolskaya pravda*. The YCL's publishing houses annually

bring out an average of over 600 titles (books and brochures) with a printing of over 46 million copies.

The YCL budget is formed of membership dues, the revenue from its publishing houses, newspapers and journals, and from undertakings conducted by its organizations. The YCL draws upon its own funds to build schools to train and re-train its cadre, printshops, sports facilities and so forth.

In the USSR there are 40 zonal, republican and regional schools for YCL cadre. Since its foundation, the Higher Komsomol School under the YCL Central Committee has provided training for more than 2,000 people and refresher courses for 13,500 people.

In its far-flung international activity, the YCL develops links to more than 1,350 national, regional and international youth and students' organizations in 140 countries. The Committee of Youth Organizations was founded in the USSR in 1956 to foster friendship and co-operation with young people in other countries. The same purpose is served by the Sputnik Bureau of International Youth Tourism, which maintains contacts with 550 partners in 88 countries.

The YCL sees its central task today in doing everything to consolidate peace, to avert the threat of a nuclear war. More than 20 million Soviet young people took part in the actions protesting against the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The "I Vote for Peace" campaign conducted in the summer of 1983 involved 70 million young men and women. In order to increase its contribution to the struggle against the nuclear threat, the Komsomol has taken the initiative to hold the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow in 1985.

Communist Youth Movement of France

Known by its acronym MJCF, this Movement consists of the Union of Young Communists and the Union of Communist Students. Its work is directed by a National Council, which is elected at congresses convened every two years. Its printed media are the newspaper *Avant-Garde* and the student newspaper *Le Nouveau Clarté*.

In its work the Movement takes its guideline from the policies and strategy of the Communist Party while remaining an independent organization with its own youth-oriented interests.

In recent years it has drawn up a new action program in keeping with the changes in French society, which is experiencing a profound crisis. This program is based on an exhaustive

analysis of the modern rising generation conducted by the Movement. The big bourgeoisie is trying to persuade young people to reconcile themselves to the present state of affairs in France, adopt a way of life not linked to work and society, and accentuate individualism.

The Young Communists have suggested revolutionary solutions of key problems confronting the rising generation, thereby helping young people to combat the negative social phenomena aggravated by the crisis. For example, they are fighting dropping out of school and the sentiment that sees chance work and unemployment as a normal state of things. They are fighting drug addiction, delinquency, violence, theft, etc. Despite the deepening crisis tendencies in France, the MJCF has been able to counter the bourgeois strategy of encouraging desperation and meekness, and to organize a movement of resistance to the crisis.

The MJCF sees young people today not only as a generation of the crisis but also as a generation of the great changes of our epoch. This generation is in quest of a new way of life. Relying on the positive aspirations and potential of young people, the Movement seeks to help them play an active role in the reshaping of society.

Of late, the Movement has considerably stepped up its work among young working people. It has developed new ways and means of activating young people. For instance, there has been a successful campaign under the heading, "Talk, I Am Listening." The purpose of this campaign was to induce young people to state their views about work, skills, and the specific problems arising out of the use of new technology, about the world they are living in and, lastly, about what it means to be a young person in French urban communities. The questionnaire was published in the newspaper *Avant-Garde*. In the course of this campaign and jointly with the communists, young people drew up "local youth charters." This was a new means of drawing young people into the political struggle. The Union of Communist Students recently organized a successful meeting of students with representatives of the Communist Party to discuss the subject "Socialism, the Cause of Our Time."

Moreover, the MJCF selects forms of international activity most appreciated by young people. Taking into consideration the fact that young people are least inclined to believe words and that they are guided mostly by their own experience, the Movement focuses on extending its international links, organizing solidarity teams and sightseeing tours of various countries. Young French people have

helped to build the Baikal-Amur Railway in the USSR, and have worked in Cuba, Nicaragua and other countries.

The struggle for peace and disarmament has had a wide response from young French people of differing persuasions. The Communist Youth circles at schools and in residential neighborhoods are rallying many young people around these aims.

The MJCF is entering a new stage in its development. This is a stage of the further extension of the Movement, which is enabling young people to unite in order to act and draw joy from life, organizing not only their joint struggle but also their leisure time, helping them to know the world, sponsoring sports activities, and so forth. This is the objective of the Movement's 1,500 circles.

United Democratic Youth Organization of Cyprus

This organization, known by its acronym EDON in Cyprus, was founded in 1959. Its predecessor was the Progressive Youth Organization, which was outlawed by the British colonialists and had to function in secret. Today EDON's membership consists of factory workers, peasants, white-collar workers, and higher school graduates between the ages of 14 and 30. It is the most militant mass youth organization in the country. In 1982 it had over 14,000 members. It publishes the weekly *Neolea*.

EDON is structured along the principle of democratic centralism. Its highest body is its congress convened once every three years. In the period between congresses the organization is guided by its Central Council, Executive Council, and Central Secretariat.

All of EDON's activities are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and it works in close cooperation with the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL).

EDON conducts manifold political, mass-cultural and sports activities, educates young people in the spirit of the ideas of internationalism, socialism and communism, staunchly champions their interests, mobilizes them for the struggle for political, economic and social rights, and presses the government to create healthy conditions for their recreation. Under EDON's aegis there are dozens of music and theatrical groups, Cypriot popular dance ensembles, and so on. Once every three years it organizes the Pancypriot Festival of Youth and Students.

By its vigorous and multiform activities EDON has asserted itself as the vanguard of the

Cypriot youth. It directs the children's movement in the country. The Pancypriot National Organization of Secondary Students, which shares EDON's aims and objectives, has thousands of members.

Currently EDON sees its principal political task in mobilizing the youth of Cyprus in the struggle to create an independent, territorially integral, sovereign, federal, demilitarized, and non-aligned Cyprus.

It takes part in all actions in defense of peace, détente and disarmament, and helps to unite the peace forces. Steadfastly adhering to anti-imperialist positions, it supports the movement

of solidarity with the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, with the democrats of Chile and El Salvador, with the freedom fighters in South Africa and Namibia, and with all the people opposed to imperialism and internal reaction.

EDON is a member of the World Federation of Democratic Youth and is active in championing the unity of the international democratic youth movement. It promotes fraternal relations with the youth organizations of the socialist world and progressive youth organizations in industrialized capitalist countries and developing nations.

Under the proletarian banner

150th Anniversary of the Lyons Weavers' Uprising

PAGES OF HISTORY

A century and a half ago, in April 1834, there took place in Lyons, the second largest industrial town in France, an event whose grim and uncompromising nature subsequently gave Frederick Engels the grounds for comparing it with the slave uprising in ancient Rome.¹ For six days and nights Lyons weavers stood up against thousands of regular troops, displaying unparalleled courage and heroism. For six days and nights the big bourgeoisie of the July monarchy trembled with fear before a then young but formidable force, the proletariat, which was taking the road of independent and determined actions.

By that time the workers of Lyons had already had their baptism of fire in the battles of November 1831, which were the first-ever large-scale armed clash between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Reduced to desperation by ruthless exploitation and abject poverty, the local weavers and artisans spontaneously took up arms and raised over their barricades a black banner of protest with the words: "Live working or die fighting!" The rising of 1831 did not have a political program and did not rely on contact with the workers of other towns or with the peasants. However, it showed that a new class, the proletariat, had appeared on the historical scene with the assertion of the capitalist mode of production.

This fact was not only reasserted but also definitively stressed by the Lyons rising of 1834. It was an important landmark in the development of the basic conflict of capitalist society and in embryonic form mirrored the economic and political aspects of the future

confrontation between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

The impetus for the action was given by the passage in the Chamber of Deputies of a bill denying workers the right of association and the authorities' summarily dealing with strikers in Lyons in February 1834. But it was not only the determination to defend their rights that once again brought the weavers to the barricades. From the beginning there was a political angle to the rising. It took place under republican slogans demanding democratic freedoms. The insurgents went into battle with a new motto — "Republic or Death!" and carried red banners.² They were joined by petty-bourgeois democrats — members of the Human and Citizens' Rights Society and other republican organizations. The workers and republicans formed the United Committee, one of whose leaders was the democrat Charles Lagrange, who was to become a prominent figure in the revolution of 1848.

It is noteworthy that having captured important positions in the center of Lyons, the workers called upon the population of the nearby villages to join them. Under the impact of the Lyons events the peasants of the vine-growing communities of Arbois raised the red banner, entered the town and, together with the local proletariat, gained possession of it. In the meantime, the struggle was joined by the workers of Saint Etienne, the suburbs of Grenoble, Vienne, and some other towns. A rising flared up in Paris on April 13-14.

While urging other strata of the population to join their movement, the workers did not conceal that it was their intention to restructure

society in the interests of the working classes. But they had not at the time learned to make effective use of many of the means of struggle available to them. They had no organization, no plan of political actions, no knowledge, and no ideology of their own. "The class struggle of the proletariat, which was only just beginning to emerge as something different from the common mass of the petty-bourgeois 'people,'" Lenin wrote, "took the shape of isolated outbursts, like the uprising of the Lyons weavers. The working class was at that time . . . only feeling its way."³

The bourgeoisie, which had on its side the state power, the army, the Church, wealth, and knowledge and political experience, drowned the rising of April 1834, as that of 1831, in blood. In Lyons alone, a thousand people lost their lives. A wave of brutal repressions swept across the land. However, the victory of the ruling class was fragile, and its importance proved to be insignificant compared with the principal result of the events.

Prior to the Lyons risings not a single action of the proletariat, whether in France, Italy or Britain, was a direct challenge to bourgeois rule. The proletariat was still acting under the leadership of the propertied classes, fighting "the enemies of their enemies." But the Lyons events proclaimed to the world that the workers were no longer inclined to submit to the order under which their labor and life were the total property of the bourgeoisie, and that the proletariat could act independently of the social hierarchy above them, including the bourgeois class.

Karl Marx, who attached great significance to the uprisings of the Lyons weavers, drew attention, in the first place, to the essentially social character of their action.⁴ This was the proletariat's first big step toward political independence, toward their awareness of their strength. Following the Lyons risings and Chartism, Engels wrote, the "class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie came to the front in the history of the most advanced

countries in Europe, in proportion to the development, upon the one hand, of modern industry, upon the other, of the newly-acquired political supremacy of the bourgeoisie."⁵

Of course, the Lyons insurgents had only a vague idea of the historical prospects of proletarian actions and were far from understanding the laws of the development of bourgeois society and the role played in this development by the working class. However, the new level of the class struggle, which was clearly delineated in the course of the Lyons events and other mass proletarian actions of those years, predicated the possibility and need for such understanding. In other words, the working class movement of the 1830s was in many respects the material preparation for Marxism, the "word before last" toward it.

Since the first clashes with the bourgeoisie, the international revolutionary movement of the working class has traversed a long, heroic and complicated road. It has become the most powerful social force and is increasingly influencing world development in favor of peace and socialism, of the national and social liberation of the peoples. In order to have a better "understanding of the significance of their movement and a thorough knowledge of it,"⁶ the working class of today and its political vanguard, the communists, are constantly drawing upon the vast international experience of proletarian struggle and upon its history, to which the Lyons weavers gave one of the first vivid pages.

Henri Paul

1. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 130.

2. The red banner was raised for the first time over the barricades in the workers' districts of Paris in June 1832 — Ed.

3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 295.

4. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 204.

5. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, p. 132.

6. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 363.

communist viewpoint

There is a connection between theory and action. If you're interested in Canadian politics, you'll find the connection in Communist Viewpoint.

— a unique, critical look at every aspect of Canadian life in articles written by some of Canada's leading Marxists

— a refreshing perspective: the need for social change in Canada and how this can be achieved

By subscribing to Communist Viewpoint you're not only doing yourself a favor, you're helping to build the socialist journal Canada needs today.

Subscriptions — 1 year:

Canada: \$6.00 USA and foreign: \$9.00

PROGRESS BOOKS, 71 Bathurst St., Toronto M5V 2P6

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Providing a Marxist approach to burning domestic and international problems, Political Affairs is indispensable reading for trade unionists, peace and freedom activists, students of politics and society as well as all those who seek clarity about current issues.

As the monthly theoretical journal of the Communist Party USA, Political Affairs is the most authoritative source on the policies and views of the CPUSA.

Special offer for new readers: \$7.50 for one-year subscription (regular \$10)

Political Affairs
235 West 23rd Street
Room 500
New York, N. Y. 10011

Now available in
French, Spanish, Arabic

*World Marxist Review and
Information Bulletin*

Same cost as English subscription:
\$15.00 one year subscription

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

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, Costa Rica, 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, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Palestine, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, South African Republic, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam.

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., \$15 a year. Institutions, double rate.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, Amharic, French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Por-

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, 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.



Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

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 Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
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

Gestu BP 2678

Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban

32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc

Dar Al-Hilal

16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

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

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

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb
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 Hírlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

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

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

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

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

PERSIAN EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden
16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

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

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

ROMANIAN 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. Cantacaro, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlari, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhập,
Khẩu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

