WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Dec. 1975, Vol. 18, No. 12 50c



Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

December 1975, Vol. 18, No. 12

Features

3 The ideological struggle in the new European conditions
K. Jespersen

11 Forces of peace and socialism on the offensive
E. Scharf

The Party

20 The strength of Communist principles
F. Keuneman

25 The masses will decide the outcome of the battle
R. Marin

31 Communist Party of Spain National Conference
S. Aliaga

37 International Women's Year. Active builders of the new life
I. Lange

Political Panorama

42 Reflections on the general election
A. Aalto

48 New serious threat to world peace
L.C. Prestes

55 Political flexibility, ideological implacability
C. Jagan

62 Some features of U.S. capitalist development
H. Lumer

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

72 The Socialist International and Africa
A. Dansoko

77 Trade unions and independence of Canada
B. Magnuson

87 Faith in victory
O. Tambo

93 Let the facts speak
B. Lhamsuren

Theory

96 Workers' class consciousness: level and trends
J. Schleifstein, J.H. von Heiseler

104 Some aspects of capitalist development in Asian and African countries
A WMR seminar

117 The intelligentsia and its future in socialist society
B. Golebiewski

The press

123 Bookshelf of political literature

134 **Contents for 1975**

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is the North American edition of the monthly journal Problems of Peace and Socialism published in Prague.

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $5.00 a year, $9.00 for two years. Single copies 50 cents. Overseas: $8.50 a year.

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

Subscriptions to these may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto.
M5V 1T4

Or, in USA from IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, 320 West Ohio St., Chicago, Ill. 60610

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published by PROGRESS BOOKS, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
M5V 1T4

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

feature

The ideological struggle in the new European conditions

Knud Jespersen
Chairman,
Communist Party of Denmark

The Helsinki Conference is rightly regarded as an epochal event in the history of our continent. The heads of state and government of 33 European countries, the USA and Canada, signed a document designed to put an end to the period of confrontation and cold war and usher in a new stage of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation between all the European countries, regardless of social system.

Affirmation of peaceful coexistence does not, however, imply 'ideological peace.' It is not attended by abatement of the ideological struggle as a form of class struggle. The new element in the situation is that the ideological confrontation of the two social systems is henceforth tied in also with solution of the central problem of world politics, extension of détente. No matter how sharp the differences between the bourgeois and socialist concepts of society, this confrontation does not endanger peace, for détente and peaceful coexistence presuppose maintenance of international relations irrespective of ideological differences.

Of course, the change will not come all at once. We are witness to continued frantic attempts to torpedo détente and direct the ideological struggle — despite peaceful coexistence — into the channel of 'psychological war' against the socialist countries. But there is a new reality: the more aggressive and reactionary imperialist circles are finding it increasingly difficult to substantiate their claim that relations with the socialist world can be based only on a 'military solution.' Obliged to accept the principle of peaceful coexistence, some ruling circles in the imperialist powers consider it prudent to keep the cold warriors at a distance.

Imperialism is adapting its ideological activity to the new conditions. It is looking for new ways to achieve its old goals, namely, to

prevent the spread of communist ideas in the capitalist countries, weaken and undermine the political and socio-economic system in the socialist countries, and split the socialist community and the international Communist movement. Détente has not diminished attempts to spread anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in Western Europe. Judging from our and other countries, the very opposite is the case. Imperialism's ideologists and politicians are apprehensive lest détente generate 'dangerous thoughts' in the masses.

Latterly, we in Denmark have had another convincing proof that imperialism's ideologists have no scruples about using every available means for their anti-Soviet propaganda. On October 17-19 the so-called Committee of Eastern Emigres in Denmark staged in the Folketing a meeting of representatives of the most malicious and rabid anti-communist and anti-Soviet reaction, designated as the 'Sakharov Hearings.' The fact that such 'hearings' were held is not in itself indicative — they were a complete fiasco and ended in chaos and a fight between the participants. What is indicative is the markedly favorable attitude of the bourgeois media: it played up the 'hearings' as energetically as it had played down the hearings against the war in Vietnam and the militarist and fascist offensive in Chile. But the reactionaries were disappointed. The 'hearings' boomeranged, and, in the end, the sponsors and organizers tried to absolve themselves of responsibility in the eyes of the public and find some justification for their crass anti-Sovietism, which had met with no response whatever. All they managed to achieve was to embarrass the Folketing and impair its international reputation. The dismal failure of the 'hearings' suggests that notwithstanding the increase of anti-Soviet tendencies, détente has proved a decisive factor in exposing anti-Sovietism.

There is ample proof that peaceful coexistence does not mean that imperialist ideology has become less anti-communist — nor has socialist ideology become less anti-imperialist. That follows from the very nature of the international class struggle. Marxist-Leninists have never denied that ideological contradictions will exist as long as there is a class basis for them. They have maintained, and now more emphatically, that the ideological struggle between classes and social systems can and should be conducted in a way that rules out military conflicts.

The ideological struggle remains a sharp form of confrontation not only internationally, between opposed social systems, but also within each country. These are two aspects of one and the same phenomenon. They cannot be separated, still less counterposed to each other in the belief that there is no need to combat anti-Sovietism because, allegedly it is something 'external,' 'beyond national bounds,' and is not related to the class struggle within one's country.

That attitude is based on the theory that, in our day, there are 'different socialist ideologies': a socialism suitable for the working class of capitalist countries, and another suitable for different socialist countries.

Such anti-Leninist views will not stand up to criticism. They imply that socialist ideology has shed its internationalism. Of course, there are differences in Communist ideological policy in different countries. That is only natural: in some the dominant ideology is bourgeois — the ideology of the ruling class, of monopoly capital. In others the dominant ideology is socialist. Conditions of struggle differ, too, and hence the concrete aims of ideological policy and activity cannot be the same. But all this does not alter the fact that genuine socialist ideology is one and the same everywhere, regardless of geography, climate or national frontiers. It is the same because it has a common theoretical foundation, Marxism-Leninism, and a common class basis, the community of vital interests of the working class in all countries of the world, and these interests are inseparable from existing socialism. In that lies the strength of the socialist ideology which our enemies are trying to undermine by, among other things, counterposing some of its elements to others.

Such is the plan, and such are the means used by the anti-Sovieteers to vilify socialism, undermine peaceful coexistence, and impede the world revolutionary process. That is why the Communists are combating anti-Sovietism — without this struggle there is no winning over the working class and the majority of the people for socialism.

At their 20th Congress (1958), the Danish Communists had to combat a rightist group on this issue. And though we knew that a split in the Party would cause us temporary damage, we decided to stand firm. Concessions to anti-Sovietism lead to an unprincipled stand on other issues. That has been confirmed by the activity of the Socialist People's Party, a rightist breakaway group.

For many years imperialist propaganda used anti-Sovietism to cultivate a fear psychosis in order to keep the working people away from the struggle for their interests. The idea was inculcated that the 'Soviets' were secretly preparing to attack Western Europe, were going to 'export' their social system by military force, that we, Communists in capitalist countries, were 'foreign agents' carrying out 'Soviet plans.' These are old, old tunes. Of course, the old anti-Soviet and anti-communist clichés are still there, acting as prejudices that impede the workers' struggle. And there are attempts to refurbish them by producing all manner of sensational reports of 'secret plans' by the socialist countries, and so on and so forth.

But the foundations of this propaganda are collapsing. For there is a

growing and expanding desire to maintain good relations with the socialist countries, and the conditions for overcoming the effects of anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda are much more favorable.

That is so because Europe is again making the choice between the paths offered by socialism and imperialism. World War I, it will be recalled, faced Europe with the question: socialism or imperialism? The October Revolution resolved it in Russia in favor of socialism, changing the European and international political situation. In the 30s the social choice was between fascism and an anti-fascist alliance of socialist and bourgeois-democratic forces. World War II resolved it in favor of socialism which triumphed in a number of countries, while a number of others chose bourgeois-democratic regimes. During the cold war Europe had to choose between another war or peaceful coexistence. In the past few years the choice has, to a very large degree, been in favor of the path suggested by the forces of socialism.

The focus has shifted to social problems. The confrontation is sharpening between the working class and its allies, on the one hand, and the monopoly bourgeoisie, on the other. There are new opportunities for social progress, but it should be borne in mind that they are largely determined by the success of peaceful coexistence, the struggle of all the progressive forces and, above all, by the contribution of the socialist countries.

This is all the more important because, with the deepening general crisis of capitalism more glaringly showing up the internal contradictions of the capitalist system, more and more people are coming to realize the need for fundamental social change.

The postwar growth of the productive forces resulting from the scientific and technological revolution prevented many from fully appreciating the achievements of the socialist countries. There was the contention that stable and high growth rates were due to 'backwardness,' 'low starting levels,' and the fact that 'small quantities' grew faster than big ones. The idea of socialism setting an example was rejected with the argument that 'we are way ahead.'* In those

*That these arguments are a far cry from reality can be seen from the following figures. In the 60s, the nine capitalist EEC countries were producing more electric power, steel and mineral fertilizer than the nine socialist CMEA members. The picture was quite different in the early 70s. CMEA and EEC power output in 1950 was 135 and 193 billion kwh respectively; 406 and 426 billion in 1960; 1,222 and 1,033 billion in pre-crisis 1973. The figures for steel: 36 and 48 million tons, 86 and 98 million, and 178 and 150 million. Mineral fertilizers: 3.1 and 5.1 million tons, 6.5 and 10.3 million, 26 and 16.5 million. CMEA gross industrial output is twice the EEC figure.

And so, the 'small quantities' are now with the capitalist and not with the socialist countries. Nonetheless, and in defiance of the laws of statistics, the 'big quantities' are growing faster than the 'small.' Is it not because the 'big quantities' now belong to socialism?

days the consequences of capitalist crises could be overcome with relative ease. This was due to the fact, among others, that neo-colonialism gave the imperialist powers substantial super profits, especially because of the low prices paid for raw materials.

But things have changed. The capitalist economy is in the throes of an all-embracing crisis that has knocked its main mechanisms out of action. Notwithstanding the considerable scale of the class struggle, the workers have not been able to prevent depression of their living standards. Mass unemployment, which only a short while ago was being described as a thing of the past, weighs heavily on the working class. The crisis has spread to neo-colonialist exploitation. In these conditions, the realization is growing that there will have to be deep-going social change if the workers are to enjoy normal living standards.

The characteristic of the present period — and it could not be otherwise — is widespread uncertainty and a search for the way out. Bourgeois ideology is leading society into a cul-de-sac. In this situation the existence of the socialist world is of decisive importance in giving the working people faith in their ability to uphold their social interests.

There are abrupt twists and turns in bourgeois ideology. The boastful optimism of the 'affluent 60s' has vanished. Pessimism has come in its place. However, it is not being ascribed to the nature of the social system, but to 'exhaustion of human capabilities.' Unchecked consumption is being blamed for swallowing up the world's raw materials and energy resources. Society is being told it must restrict itself to 'zero' or 'negative' growth. That is the justification given to production and consumption cutbacks caused by the crisis of the capitalist economy.

It is a blessing in this ideological atmosphere that the working masses can see the crisis-free development of the socialist countries without inflation and unemployment. That is graphic evidence that the hardships are not of a natural origin, that they stem from the character of the society, and that to end them it is essential to replace the capitalist system. People have begun asking themselves: can capitalism survive?

There is evidence of a new line in imperialist propaganda. The right of the peoples to change their social system is, of all things, being declared inconsistent with peaceful coexistence.

Peaceful coexistence is alleged to be an 'ideological compromise' between the two social systems obligating the socialist countries to refrain from solidarity with peoples reconstructing their society on revolutionary lines. Imperialism, on the other hand, is allowed the 'right' to export counter-revolution in 'its own' part of the world.

Some even insist on this ideological compromise as the condition for honoring the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations. They want world peace to be paid for with an end to class struggle.

But the class struggle cannot be stopped as long as there are antagonistic classes. At present, the line of attenuating the class struggle is directed mainly against the working people in capitalist countries fighting to change the social system.

U.S. imperialism's leading spokesmen claim the 'right to action.' And certain right-leaning West European Social-Democratic statesmen, too, have of late resorted to similar arguments to justify outside interference in the revolutionary movement of the peoples. This is in glaring conflict with the essential principles of peaceful coexistence, the letter and spirit of the Helsinki accords.

The principles of peaceful coexistence do not concern the question of power within any country. They do not imply preservation of the social or political status quo. They do not contradict the right of any people or nation to choose its own political or social system, to opt for any form or forms it may consider necessary. Precisely that is their class content.

Peaceful coexistence is no barrier to revolution. On the contrary, it creates favorable conditions for the peoples to settle the question of their social order as they themselves see fit.

The Communist parties presented a clear concept of this at their 1969 International Meeting. Its Main Document says that the policy of peaceful coexistence 'helps to promote the class struggle against imperialism on a national and worldwide scale. Determined class struggle for the abolition of the monopolies and their rule, for the institution of a genuinely democratic system, and for the establishment of socialist power, whatever may be the road leading to this goal, is an inalienable right and duty of the working people and their Communist parties in the capitalist countries. The Communists of the world are in solidarity with this just battle.

'Mass action against imperialism is a condition for implementing the policy of peaceful coexistence.'*

This concept, which was formulated before the détente, is still entirely valid. In conditions of peaceful coexistence, as the Communists see it, it is possible — the Maoists' concept notwithstanding — to eliminate new links from the imperialist chain, carry out deep-going democratic changes, establish working people's power and assure the victory of socialism.

**International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow 1969.* Prague, Peace and Socialism Publishers, 1969, p. 31.

Imperialist propaganda, on the other hand, tries to deter the peoples from taking their future into their own hands. It tells them that changing the social system in the conditions of peaceful coexistence is ruled out, because their country would get no support from the socialist world and would be confronted by the concerted power of the whole capitalist world.

At present, the attacks of imperialist ideologues are directed against the international solidarity of Communists and other democratic forces with the revolutionary-democratic process in Portugal. The Danish Communists are repulsing these attacks by showing that it is U.S. and EEC interference that conflicts with the principles of peaceful coexistence. We are warning the Danish Social-Democratic leaders of the responsibility they are assuming by assisting imperialism in a matter so obviously contrary to the interests and rights of the Portuguese nation and the international working class.

Imperialism is showing ability for adaptation in the ideological struggle. But due to the détente and the sharpening of the crisis it has not been able to prevent people from understanding the need for deep-going social changes ultimately oriented on passage to socialism.

This is quite apparent in our country. There are more than just the objective conditions for the passage to socialism. There is also a visible development of subjective, and consequently of ideological, conditions. Disenchantment and a clear desire for change have become an important factor in Denmark's political life.

The reasons for this stem mainly from the gradual dissipation of many of the reformist illusions of generations of Danish workers used by local and foreign capital to strengthen its positions and multiply profits. These illusions were particularly strong in the prosperous period at the end of the 50s and in the early 60s. Capitalist society was portrayed as a 'welfare society' in which 'the vestiges of poverty had almost all disappeared' by virtue of 'progressive taxation' and 'effective social legislation,' in which classes and divergent ideologies would soon vanish and the worker would become the capitalist's 'partner.' Bourgeois and Social-Democratic propagandists portrayed socialist reconstruction as something possibly applicable in backward countries, but entirely out of place in Scandinavia's social-liberal society.

However, the real state of affairs, as the Danish Communists have not failed to point out in their documents, was quite different. Distribution of incomes and wealth was becoming increasingly unbalanced, while exploitation grew more intensive. Broad use of state-monopoly methods, especially redistribution of resources through the public sector, had concealed the real facts from the bulk of the

population. But closer to the 70s the chances for maneuver diminished. A year or two before the worldwide economic recession Denmark was already struck by a profound political and ideological crisis, which came to the surface during the parliamentary elections of December 1973.

The 'welfare state' proved so much empty talk when the working people discovered that they had to assume a still heavier tax burden while the prosperous population groups, first of all big capital, remained unaffected. The mass discontent was exploited in the elections by the demagogues of the 'Progress Party,' which, headed by a persistent tax evader, one M. Glistrup, campaigned for the abolition of 'all taxes.' But the Communists, too, captured considerable attention with their demand to lighten the working people's tax burden and raise taxes on big capital. Our Party gained a considerable political success in these elections.

The hardest blow to reformist illusions of an 'affluent society' came with the economic recession, which resulted in a visible growth of unemployment and a decline in production. Disenchantment and aspirations to change, coupled with socialism's force of example, came into evidence in many spheres.

The influence of the Communist Party climbed steeply. The Party's position in Parliament, the municipalities and trade unions gained a new quality. The Party membership more than doubled. Working people took part en masse in actions organized by the Party. The militancy of the working class, the youth and other groups of working people grew on an unprecedented scale. In 1974 a series of large demonstrations outside the Folketing demanded shifting the burden of the crisis on those capable of meeting its costs.

There is ferment everywhere, a search for new forms of struggle against the reactionary forces' offensive on the people's social and democratic gains. This qualitatively new political situation is making an imprint on the activity of the Danish Communists as they advance toward their 25th Congress (to be held in September 1976). It was moved at the Party's national conference on October 4-5, 1975, to submit the draft of a new Party Program for discussion by the membership and the general public. The main task, as the Communists see it, is to show all the active forces in Danish society the concrete manner to secure radical change and lead the country out of the crisis along the way to socialism.

As elsewhere on the European continent, the ideological struggle in our country is increasingly concentrated on the question of advancing to socialism. And in the new international conditions created by the détente and the successes of the peace policy this unquestionably presages new working-class social battles in Western Europe.

Forces of peace and socialism on the offensive

Erwin Scharf
Member of Political Bureau and
Central Committee Secretary,
Communist Party of Austria

In capitalist countries people associate the new favorable conditions for social progress ever more closely with the positive changes in international relations, the political détente in Europe, and the bankruptcy of the cold-war doctrines. The masses have also begun to understand that the far-reaching international changes and the lessening of the war danger did not come about by themselves, that they are the result of tremendous efforts, and first and foremost of the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. And for this mankind will always be grateful to them, no matter how hard imperialist ideologues try to obscure and distort the role of socialism, which sees one of its strategic aims in preventing nuclear war and building an enduring structure of peace and collective security.

Besides, with the Marxist-Leninist parties in the van, the working people's struggle in capitalist countries served notice to the militarists, the advocates of a policy from 'positions of strength,' that they could no longer with impunity start aggressions or trample upon the sovereign rights of peoples. The hard-won changes in the balance of class forces were and are being achieved on the basis of socialism's broad peace offensive. In a world of opposed blocs, of incessant arming and somber predictions by bourgeois 'politologists' of inescapable global catastrophe, socialism showed the peoples the realistic perspective of a world without wars, of an atmosphere of cooperation and progress, and joint solutions for humanity's many problems. This perspective was advanced in the form of a concrete program for consolidating peace, building a security system, and surmounting the existing obstacles.

In many ways, socialism's peace offensive followed the comprehensive program of foreign policy actions advanced by the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in April 1971. It

will be recalled that the program consisted of six points, each a concrete expression of the aims and objectives of Soviet foreign policy in specific spheres of international relations. Among other things, it envisaged efforts to terminate the seats of war in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, achieve a radical turn to peace and détente in Europe, end the nuclear war danger, promote disarmament, eliminate the still surviving colonial regimes, and work for mutually advantageous cooperation among states in line with the principles of peaceful coexistence. The program aroused unprecedented international response, and came to be known as the Peace Program.

It is as it should be that the Peace Program was advanced by Lenin's party, the Soviet Communists. Franz Muhri, head of the CP of Austria delegation to the 24th CPSU Congress, described the Soviet Union as 'the crucial factor of peace, the chief bastion of the forces fighting for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.' The impact of the Peace Program stemmed from its political and moral power. Georges Marchais, leader of the French Communist Party's delegation to the 24th Congress, said it was 'a true plan for peace' which deserved 'the support and approval of all progressive and peace-loving forces.'

Its significance grew still more when the subsequent congresses of the Bulgarian CP, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the CP of Czechoslovakia, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Polish United Workers' Party came forward with foreign policy platforms based on the Peace Program. Identifying it as the common program of the socialist community, the fraternal parties and countries mounted joint efforts to implement ideas and objectives consistent with the interests of all the peoples of the world.

The might of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, the advanced nature of their social system, and their fidelity to the ideas of internationalism, enable them to conduct an effective peace policy. The ability of the working class and socialism, which puts an end to the exploiting system, to conduct such a policy was scientifically proved long ago by Marx and Engels. And ever since the first socialist state came into being — from Lenin's Decree on Peace to the Peace Program — the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, and later that of the community of fraternal countries, has served peace, national liberation and social progress. The new political situation in the world would have been inconceivable if the community of socialist states had not existed.

'For many centuries, people — at least the wisest among them — did not cease to denounce and condemn war . . . Neither the lessons of history nor man's seemingly natural revulsion from mutual exter-

mination could prevent recurring slaughter, for the forces of war were too strong . . . In our epoch the situation has changed radically. Now, struggle against war has a dependable basis: the might of the forces of peace, democracy, freedom and independence.'

These words were spoken by L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, at the World Congress of Peace Forces in October 1973. His address contains a summing up of the basic Marxist-Leninist tenets on war and peace, an exposition of the futility of purely pacifist illusions in face of the militarist groups' interest in war, and a description of our epoch, in which — thanks to the new relation of forces — humanity can succeed in safeguarding peace.

Together with hundreds of millions of people on earth, the socialist states have erected a mighty barrier of resistance to imperialism's militarist tendencies.

The Peace Program has exercised a determining influence on the international situation as a whole, and on the major events of the past four years.

The principles of the peaceful coexistence of capitalist and socialist states have won broad recognition. Europe is having the longest period of peace in its entire history. The FRG reactionary groups' revanchist claims to West Berlin and the German Democratic Republic have collapsed. The GDR has gained international recognition and has been admitted to the United Nations. The Soviet Union and the USA have concluded a number of accords assuring equality in their relations. Of special importance are the Soviet-U.S. agreements on prevention of nuclear war and on strategic arms limitation.

In Asia, imperialism's strategy of local wars has broken down. The help to Vietnam of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries has contributed to the materialization of a new political situation in Indochina.

The socialist countries' constant readiness to come to the aid of national-liberation movements and developing countries in their struggle for political and economic independence is evidence of their dedication and selflessness. The resulting contraction of the imperialist powers' sphere of influence has facilitated the process of détente.

The anti-imperialist majority that evolved in the United Nations won acceptance of many important political resolutions on the Middle East and the Cyprus conflict. The imperialist forces in the UN were isolated. As many as 105 votes were cast in favor of inviting to the 29th UN General Assembly the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine. The right of the PLO to be represented at the Middle East peace conference in Geneva was also reaffirmed. The 29th UN Gen-

eral Assembly recognized the sovereignty of Cyprus and its non-participation in blocs, and demanded the withdrawal from the island of all foreign armed forces. The NATO countries came under fire for violating the embargo on arms shipments to the racist regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia. More, the South African regime was not admitted to the 29th UN General Assembly. From the UN platform members of the anti-imperialist majority denounced Pinochet's fascist junta for gross violations of human rights and demanded the release of political prisoners in Chile.

And in each case we saw that the interests of the socialist countries and the non-aligned new states coincided. Each such resolution confirmed their unity of aims in the struggle for peace, national independence and democracy. The fruitful cooperation of the socialist and developing countries in and out of the United Nations shows that efforts for the materialization of détente were substantially facilitated by the successes of the national-liberation movement.

The détente in international relations is obvious, especially in Europe.

The third and concluding stage of the European Security and Cooperation Conference in Helsinki was attended by the leaders of 33 European states, the USA and Canada. Its Final Act sets out agreed guidelines for relations between states with different social systems. This supreme achievement in international affairs is the outcome of persevering efforts by the socialist states, the Communist parties and peace forces since the late 1960s.

The principles laid down in Helsinki will facilitate further efforts on behalf of peace, national independence, democracy and social progress. They are creating a dependable foundation for negotiated rather than military settlement of conflict situations.

Speaking in Helsinki, L.I. Brezhnev stressed the Soviet Union's readiness to work for military détente with redoubled energy. At the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, the Warsaw Treaty countries have advanced proposals for reducing arms and troop strength without prejudice to the security of either side. The NATO states turned them down and insist on a 'reduction' that gives advantages to the Western countries. Negotiations at diplomatic level are not enough to settle the problem in the interests of détente and peace. The public at large, including the greatest possible number of cultural workers and scientists, must be mobilized; the masses must come out and fight for disarmament and reduction of armed forces.

The socialist countries' coordinated foreign-policy actions and consistent policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation have registered diplomatic gains and earned them the peoples' increased confidence.

The growing impact of their peace policy is also seen in the imperialists' efforts to adapt to what is a new situation.

Every time socialism scores a gain and imperialism suffers a setback, reactionary forces look for a chance to counter-attack. This means that imperialism's adaptation to the situation is forced and contradictory, prompted by a desire to regain lost spheres of political influence. Concessions to détente run counter to the imperialists' plans for aggression and interfere with their active struggle against socialism. The Helsinki forum had a favorable outcome and provided a sound basis for peace and security. But the struggle is not over and will require further effort for a long time to come. Peace is endangered in many ways because the enemy goes on trying to undermine it.

Accordingly, the task facing Communists and other peace supporters today is to promote détente and make it irreversible. More vigilantly than ever, they must look out for survivals of the cold war and see to it that the principles approved at Helsinki are translated into political reality and that they determine relations between countries with different social systems.

The principles of peaceful coexistence, which are taking root as a standard of international relations, include respect for the sovereign equality of all countries, the inviolability of frontiers, and non-interference in internal affairs. Constrained to accept these and other important principles, the imperialist powers proceeded to interpret them as recognition of the status quo in various countries. The advocates of anti-communism, who pursued a cold war policy for years but are compelled to reckon with the results of the European Security and Cooperation Conference, insist now, with reference to the principles of peaceful coexistence, that there be no changes in the system existing in West European countries. Bruno Kreisky, Chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria, described the revolutionary process in Portugal as a 'threat' to détente and peaceful coexistence. Karl Chernetz, a Socialist MP, contended that this process could result in changing the political map of Western Europe. The 11 European Socialist leaders who met in Stockholm after the Helsinki Conference called on the Soviet Union, of all things, to 'ease tensions' in Portugal. Harold Wilson, the British Prime Minister, claimed that should the Soviet Union refuse to respond to this — in our view provocative — appeal, the Helsinki Conference would lose in significance.

We are in the presence of an obvious distortion of the nature of both the Portuguese events and the results of the Helsinki Conference. Western leaders continue their attempts at interference, and actually interfere in the domestic affairs of sovereign states, gravely

violating thereby the letter and spirit of the Final Act signed in Helsinki.

In these past decades the CIA has used the strategy of gross interference, doing it recklessly and on an unlimited scale. Some politicians still come out for this strategy. George W. Ball, a former U.S. Under-Secretary of State, has raised the question of the extent to which U.S. intelligence agencies may collaborate with the opposition forces of a foreign state. Specifically, he questions whether the U.S. should maintain contacts with groups opposed to the military regime and the Communists in Portugal. His feeling is that the U.S. ought to maintain such contacts.

Resistance to the policy of détente also expresses itself in efforts to increase the NATO membership. The U.S. is out to bring fascist Spain into the North Atlantic military bloc. U.S. Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger has repeatedly made provocative statements to the effect that the eventuality of a limited tactical nuclear war against the socialist countries of Europe should not be discounted. Everyone will also recall the recent U.S. threats of armed intervention against oil-producing Arab countries. There are, furthermore, the claims of West Germany's revanchists. In the Bundestag, CDU/CSU leaders took a stand against signing the Helsinki documents.

Among the survivals of the cold war are certain of the Common Market's discriminatory measures against CMEA countries. These measures are incompatible with the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, which calls for the removal of all obstacles to expanding trade, a key sphere of international cooperation.

It will be seen that détente is opposed above all by reactionary imperialist forces which have always been against peaceful coexistence and would now like to go back to the cold war. Besides, attempts to check the progress of détente are made by some official spokesmen of the Western powers who took part in every stage of the Helsinki Conference.

The phenomenon is not unfamiliar, for we have witnessed it in various periods of history. The negative approach to détente betrays fear of the growing struggle of the working class of capitalist countries for peace, democracy, social progress and socialism, and alarm at the successes of the national-liberation movement. To an equal degree, this approach is prompted by the desire to reduce the moral and political effect of the continuing peace offensive of existing socialism and diminish the appeal of socialist ideas.

Speaking of active opponents of détente, mention should be made of the Peking leaders. During his official visit to France last spring Teng Hsiao-ping, deputy Premier of the State Council of the PRC,

called for a 'West European alliance.'* China's statesmen are aware that this connotes forming European armed forces. 'China,' *Le Monde* commented on May 15, 1975, 'urges West European countries more persistently than ever to hasten their economic, political and — more recently — military unification. "Europe must be able to defend itself by its own means," Mao Tse-tung confided to Premier Tindemans of Belgium a few weeks ago.'

Twice in recent months Peking has played host to Franz-Josef Strauss, the West German reactionary leader. Also not long ago, it received Edward Heath, the former British Prime Minister, with considerable pomp. From what is known about the two visits, the Peking leaders are willing to ally themselves with anyone so long as it hurts détente. Furthermore, they are stepping up their support of the Chilean fascist junta and expanding trade with the racist Vorster regime in South Africa. All this adds up to a global strategy of the Chinese leadership directed against the forces of peace, détente, democracy and social progress.

In the light of these facts, it is also understandable why Peking is anxious to include in the treaty with Japan a clause on the need to combat 'the hegemony of certain forces,' meaning the Soviet Union. Peking would like to commit Japan in this way to an alliance against the Soviet Union, that leading force in the struggle for peace in Asia.

The Peking stategists' intrigues should induce all peoples, particularly the working people of capitalist countries, to which Maoist emissaries pay frequent visits nowadays, to be more vigilant. The fortunes of détente are not immaterial to the workers or other non-monopoly segments of the population of our countries. Lessening international tensions and putting the policy of peaceful coexistence into practice are matters of vital importance to the masses in capitalist countries.

In Austria, the peace movement and anti-imperialist solidarity have become much stronger. Spokesmen of all the major ideological trends have held many joint rallies and demonstrations against the U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam and the persecution of Chilean democrats. The trade unions, Communists, Socialists and Catholics demonstrated together against the blood-stained Franco regime. It was one of the most powerful mass actions carried out in Vienna in recent years.

Austria's Communists continue their struggle in support of state neutrality as a factor for peace and détente. When, in October 1972,

*'China resolutely supports the West European alliance,' Teng Hsiao-ping said in Paris. 'May West European countries make steady progress toward greater unity to safeguard their security. We think that would contribute to a favorable evolution of the international situation.' (*Le Monde*, May 10, 1975).

the parties loyal to state-monopoly capitalism approved in parliament the Free-Trade Zone Treaty with the EEC, it was the Communists who pointed out that the treaty is incompatible with neutrality. 'Treaties with the EEC,' said a CPA statement, 'help foreign big capital to penetrate into Austria's key industries, above all into the nationalized industries and banks . . . Small countries, too, can effectively resist the pressure of powerful monopoly groups. The way to this is shown by the European system of security and cooperation, which removes all discrimination, provides for the abolition of all trade curbs and guarantees all European countries full economic and political sovereignty' (*Volksstimme*, October 26, 1972).

Economic upheavals in the capitalist world make the Austrian government look for closer economic relations with socialist countries, for more extensive trade and cooperation with them. During the Federal Chancellor's visit to the Soviet Union in 1974, the agreement on economic, scientific and technological cooperation signed between the two countries in 1973 for a term of 10 years was concretized. The Austrian government is trying to solve the energy problem through a long-term agreement on Soviet deliveries of oil and natural gas and the transmission of power from Poland.

Trade between Austria and the Soviet Union increased from 189.3m rubles (4,732.5m. schillings) in 1972 to 339.6m. rubles (8,490m. schillings) in 1974 (*Volksstimme*, May 28, 1975). Economic relations with Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and other socialist countries are developing at a similar pace. However, trade with the socialist countries could and should be much more extensive, which would be in the interests of Austria's politico-commercial equilibrium and independence, and would provide more jobs.

The progress of the Peace Program and the scale of détente resulting from the efforts of the socialist community and other peace forces, have increased the impact of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence on international relations. The historic contest between socialism and capitalism is more and more on the plane of peaceful competition.

People wonder whether détente can be made irreversible so long as the imperialist states still exist. Yes, but depending on the degree the peoples are mobilized to fight for peace and for a further change in the balance of forces in favor of socialism.

The enemies of peace are plainly trying to minimize the achievements of the peoples' fight for détente. In fact, they do not scruple to assert that the Helsinki forum was of no consequence.* The task is, therefore, to expose the meaning of the political maneuvers and ideological provocations that have been taking place since the Helsinki Conference. Marxist-Leninists should join efforts to popularize

the results of the conference as widely as possible. They should make it clear that these results meet the age-old wish of the peoples of Europe to live without wars, maintain good-neighbor relations and cooperate for progress, and, secondly, afford new opportunities for the future development of Europe and the world and show other continents the way to solving complicated international problems.

The foreign policy of capitalist countries today is increasingly influenced by the policy of socialist countries and the movement of the masses, who stand for the Peace Program.

The role and responsibility of Communist parties are growing. We consider, therefore, that it is very important to hold a conference of European Communist and Workers' parties. The conference would play a tremendous part in coordinating Communist action, bringing the working people and all progressive forces into the anti-imperialist solidarity movement and giving rise to new initiatives in the struggle for peace and social progress.

*A *New York Times* editorial described the Final Act of the conference as a symbol for 'pseudo-détente' (see *International Herald Tribune*, October 11-12, 1975).

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXIST-LENINIST PHILOSOPHY

New Edition

Updated to include creative elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory to contemporary conditions.

Improved structure to facilitate use by all levels of understanding.

CLOTH — $6.95

Progress Books, 487 Adelaide Street West, Toronto, Ontario. 368-3550



The strength of Communist principles

Pieter Keuneman
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Sri Lanka

The march of history provides ample evidence of the close interconnection between major international developments and political processes within each country. Such crucial shifts in world affairs as the changed balance of strength in favor of socialism, the turn from cold war to détente, the growing-over of liberation into social revolution, present immense opportunities in the fight for peace and social progress. The effect of Communist activity in a given country or region largely depends on how fully and comprehensively these new realities are understood and used. But Communist activity, international as well as national, must be based on a correct policy in internal affairs, and on close unity of the Party. The history of our Party fully confirms this.

The main feature of world development in our time is the decisive turn toward détente and peaceful coexistence, which is a form of struggle between the mutually opposed social forces, the socialist world, the working-class and national-liberation movement, on the one hand, and the forces of imperialism, reaction and war, on the other.

The winds of détente have reached our continent, too, and for several years now there has been a constantly strengthening process of rapprochement of states and peoples. Imperialist intrigue has not diverted the peoples of Asia from their resolve to base their relations on the principles of equality and fraternity. The Helsinki Conference has made the idea of Asian collective security even more attractive as a natural and immensely important step. The concept of collective security for Asia is a logical development of the principles proclaimed by the Bandung Conference in 1955.

Another distinguishing feature of the international situation is ag-

gravation of the crisis of capitalism, the most profound since the war. It extends to the monetary and financial sphere, energy, and the capitalist economy as a whole. The superiority of the socialist system and of the socialist economy stands out in bold relief against these continuous upheavals.

The national-liberation movement has been making rapid and impressive progress in the new conditions created by the growing strength of the socialist community, the ascendent process of détente and the increasing class struggles in the capitalist countries. This is most vividly expressed in Asia. The ignominious failure of the U.S. aggression in Indochina is an outstanding landmark in the history of Asia's battle for liberation. The victories of the patriotic forces of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia have a significance that goes far beyond Indochina.

The non-alignment movement, which plays so important a part in promoting peace and progress, has made impressive strides. The Sri Lanka Communists are opposed to any attempt to deprive it of its anti-imperialist content, and will work to develop its genuinely democratic features. The Conference of Non-Aligned Nations to be held in Sri Lanka next year will be an event of cardinal importance for our country and its foreign policy, and for all the anti-imperialist and peace forces.

The main features of the international situation were analyzed by the Ninth Congress of the Sri Lanka Communist Party, held in Matara on August 20-24 and attended by 516 delegates representing Party branches in every part of the country. The Congress concentrated on discussion of the political report of the Central Committee, the draft Party Program and the Central Committee report on organizational work, and elected a Central Committee of 50 members.

The Congress, and the preparatory work that preceded it, showed a higher level of political understanding and activity of the Party membership. Practically the entire membership took part in the pre-Congress discussion of the Congress documents which, like the Party's general line, were fully endorsed. The campaign to collect funds for the Congress was a big success: the target figure of 100,000 rupees was nearly doubled, and farmers in the Matara district donated food for the delegates.

The picturesque opening ceremony was attended by representatives from mass organizations and leading personalities in public and political life. Representatives of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party and the Lanka Sama Samaja Party spoke warmly of the Communist Party's contribution to the anti-imperialist movement, the formation of the alliance of patriotic forces, and the formulation and implementation of progressive measures by the United Front government.

The Party's close ties with the international Communist movement was emphasized by the presence of delegations from the Soviet Union, the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Cuba, Mongolia, Italy, Chile, Britain, India, and also a representative of *World Marxist Review*. Besides there were many messages of greetings from fraternal parties.

The Central Committee political report centered on the situation in Sri Lanka. It noted that the patriotic forces had accomplished much since the establishment of the United Front government. The new republican Constitution strengthens the country's independence and weakens the influence of the reactionary element. Another major achievement of the Front is the policy of nationalization, agrarian reforms and important measures in the social sphere.

However, there have also been negative tendencies in social and economic development, the result of upheavals in the capitalist world economy, unfavorable weather conditions that affected agricultural output, particularly foodcrops. Sabotage and subversion by the reactionary forces led by the United National Party helped to complicate an already difficult situation.

The government's economic stabilization methods did not yield the expected results. Worsening foreign trade conditions sharply increased the foreign debt. The United Front government has been unable to fulfill some of its main election pledges.

All these difficulties, especially economic, have worsened the position of the workers. But the privileged groups, the capitalists, big merchants, speculators, and so on, continue to make big profits at the expense of the people. They are trying to influence the government, and this pressure from the right — this was stressed at the Congress — is bound to produce indecision and wavering among a certain section of the national bourgeoisie which would like to come to terms with imperialism and the reactionary opposition.

In the circumstances special importance attaches to how well the Party is prepared to repulse the dangers to the country and how faithful it is to its principles. It is gratifying to note that the Congress showed such preparedness and the Communists' loyalty to their duty.

Our Party has rejected the demagogy spread by the reactionaries, who want to overthrow the government. The organized workers, the youth and students, are determined to defend the United Front and its achievements. And the Communists hold that the alliance of patriotic forces will grow even stronger if the working class and the radical democratic groups will assume a bigger leading role in the Front.

The Communists have advanced a realistic program leading us quickly out of the difficult situation (before the general elections of 1977). Included in the program is nationalization of foreign-owned

plantations and banks, and of branches of transnational corporations; extension of democratic rights and a higher living standard; expansion of food production and improvement of economic management, especially in the state sector. How urgent these measures are is demonstrated by the new act on the nationalization of foreign and locally-owned plantations unanimously adopted by the National State Assembly in October 1975. More than 400 plantations totalling 160,000 hectares have come under state control. This is an impressive victory in the battle for economic independence.

The Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka stressed the utmost importance of restoring the Party's unity following elimination of the temporary differences that arose in the period since the previous Congress. The Party was able to overcome divisions and reunify its ranks speedily because, first, all comrades remained loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as well as to the international Communist movement and the scientific conclusions reached at its world meetings. Second, success was assured by the fact that the correct general political line of the Eighth Congress was made the basis for reunification. The Communists' unity was a source of strength for the Party, the United Front, the entire progressive movement.

Many of the comrades who separated themselves from our Party on earlier occasions are now returning. This applies first and foremost to comrades who fell under the influence of the disruptive policies of the Maoist leadership of the Communist Party of China. They have acknowledged their mistakes and have repudiated Maoism. The Sri Lanka Communists are exposing the foolhardy anti-socialist policy of the Maoist leaders, their disruptive and great-power chauvinist line that has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and grinds the imperialist axe. The policy of the Maoists has done untold harm to the anti-imperialist movement, the socialist cause, and the people of China.

The reunification of its ranks has given the CP of Sri Lanka new strength and prestige; the Party has learned to combat the dogmatism of the ultra-leftists as well as right opportunism, and correctly to apply Marxist-Leninist theory to the revolutionary process in our country. The report on organizational matters noted the continuing invigoration of the Party's unity, its numerical growth (its numbers have doubled since the previous Congress). Our experience and that of the world Communist movement confirms that only a party that has firm ties with the working class, the working masses, and one that cherishes the unity of its ranks, is capable of achieving its goals.

The road followed by the Sri Lanka Communists is set out in the Party Program unanimously adopted by the Ninth Congress. The

Program contains a thorough scientific analysis of the country's development since the beginning of the century until the present, and formulates the Party's objectives.

The program notes that Sri Lanka's development along capitalist lines has caused a sharp crisis in all areas of our society, and is sustained exclusively by the impoverishment and exploitation of the masses, deceleration of economic growth, and neglect of national independence and sovereignty. The Communist Party holds that the country cannot win economic independence if it follows the capitalist way.

Sri Lanka will gain real independence only on the non-capitalist road leading to the creation of a socialist society. We have the objective, as well as subjective, conditions that make this transition possible and necessary.

Successful non-capitalist development requires a state and government of national democracy. Such a state is crucial for liberating the national economy from the grip of foreign monopolies, for consolidating the state sector, and for radical agrarian reforms and other progressive measures. It will forge close ties with the socialist world and the young independent states. The working class, the masses of working peasants and agricultural proletarians, the non-agricultural small bourgeoisie, the urban and rural intelligentsia — those are the social forces that must be mobilized for these transformations.

Creation of a National Democratic Front is essential for the struggle for economic independence and the non-capitalist way. It can be formed through a series of progressive changes within the existing United Front, with the result that representatives of the laboring classes, the radical elements, will assume the leading role. The worker-peasant alliance will form its foundation, and it will encompass the patriotic classes, including the patriotic anti-imperialist sections of the national bourgeoisie.

The Party Program gives the Communists knowledge of the laws of social development, and skill in finding concrete solutions in the present complicated situation, distinguished by rapid changes in the alignment of class and political forces, and a deepening of social contradictions. Consistent implementation of the program is a guarantee that the national-democratic revolution will win in our country.

The cause of the Sri Lanka Communists is part of the great cause of humanity's liberation from national and social oppression. No national unit of the Communist movement can perform its historic mission on its own. Our Party knows this. The Sri Lanka Communists are agreed that the time is ripe for the earliest convocation of a new international conference of fraternal parties.

The masses will decide the outcome of the battle

Reynaldo Marin
First Secretary,
Paraguayan Communist Party

The Communists of Paraguay are preparing for their Fourth Congress. Unlike the Third Congress,[1] it will be convened within the time limit set by the Rules — an indication that the situation in the Party has improved.

Recent years have been hard for the Communists because the blows dealt to the Party when Creydt[2] was in its leadership made themselves felt. The ramified network of agents set up in the Party by the enemy could not be uncovered at once. Repression led to the successive destruction of two of the Party's organizational centers. Almost the whole Central Committee, Political Commission and Secretariat had to emigrate.

It is well known that isolation from the masses over a long period often breeds subjectivism in estimating the political situation, dampens militancy, makes for the spread of opportunist sentiments and aggravates differences. To be sure, these adverse effects of protracted emigration are not inevitable. In our case, they emerged because the effort to eliminate internal discord was made from the wrong ideological and political position and attention did not focus on establishing links with the masses, which was the paramount task. As a result, the Party split and a parallel organization came into being shortly before the Third Congress.

That trying period is over. The general agreement on Party unity reached in December 1974 meant that the Communists and the working-class and popular movement in our country had scored a major gain to the detriment of the Stroessner autocracy and imperialism. Most of the Party work could now be done in Paraguay itself.

In preparing for the Fourth Congress, we try to assure strict implementation of the agreement on unity. We strive to remove every vestige of division and to unite the Party on a principled basis. To strengthen Party unity is the foremost duty of every Communist.

The congress will discuss, first of all, problems arising from the changed social, economic and political situation in Paraguay and the Communists' tasks in the new stage.

Paraguay is still one of the most backward countries of Latin America. Its social and economic structures are deformed. Its capitalist production, handicapped by contradictions, grows slowly and labor productivity is exceedingly low. These are primarily consequences of imperialist domination. The U.S. monopolies own the banks, the whole of road and air transport, oil pipelines and power stations; six per cent of the country's land belongs to Standard Oil. Economic growth is held up, in particular, by the latifundium system and survivals of the pre-capitalist mode of production.

However, it would be wrong to imagine that pre-capitalist production relations predominate in Paraguay. Analysts who take this view generally refer to the latifundium system and the high proportion of rural population (over 60 per cent). Yet the Paraguayan latifunium is a capitalist enterprise using wage labor (in crop and stock farming as well as forestry). Diverse forms of land rent are a source of capitalist accumulation. The rural population does not comprise peasants alone, for there are also many agricultural workers and rural semi-proletarians, who are compelled to work as farm hands part of the year.

In the towns there are many handicraftsmen, but most of them supply capitalist enterprises and are paid by them on a piecework basis.

The gross national product is formed chiefly in capitalist production relations. Anyone who wants to gain an idea of the Paraguayan economy and its development trends should bear this in mind. However, survivals of pre-capitalist relations are still strong.

Lopsided capitalist development and growing dependence on imperialism are aggravating the drawn-out economic crisis. The external debt has increased 80-fold over the past two decades. General Stroessner's economic policy is geared entirely to the foreign market, in keeping with the interests of the U.S. imperialists and the rulers of Brazil, on the plea that Paraguay is a small, poor country and has no choice. This argument is another indication of his subservience to foreign masters. For no country, however small and poor, is foredoomed to such a destiny. The oil-producing countries, for example, include some that lag behind Paraguay socially and economically and yet have embarked on independent development.

Communist Party documents have repeatedly pointed out that the deliberate gearing of production to export, coupled with a huge foreign debt, spells more hardships for the masses,[3] slows down production growth and makes the economy extremely vulnerable.

The dictatorship ignores the warning — made even by spokesmen of the bourgeoisie — that economic development should be intended, first of all, to rapidly expand the home market and establish trade links with all countries, including socialist countries.

The Stroessner clique shuts its eyes to the mounting economic and financial difficulties and continues to extol Paraguay's standing on the world market. For roughly seven years — 1964-71 — the government, acting on recommendations of the International Monetary Fund, managed to keep the purchasing capacity and exchange rate of the guarani stable at 126 guaranis for one dollar. It used the 'stability' of the guarani as a propaganda ploy. For the working people, however, it meant a wage freeze and higher taxes.

As we had foreseen, that 'stability' was swept away by inflation, which the government and a docile press describe as an 'imported commodity,' alleging that it is due to external causes, in particular to higher prices for oil and derivatives. It is true that imperialism exports inflation, which puts an added burden on the people of underdeveloped and dependent countries, including ours. But in Paraguay inflation began as early as 1971, being a product of the regime's financial and economic policy and a declining foreign trade. As for the measures taken by oil-exporting countries, they were designed to defend themselves against inflation.

By mid-1974, it was evident that the standing of underdeveloped countries, such as Paraguay, on the world market was becoming unfavorable. The situation took a turn for the worse in 1975, when export of meat, cotton, soy beans and other traditional items declined due to both a drop in world prices and the loss of markets through increased competition. The government's financial difficulties prevent it from stimulating exports by abolishing or substantially reducing tariffs.

The dictatorship plumes itself on the fact that Paraguay's foreign currency reserves stand at $75m. Yet the use of a depreciated dollar in international settlements rapidly depletes the dollar reserves of underdeveloped countries, specifically Paraguay. Some hope for foreign aid. But the major capitalist countries are in a deep crisis themselves and seek salvation at the expense of their developed or underdeveloped 'partners.' The Communists maintain that in these circumstances (as, indeed, in earlier conditions), to expect real aid as a way out of the economic impasse is to indulge in wishful thinking. It is only the Stroessner clique, used to monopoly handouts, that can look to imperialism for aid — by way of compensation for faithful service.[4]

The disastrous consequences of the dictatorship's economic and social policies bringing into motion large segments of the population.

Gone is the semblance of 'peace and harmony' which the imperialist press wrote about, contrasting the 'political calm' reigning in Paraguay to the turmoil in other Latin American countries. In fact, it was a graveyard calm, repression stifling all free thought. 'We cannot go on like this any longer,' say many Paraguayans.

The National Conference of the PCP, held in early 1974, noted the increased militancy of the working class. From March 1973 to March 1974, the workers won three wage rises — by 10, 15 and 20 per cent respectively. The struggle for immediate demands in January and February 1974, which culminated in a strike at Acaray-2, showed that many union leaders had taken a militant and independent stand and refused to knuckle under to the venal leadership of the Paraguayan Confederation of Working People (PCWP) as they had done in the past.

In 1974, strikes spread to areas where unions are banned. In 1975 the struggle for higher wages and other economic demands assumed such proportions that the PCWP leaders decided to hold a bogus congress attended by many representatives of the dictatorship and U.S. imperialist agents.

The peasants, the workers' chief ally, are stepping up their struggle. For years the dictatorship has been trying to disrupt and eliminate peasant organizations, and has jailed and tortured leaders of agrarian leagues. But terror has failed to break the morale of organized peasants, who seize estate lands and demand equitable prices for farm produce and respect for the rights of the agrarian leagues.

The movement of university and secondary school students became more active in 1974-75. The democratic student press, growing mature and militant, is winning more and more readers. There is a mounting campaign to form a university federation on democratic and unitary lines. Students demand the lifting of reactionary curbs on admission to educational institutions and a substantial increase in budget appropriations for education, primarily at the university level. Their struggle for immediate demands interlocks more and more with the people's fight for democratic freedoms and national sovereignty.

Anti-government sentiment is also on the rise among civil servants. This category is the lowest-paid and its economic condition depends entirely on budget allocations. Its demand for higher pay has important political implications for the people have traditionally regarded civil servants as a pillar of the regime.

Discontent is spreading among small and medium employers and traders, whose interests are hit by domestic magnates making money out of smuggling, 'the only thriving industry,'[5] as well as by U.S. and Brazilian capital (The U.S. and Brazil supply Paraguay with manufactured goods and food products).

All these actions, unconnected for the time being, presage widespread mass action for unity in the foreseeable future, the National Conference stated.

The upsurge in the people's struggle has its effect on all political parties, legal and illegal alike. In the leaderships of the Febrerista and Christian Democratic parties,[6] forces opposing the dictatorship and conciliatory policies have grown stronger. The change is particularly marked in the Liberal Radical Party (LRP), the main legal opposition force. Its leader, Dr. Domingo Laino, is known in and outside parliament for his exposure of large-scale smuggling by the government and the plunder carried on by the U.S. Repsa monopoly, which controls oil refineries and trade in oil products. He has also campaigned against the treaty ceding the Itaipu area to Brazil. The LRP leadership sponsored a rally demanding the release of political prisoners, including Antonio Maidana, Chairman of the PCP, who has been in prison for 17 years, and Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta, members of the CC PCP. This important action holds the promise of a militant opposition backed by the masses.

The Church has broken with the fascist regime.[7] Opposition, still timid, manifests itself even in the armed forces, the regime's mainstay. Indeed, discontent is spreading in the ruling Colorado party.

The Communist Party is back on the political scene. It shows great militancy and is an important reality strengthening the trend toward the unity of all democratic and progressive forces.

What are the Communists' tactics at this stage? Unlike certain opposition parties, which pin their hopes on election campaigns, we consider that the Paraguayan regime cannot be changed through rigged elections held in an atmosphere of violence.

The Communists do not live and work according to the dictatorship's political agenda although they take it into account by trying, for instance, to use the slightest opportunities for legal electoral activity. We are emphatically against passively boycotting 'elections' or waiting for the 'rescue action' of a coup, as well as against individual terror or actions by small armed groups isolated from the masses.

Years-long experience shows that to overthrow the Stroessner clique and establish a democratic order, we need a national anti-dictatorial front. This front is now more necessary and feasible than ever. The terroristic, corruption-ridden regime, whose policy breeds hunger and which fritters away the nation's wealth, is an enemy of the whole people. We consider that the anti-dictatorial front should be open to all: members of the Colorado, Liberal Radical, Febrerista and Christian Democratic parties, Communists, civilians and military men, believers and atheists, workers, peasants, students, small and

medium employers, and even, in definite circumstances, members of the ruling element.

As we Communists see it, united action could be based on the following demands: end repression at once, release all political prisoners, lift the state of emergency, raise the pay of workers, teachers, and other salary-earners living on the verge of starvation, stop the eviction of peasants from the land, fix equitable prices for farm products, respect trade union freedoms, revise the Itaipu treaty, nationalize Repsa, and pass a law protecting national industry. Needless to say, program provisions and fighting methods can be perfected as action against the dictatorship unfolds.

We know that most opposition forces agree with us on the objectives of the struggle. This follows from their slogans and appeals. But the time has come to move on from appeals for unity, which is important too, to the direct formation of a national anti-dictatorial front. It is a task for the leaders as well as the rank and file of political parties. In every town or village, in factories and residential neighborhoods, in colleges and universities, they must operate as a united front. A beginning can be made by, say, helping political prisoners or taking action against the high cost of living and against smuggling. By setting itself ever more important objectives, the opposition can unite the whole people and rouse them to a decisive fight against the Stroessner autocracy.

Only the masses headed by the working class can radically change the situation in the country. They alone have the real strength to undermine and then destroy the hated dictatorship. We Communists, the working people's vanguard, have a decisive role to play in this. This makes it the primary task of Party organizations to strengthen the unity of the working class, the trade unions and other mass organizations, establish solid links with the masses and unite them. The working class should back the demands of the peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, urban middle strata and national bourgeoisie. We must bring our ideas and program home to the people and intensify our political and organizing work among them.

It is the people that the dictatorship dreads most of all. However self-confident Stroessner and his clique may seem, they realize that a united people means an end to their rule. They also know that the Communists are the only force capable of uniting the masses. This prompts the regime to step up its anti-communist campaign and its attempts to draw into the 'struggle against Marxism' opposition leaders holding consistently democratic and anti-imperialist views. But more and more Paraguayans are awakening to the fact that the dictatorship uses the bogey of communism as an excuse for repression. Hard as the present rulers try to cut off the people from the outside

world, they know that Communist activity is the source of this century's most noteworthy achievements. The weapon of anti-communism is beginning to fail, bringing the dictatorship into collision with the forces seeking national progress.

1. The Third Congress (1971) was held 22 years after the Second.

2. Creydt posed as a champion of the general line of the world Communist movement and feigned opposition to anti-Sovietism as the worst variety of anti-communism. Exposed as an agent provocateur and expelled from the Party in 1967, he made a volte-face toward Maoism and is now received in Peking as a welcome visitor.

3. The dictatorship has reduced the country to extreme poverty. Life expectancy averages 28 years, and 125 in every 1,000 newborn children die before the age of one year. — *Ed.*

4. U.S. subsidies are used by Stroessner and his entourage for their private needs and for the maintenance of a large repressive force. — *Ed.*

5. Smuggling involves everything, including necessities. Asuncion shops have departments stocked entirely with smuggled goods. Even coffins have become an illicit import item. A leader of the Production, Industry and Trade Federation has said that the day will come when smugglers will be the only businessmen in Paraguay. — *Ed.*

6. The revolutionary Febrerista Party represents the interests of some sections of the urban middle strata, army officers and the national bourgeoisie.

7. In early 1975 the army and police took brutal action against Catholic priests and peasant Catholics in some areas. — *Ed.*

Communist Party of Spain National Conference

Serafin Aliaga
Member of Central Committee,
Communist Party of Spain

The Second National Conference of the Communist Party of Spain, called last September under the Party's Statutes as the highest political organ between congresses, was attended by members of the CPS Central Committee, the general secretaries and other leaders of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia, the Basque CP and CP of Galicia, political secretaries of provincial Party organizations, and leaders of Party organizations active outside the country. The provision concerning national conferences is contained in Article 23 of the Statutes partially amended by the Eighth Congress (1972) to fit the experience of underground activity. In fact, it concerns a norm already applied in the past and also encountered in the practice of legally active parties.

It was essential in the present conditions to revive the institution of national conferences as a high-level assembly that can adopt decisions obligatory for the whole Party when thorough preparation and quick convocation of a congress, the supreme political authority, is impossible. In such cases, the conference — its composition and powers — assure uninterrupted democratic functioning in all situations.

It is not the purpose of these notes to examine in detail the discussions and decisions of the Second Conference. They merely show its principal features and provide basic information.

One of the most relevant features was its highly representative character. It was attended by Party delegates from all parts of the country, practically all provinces, thus reflecting the extent of the Party's influence.

The fact that Party branches exist and operate in all urban and rural districts, at enterprises and in universities, gives us knowledge of the problems occupying each stratum of society, and enables us to work out policy and practice in full accord with the situation in the country. Hence the Party's growing influence and prestige, and the broad response it is able to muster among the masses, who see and feel that it reacts to the nation's vital problems and is deeply involved in the struggle for economic and social demands, and for freedom.

The Second Conference showed that the Party has grown stronger with the influx of thousands of new members and the opening of new branches. Big strides have been made since the Eighth Congress in building the kind of large mass party Spain needs — a militant party of the working class, the working people, the progressive intelligentsia, all who aspire to the victory of socialism.

The composition of participants in the Conference reflected the progress made in this respect. For example, it was attended by Christians, who are simultaneously activists of the Communist Party and also represent broad Christian strata. They are working for socialism in all areas of the class struggle. The Party supports them and promotes them to various posts of leadership without reservation or discrimination. They have the same rights and obligations as any other Party member. The only condition they must meet is to observe unity in the political, economic and ideological struggle in line with the Party's program and statutes, to which they have freely subscribed.

Another feature is the largest number of women in posts of leadership ever to take part in a national conference. This is evidence of success in the policy — charted by the Eighth Congress — of enlisting more women in Party work and promoting those distinguished by their ability, enthusiasm and involvement. Promotion of women, the Eighth Congress pointed out, not only strengthens the Party organiza-

tions, but also demonstrates our determination to advance the liberation of women, affirm their equality with men in public and political life, and involve them in the struggle for freedom and socialism. With this in mind, the Conference took certain concrete measures. Discussion points in the form of a manifesto, 'For the Liberation of Women,' were adopted for the envisaged Party conference on the women's question. The Central Committee co-opted seven women, leaders of Party organizations; this was unanimously approved by the Conference.

The central item on the agenda: discussion and adoption of the Program Manifesto and the Party's tasks in the present situation.

The text of the Program Manifesto drafted by the commission appointed by the Eighth Congress was discussed in Party branches over the past almost two years. The draft was updated to suit the changing situation, and complemented on the basis of proposals and remarks gathered during its preliminary discussion by the Party membership and at the Conference, which endorsed the final text. In the light of the present developments, the Program Manifesto has acquired special importance.

The main aspects of Spain's democratic road to socialism are treated in the document in conjunction with the tasks of the present stage. The two stages are not separated. The struggle for the elimination of the fascist dictatorship by democratic means and the establishment of a regime of political freedom is, beyond doubt, the first step to social and political democracy and, in the historial perspective, the victory of socialism. Exploitation of man by man will be eliminated through this continuous process, creating a new society.

The Manifesto blends theoretical guidelines and political practice. The tactical line and strategy are based on a deep analysis of the world revolutionary process and its influence in Spain, on the specifically Spanish conditions, the relation of forces, the social and political situation, and the state of the economy. The document explains the Party's ideas, aims and tasks.

The Program Manifesto brings the Party's views to the masses, acquaints them with Communist positions and aims relating to the perspective of the Spanish revolution. It will help immensely to mobilize the masses for the struggle for freedom and socialism.

Santiago Carrillo's report on behalf of the Executive Committee touched on crucial aspects of the political situation at home and abroad.

International détente is more solid, there is growth of the forces of socialism, of the national-liberation, working-class and democratic movement, and the crisis of capitalism has become sharper. This

creates common problems for the working-class and popular fronts in Western Europe, requiring joint solutions in a progressive spirit.

Analyzing various aspects of the international situation, the Executive Committee's report reaffirmed the internationalist character of CPS policy. At the same time, it stressed the immense significance of internal factors in the struggle for democracy and socialism.

The report analyzes the crisis of the Franco regime in the setting of the general crisis of world capitalism and the situation in Europe. Certain ideas are put forward to round out the formulations of the Program Manifesto, showing that objective conditions have shaped for the Party's democratic road to socialism.

The social-political situation in Spain is closely scrutinized, showing the position of different political forces, examining national and regional questions, and setting the Party objectives of broad popular alliances, strengthening the Democratic Junta, and promoting the people's struggle on the scale of the country.

The discussion showed that the Party approves the ideas and guidelines of the Program Manifesto and the report, underlining the unity of outlook and will of all Spanish Communists.

The concluding remarks, summing up the results of the Conference, were made by Party Chairman Dolores Ibarruri. She said, among other things, that experience in the different periods stressed the continuity of the Party's unitarian strategy at all stages of the struggle. Unity of all forces of the working class and people in the fight against fascism and for a common democratic program is still the main aim in the Party's present struggle against the Franco dictatorship for freedom and socialism.

'With the regime disintegrating and all political forces on the move,' Dolores Ibarruri said, 'broad democratization of the situation in our country is bound to create new opportunities for joint action not only by Communists and Socialists, but also by all the forces aspiring to democratic change. One such opportunity is the already formed Democratic Junta, which could be broadened through influx of new forces and social-political strata.'

The delegates unanimously adopted the final text of the Program Manifesto, approved the Executive Committee report by Santiago Carrillo, and Dolores Ibarruri's concluding remarks. They adopted a resolution endorsing the work of the Executive Committee and the line it follows in the preparations for the conference of the Communist parties of Europe.

At the time of the Conference, a Central Committee meeting co-opted eight new comrades and elected six CC members to enlarge the Executive Committee.

These decisions were endorsed by the Conference. It also endorsed

the CC statement exposing the slanderous campaign against the Party and its General Secretary, Santiago Carrillo, alleging a leadership crisis.

The outcome of the Second National Conference, says the Central Committee statement, has confirmed 'the solid unity and cohesion of the entire Party, the considerable political invigoration and numerical growth of its organizations, the Spanish Communists' firm support of the Program Manifesto based on the idea of a democratic road to socialism, our conception of socialism in conditions of democracy.'

International Women's Year

1975, the year that will go down as the first International Women's Year, is ending. Its motto, 'Equality, Development, Peace,' responds to the aspirations of the many millions of women on earth and those of all progressive humanity. For the Communists in capitalist and developing countries it was a year of recruiting women for the class and liberation struggles, and in the socialist countries for the further construction of socialism. Along with all other progressive forces, the Communist and Workers' parties worked perseveringly for real women's equality, for women's participation in production and in political, public and cultural affairs.

The Women's International Democratic Federation, which recently marked its 30th anniversary, and the many other women's organizations contributed palpably to world peace, social progress, national independence, and international solidarity with victims of imperialist aggression and reaction. The scale of this work and the growing prestige of the women's democratic movement was reflected in the fact that the World Congress of Women held in Berlin last October, was attended by more than 2,000 delegates representing 140 national women's organizations and more than 80 international women's and democratic organizations.

The Berlin Congress has inscribed an inspiring chapter into the chronicles of the international women's movement, the mighty movement of the forces fighting for peace and social progress. The Appeal issued by the Congress to the women of the world stresses

that 'real emancipation of women will be gained only through national and social liberation, because the lot of the women is tied up with the lot of their peoples. Peace, democracy, national independence and social progress must triumph all over the world.' A statement released by the Congress called on governments, parliaments, political parties and public movements to work for the consolidation and extension of détente and the consolidation in international affairs of the principles of peaceful coexistence and cooperation in the name of the humane and lofty ideas of equality, development and peace.

The situation of women in socialist, capitalist and developing countries, and the position and experience of Communists in the women's movement have been examined in recent issues of *WMR*.* The following article by Inge Lange, alternate member of Political Bureau and CC secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany concludes the special International Women's Year series. The subject of women's rights will, of course, continue to figure prominently in the journal in future.

ACTIVE BUILDERS OF THE NEW LIFE

Inge Lange
Alternate Member of
Political Bureau and
Secretary of Central Committee,
Socialist Unity Party of Germany

In the German Democratic Republic, as in the other countries of the socialist community, the building of the socialist system under the direction of the SUPG, the working-class party, powered a process of revolutionary change which, among other things, assured the equality of the sexes. Almost overnight, changes of tremendous significance for the outcome of socialist construction were wrought in the life of women, who comprise more than half the GDR population.

Comrade Erich Honecker, First Secretary of our Party's Central Committee, stressed this in the CC report to the Eighth Congress of the SUPG. He said: 'It would be unthinkable to speak of socialism in our republic without referring to the outstanding role women are playing in all our successes, irrespective of where they work.' Women's achievements provide graphic evidence of their ability to participate in building the developed socialist society and to acquire the knowledge and skills this involves.

*E.g. see *WMR*, October 1974, January, March, July, October 1975.

Knowing that socialism cannot be built without the participation of women, our socialist state has always promoted efforts to liberate women's creative gifts and introduced conditions enabling women to combine work and motherhood. August Bebel's prediction in *Women Under Socialism*, a book published in 1879, has come true. 'The future,' he wrote, 'belongs to socialism, that is, first of all the workers and the women.'

The influence of socialist development, showing that only a system devoid of exploitation can assure the equality of men and women so essential for the progress of humanity, extends far beyond the community of socialist states. Never before have so many women in the capitalist and the young national states participated in the social battles of the working class and other progressive forces against exploitation and oppression, and for peace, democracy and social progress. No longer do bourgeois ideologists venture to justify the subordinate role women play in the exploiting system.

Women's equality has always been an important plank in the programs of the revolutionary working-class movement. The subject is treated in the *Communist Manifesto* and other works by Marx, Engels and Lenin, the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Today, recognition of the close link between the condition of women and the prevailing social relations has spread outside the organized working-class movement, and the class character of the women's question is hardly ever placed in doubt. This is due mainly to the historic achievements that have changed the life of women in the countries of the socialist community. Also, and not least of all, this is due to the fact that in the capitalist world more women than before are entering production or fighting for their right to work, beginning to see their subordinate status and dual exploitation — especially in the conditions of the deep crisis of the capitalist system and the accompanying social dislocation, whose adverse effects are hitting women and the youth hardest of all.

It is safe to say that all this affected the decision of the 27th UN General Assembly to back the proposals of the Women's International Democratic Federation to make 1975 International Women's Year.

The declared UN aims — to promote the equality of men and women, encourage women's participation in the economic, social and cultural development of their countries, and facilitate a greater contribution by women to friendly relations among states and to the consolidation of world peace — are accepted practice in the German Democratic Republic.

In our country's history of more than 25 years, far-reaching changes have thus been forged in the lot of women. Conscious of the

fact that solution of the women's question is mainly a social problem, our Party used its influence to enlist all social forces for this cause, to rally and teach the women themselves to fight for equality. Today, women have the same rights and obligations as men and participate in social production as equal, educated, economically independent builders of socialism. Their scope of vision has expanded and their interests are no longer limited to home and family.

Millions of women have acquired extensive knowledge and experience. They cope successfully with complicated assignments in industry, agriculture, science and technology. They comprise the absolute majority in education, trade and public health. Many stand at the head of enterprises and control assets worth many millions of marks. In short, women participate on an equal footing in the building of the developed socialist society. And this is fully consonant with their vital interests. None of them can now conceive their lives without work and responsibilities to society.

Women's right to work is guaranteed. As many as 85.9 per cent of able-bodies women are gainfully employed, improving their skills, or attending educational establishments. Every second job in the country is held by a woman. And men have long since learned to regard the fact of a woman working as natural.

Men and women have equal rights in education and in vocational training and retraining. The extent to which women take advantage of this important aspect of equality is illustrated by the fact that the educational gap between men and women inherited from the capitalist past has been virtually closed. Today, 470 out of 1,000 professionally trained persons of working age are women, and 311 per 1,000 specialists with a higher education. As many as 56.6 per cent of working women between 15 and 60 have a vocational, secondary or higher education, and as many as 70 per cent in the under 35 bracket.

This relatively high educational standard shows how consistently socialist society created conditions for even those women who were deprived of the advantages of our socialist school system by their age, to acquire knowledge through adult training and retraining. The main problem here was to provide opportunities for untrained or insufficiently trained working women to acquire higher proficiency. Setting this objective, the Socialist Unity Party was motivated not only by the need to overcome the gap inherited from capitalism between the knowledge and qualification of men and women, but also by other important factors, and primarily that women belonged to the working class, the leading force of our society. The percentage of women employed in industry is rising steadily.

Good results have been achieved since new legislation came into force in 1972, providing benefits for women combining work and

study. Women employed in industry and receiving instruction are allowed shorter hours at average monthly wages. In 1973 alone, nearly 12,000 working women were thus able to acquire new skills. Similar benefits have been introduced for working family women to receive a specialized secondary or higher education under a program of special women's training. In addition to other benefits they are assured 80 per cent of their average wage during academic leave.

Thousands of women have taken advantage of this arrangement to become qualified specialists. Yet soon there will scarcely be any need for it, because equal professional education and training is provided to boys and girls under our Constitution. By now nearly 99 per cent of girls who do not go on to college or university acquire a trade. In the past three years, for example, more than 40 per cent of the girl school-leavers passed vocational examination and received a grading. The growing percentage of girls and young women among students of specialized secondary and higher educational establishments is evidence that this constitutional provision is yielding good results. They comprised nearly 47 per cent of higher school students in 1974, and more than 60 per cent in specialized secondary schools. The enrollment in university departments that had few women several years ago, has changed. In the past 10 years, for example, the percentage of girls majoring in technical sciences went up from 5.6 to 30 per cent.

Women's access to jobs and education is tied in with the provision of material conditions and encouragement. Working mainly through the trade unions and government agencies, the Party has produced a new regard for the role and place of women in socialist society. It has brought home the fact that women's equality in law and in fact (see Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 371) entails certain outlays.

Here are a few facts and figures on this score:

Take the matter of society's involvement in the upbringing of children of pre-school and school age. We have 403 places in infant nurseries per 1,000 children up to three years of age, and 804 places in kindergartens per 1,000 children of pre-school age. Trained teachers and doctors, jointly with parents, attend to the children's normal physical and mental development. Approximately two-thirds of pupils in the first four years of school are enrolled in day-care groups.

Hot meals in schools and hot meals in factories and offices lighten the burdens of housekeeping. These days, some 65 per cent of working people and students have their mid-day meal away from home in the five working days of the week.

Community services are being expanded, and there is an ample supply of up-to-date domestic aids and appliances. Seventy per cent of housewives have washing machines and 80 per cent have refrigerators. The continuously bigger range of detergents and other

chemical aids is another time-saver, giving the housewife additional leisure. Furthermore, married women and unmarried mothers with children under 18 are allowed one extra day off monthly for housework.

Still, housekeeping, especially if there is more than one child, consumes much energy and time. As a result, some women find it difficult to cope with their jobs. This, along with other reasons, probably explains the temporary decline of the birth rate. The number of women bearing children has not gone down, in fact, but the percentage of women bearing more than one child has. Yet, this is also due to the fact that the woman's urge for a family life consonant with her new place in production and society has outstripped her husband's ability to understand and help.

The still existing problems show that the time in which we wrought deep-going changes in the woman's social status has not been long enough objectively to eliminate all elements of inequality in society, wedlock and family evolved over centuries. Furthermore, equality as such cannot settle matters. As the Eighth SUPG Congress noted, conditions must be assured to enable working mothers of several children fully to exercise their equal rights.

Much has already been done in this respect. In pursuance of the Eighth Congress decisions, a 40-hour week (the full work week is 43 hr. 45 min.) without loss of pay has been introduced for working mothers with three children, and for mothers with two children on shift work; annual paid holidays have been extended to as much as 24 working days; a year for every child is added to seniority to lower the pension age; maternity leave has been extended by four weeks to 18 weeks; a grant of 1,000 marks is paid at the birth of each child. A series of other measures envisage free medical care and consultation for expectant mothers, a ban on injurious work, and the guaranteed right of every woman to decide how many children she wants. Every assistance, as mentioned above, is given to mothers studying in universities, technical and vocational schools, so that the birth of a child should not interfere with their studies. This has proved a timely and good measure: the percentage of drop-outs among women is the same as among male students. There are now better conditions for working unmarried mothers. For instance, if no day nursery accommodation is available, the mother is paid a monthly grant equal to what she would get for looking after a sick child.

To encourage young families, newlyweds are given an interest-free loan of 5,000 marks repayable over eight years, but part of the debt is written off at the birth of the first and the second child and totally cancelled on the birth of the third.

The social program adopted by the Eighth Party Congress centers

on housing construction, the aim being final solution of the housing problem by 1990. The more than 500,000 flats built between 1971 and April 1975 have substantially improved housing conditions for 1,500,000 persons. About two-thirds of the new flats have been allotted to worker families, and 12 per cent to large families, which also enjoy other advantages, such as reduced rents, reduced transport charges, etc.

Government allocations for education, culture, health and social maintenance have been steadily increasing. Last year a family of four benefited to the amount of 511 marks from these social services, and this did not include social and cultural expenditure by factories and cooperatives.

Our Party's policy is based on the principle that socialism must further the interests of the working class and the people, bring them greater prosperity and happiness. Our women appreciate that and are displaying a conscientious attitude to their work and to public affairs. The vast majority are now more politically active. They have an equal part and equal responsibility in shaping the country's future, and there is practically no difference in the development of the personality as between men and women. Woman's position and status improved visibly after the Eighth Congress: women make up about a third in all legislative bodies, from municipal councils to the People's Chamber, a third of judges and half of assessors, and more than a fifth of mayors.

The number of women holding elective positions in non-government organizations is still another index of their status and socialist consciousness. For instance, they won nearly half of the positions in the last trade union elections.

New conditions have been created for women's active participation in building a developed socialist society and preparing the gradual transition to communism. The job now is to make effective use of these new opportunities to advance our society, and in this way further improve the position of women.

That is an ambitious aim. It has nothing in common with the task of winning equal rights for women, still a problem in capitalist society. That goal was achieved, in the main, with the elimination of the exploiter system.

In the German Democratic Republic women are equal and confident participants in socialist construction. That could be seen by all the delegates to the World International Women's Year Congress held in Berlin in October. It gave a new impetus to the fight for social progress, equality, peace, democracy and social security.

political panorama

Reflections on the general election

Arvo Aalto
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Finland

Why the People's Democratic Movement won

The latest general election (September 21-22, 1975) brought indisputable gains to the Finnish Democratic People's League (FDPL) and its biggest member organization, the Communist Party of Finland. The people's democratic movement polled almost 520,000 votes, or more than ever before — an increase of more than 80,000 votes over the previous election. The FDPL vote went up from 17 per cent in 1972 to 19 per cent and the number of seats in parliament, from 37 to 40. The movement consolidated its positions as the second biggest and strongest political force.

The FDPL was particularly successful in working-class centers whereas the Social Democrats gained less there than in the country as a whole. We won new supporters, mostly young people, but they also include many of those who until recently had voted for the Social Democrats and the Rural Party.

We owe our electoral success to a policy which we call opposition in the people's interest. The proposals for a democratic cooperation program approved by the 17th Party Congress envisage a comprehensive democratic alternative to the country's present socio-economic policy. The FDPL energetically supported this program in the latest election.

During the election campaign the Communists and People's Democrats concentrated on the working people's vital problems. We demanded higher real wages, measures to prevent wage increases from being nullified by inflation, and a special pay rise for low-paid categories. We insisted on an immediate price freeze and on stricter controls. We demanded that the state take effective steps against unemployment and improve the condition of the jobless. We pro-

posed a democratic reform of pensions to benefit primarily the low pension categories. We campaigned for revising the tax system to ease taxes on low and average incomes and increase taxes levied on high incomes. We called for more home-building and lower rents for working people. We said the time had come to effect an educational reform and establish a new public health service.

In short, the people's democratic movement owes much of its electoral success to the decisions of the 17th CPF Congress.

Bourgeois parliamentary system in crisis

These were mid-term elections held because the backers of the government parties were dissatisfied with the pro-monopoly economic policy of the Social-Democratic and Center parties. This discontent sharply increased antagonisms inside the government. Besides, if held at the usual time, the election campaign would almost have coincided with the renegotiation of collective agreements. Faced with these facts, the government parties preferred to hold the election in the autumn of 1975 instead of the spring of 1976. The next general election may likewise take place in the middle of the term. The bourgeois parliamentary system is in crisis in Finland. This is seen in the weakness and instability of the government, a parliament which is powerless to exert decisive influence on national policy, the fact that mid-term elections are becoming something of a rule, and the decline of parliamentary ethics. More and more, parliament is becoming a debating club instead of functioning as the highest authority responsible for the fundamental content of national politics.

Two key issues

Two key issues left their imprint on the campaign. One of them was foreign policy, which has always dominated Finnish politics and will continue to do so. The Communist Party rightly considers that the Finnish policy for peace whose fundamental purpose is good relations with the Soviet Union and extensive mutually beneficial cooperation is the most valuable achievement of the postwar period. The policy based on the Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance has from the first been carried on amid continuous struggles against right-wing, reactionary forces at home and their inspirers abroad. The Communist Party, FDPL and other contingents of the people's democratic movement are invariably in the forefront of these struggles. All postwar general elections have been battles over foreign policy. Battles of this nature are fought whenever a new government is being formed or a new President of the Republic elected.

However, foreign policy received less emphasis in the latest elec-

tion than in earlier campaigns, largely because the vast majority of our people is in favor of a peace policy. The successful conclusion, shortly before the election, of the third and final stage of the Helsinki Conference literally disarmed the opponents of Finland's current foreign policy. And while they did not give up their ways, it is just as true that their foreign policy insinuations and their attacks on President Urho Kekkonen did not get them anywhere.

NATO had to take the actual initiative of assailing Finnish foreign policy and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, which meant that this campaign took place outside our country.

The election created new opportunities for the country's continued peace policy. The Communist Party intends to make this policy consistently anti-imperialist.

Another notable feature of the September election was the atmosphere of economic depression. The capitalist crisis also affects Finland even though in our country it has not yet gone as far as in the main strongholds of capitalism. It expresses itself, specifically, in intensifying class struggles. The working class has become more vocal and is more prepared for militant action. This is all the more important as the workers have increased to roughly 70 per cent of the gainfully employed population.

The working class is becoming more organized as its absolute and relative social weight grows. About 80 per cent of working people belong to trade unions. This is largely the result of the restoration of the unions' organizationl unity on principles jointly recommended by the Communists and Social Democrats. Strikes are more frequent and involve more wage- and salary-earners. The working people's struggle has repeatedly defeated the so-called incomes policy, which injures their interests. To cite an example, actual pay rises in recent years have been roughly twice the amount envisaged in agreements.

The economic situation has greatly deteriorated. Economic growth is at a standstill and there are even signs of a downward trend. Inflation is growing at an annual rate of almost 20 per cent. The foreign trade deficit is soaring to record heights. In the first nine months of this year, imports were worth 6,000m. markkas more than exports. Our foreign debt today makes up almost 20 per cent of the Gross National Product. Fewer homes are being built. The threat of mass unemployment looms large. Attempts are made to curtail social maintenance. The reform of public health and education is being held up and so is the development of municipal and social services. The tax burden of the working people is being increased to the limit. A lower standard of life has become a reality for tens of thousands of Finns. This, then, was the economic background to the election.

Political crisis

Growing economic difficulties go hand and hand with greater political division. There were many indications of this in the general election as well. Twelve parties took part in the election, including nine bourgeois ones. Never before had so many political groups campaigned in a general election. Furthermore, in some parties there was a great deal of internal discord.

On the other hand, it should be noted that in the latest election bourgeois parties formed more technical blocs than in any other postwar election. These blocs helped them ward off defeat of the bourgeois front in spite of internal disputes. They were also designed to realign political forces.

The most noteworthy bloc was formed by the Center Party, Swedish People's and Liberal parties. The three parties made common cause in almost all constituencies to prevent loss of their parliamentary majority to the Left. They achieved their goal although, of course, it was not only because they had formed a bloc.

By resorting to a bloc, the Center Party wanted to wrest from the Social Democrats the position of leading government party it had lost. Actually it was only the entire bloc of centrist parties that succeeded in winning more votes and seats than the Social Democrats. The election campaign and its outcome aggravated relations between the Social-Democratic and Center parties.

Once again, the bogey of communism

The Finnish bourgeoisie carries on anti-communist propaganda in every election campaign and all that varies is the intensity of the propaganda. The weakened world positions of apologists for capitalism and the unfavorable situation created for them in our country compelled the Right to use extreme propaganda means that had proved effective in the past. In the latest election campaign the bourgeois front as a whole viciously slandered and attacked socialism. However, its gross, undisguised anti-socialism, which had paid off until recently, was in vain. Candidates who used anti-communist demagogy collected few votes. The Rural Party was completely defeated and as for the Constitutional People's Party, as the new party of right-wing extremists is called, it had to be content with one seat.

It is worthy of note that for once the campaign of intimidation using socialism as a bogey was also directed against the Social Democrats.

There were also instances of direct monopoly capitalist interference in the election campaign. Never since the end of the war had special groups and organizations in the service of monopoly capital fought so openly and so furiously. They revealed their anti-popular

objectives even more frankly than bourgeois political parties. These groups were behind moves to lower the standard of living. They tried to prevent electoral meetings and the distribution of left-wing literature in the enterprises. They did not everywhere succeed only because the workers put up strong resistance. Once again it was significant that monopoly attacked not only the Communists and People's Democrats but the Social Democrats as well.

All indications are that the monopolies are somewhat less confident now of the ability of bourgeois parties and the Social Democrats to pursue a policy meeting monopoly interests. Not all aspects of bourgeois democracy suit them. This is evidently the reason for the measures which the bourgeoisie is taking taking to reshape organizations upholding the interests of monopoly capital so as to concentrate and increase their forces and financial means.

The trade unions favor a parliamentary majority of working-class parties

In contrast with the activity of those who serve monopoly capital, the trade union movement sided during the election campaign more openly than in the past with the working-class parties. The Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions (COFTU) called on its 900,000 members to assure a working-class majority in parliament. The unions affiliated to the COFTU and their branches contributed substantial sums to the electoral funds of the Social Democrats and People's Democrats. Local union functionaries took an active part in the election campaign.

Support from the trade unions proved insufficient to change the balance of forces in parliament in favor of the left-wing parties. Nevertheless, it had a favorable impact. Significantly, the Communists and People's Democrats were more successful than the Social Democrats in working-class centers, as has been said. In estimating the role of the trade union movement in the campaign, it should be borne in mind that the Communists, People's Democrats and Social Democrats belong to the same trade unions. In the COFTU and in most unions, the Social Democrats have a majority, although in many cases very slight.

Changes in the electorate

About 3,700,000 Finns had the right to vote as against 3,200,00 in 1972, with 18-year-olds voting for the first time. The numbers of voters under 30 was about 950,000, including 420,000 who voted for the first time. Also entitled to vote were about 300,000 Finnish emigrants (only seven per cent of them actually went to the polls). According to preliminary data, participation by young people in the

election was below average and the overall turnout index was considerably lower because of the emigrants' passivity. Whereas in the 1972 election 81.4 per cent of the electorate went to the polls, this time the turnout was only 74.6 per cent. Even leaving out the emigrants, the 1975 turnout did not exceed 79.8 per cent.

Election results

The election brought about no substantial changes in the alignment or balance of political forces. In spite of a certain setback, the Social-Democratic Party retained its lead in parliament (54 seats). The people's democratic movement improved its standing as the second biggest political force (40 seats), with the result that the Left as a whole slightly increased its leverage in parliament (94 seats against 92 in the previous parliament). Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie, though disunited, retained a majority (106 seats out of 200). The Center Party made some headway and so did the Coalition Party. The major parties gained a somewhat greater leverage compared with the small ones. The extreme right-wing Rural Party suffered a severe reverse. The positions of small parties were somewhat weakened. The Christian Union won several new seats by joining in blocs. There are now 10 parties in parliament.

The election was particularly disappointing to the Social-Democratic leadership in view of the trend in 1972, when that party won three new seats. In the 70s the Social Democrats based their strategy on the assumption that they could go on strengthening their positions in parliament. They had expected to hold 67 seats by the end of the current decade. Recent public opinion polls seemed to bear out this forecast, for they suggested that the Social Democrats would win 30 per cent of the votes this time. Actually, they won 25 per cent and lost one seat. The party leadership has yet to make a final assessment.

Some political conclusions

The outcome of the election is likely to aggravate the domestic political situation. The prospect of forming a political government* has become dimmer. Centrist forces show a stronger rightward trend. The organizations expressing monopoly interests campaign openly for lowering the standard of living and for giving big capital still more dominant positions in national politics. This threatens a swing to the right on the Finnish political scene. On the other hand, the obvious success of the Communists and People's Democrats is a factor making for a leftward trend. The struggle over the policy to be followed

*That is, a government of party representatives. At this writing, power was in the hands of a caretaker cabinet. — *Ed.*

by Finland will undoubtedly intensify. There are also major social problems to solve.

In this situation, the Communist Party strives to use at government level every opportunity for cooperation among the democratic forces, which represent the vast majority of the people. We see a basis for this in the proposals for the program of cooperation of the democratic forces that were approved by the 17th Party Congress. Our Party has invited the Social-Democratic and Center parties to join promptly in talks on this issue.

The Communist Party and the people's democratic movement as a whole, strengthened by their electoral gains, will be able to take part in talks on the future policy of Finland with the support of more than half a million citizens. We will draw on our own political experience and the actions of the working class and other working people to step up our fight for the democratic alternative.

The outcome of the general election will also enable us to speed the organizational growth and build up the strength of the Communist Party and the FDPL as a whole.

New serious threat to world peace

Luis Carlos Prestes
General Secretary,
Central Committee,
Brazilian Communist Party

The year 1975 will be remembered by mankind as a period of historic accomplishments. It was highlighted by events whose significance goes well beyond the year's bounds, such as the Vietnamese people's victory, notable advances in détente, regional conferences and national forums of fraternal parties, in particular the Congress of Cuba's Communists. The months ahead will see a world disarmament conference, a meeting of European Communist and Workers' parties, the 25th Congress of the CPSU and congresses of other fraternal parties.

We regard the succession and interconnection of favorable changes in the international situation, the achievements of the forces of progress and the gains of the Communist movement as manifestations of the dominant trend of world development which determines the content of our epoch and is due essentially to the decisive role of the

socialist community and its growing might. It is no longer imperialism but socialism that decides the fundamental trend of mankind's development.

We do not delude ourselves with what has been achieved so far. The enemies of progress, peace and détente persist in their plots. The Pentagon is pondering 'dosed' application of nuclear weapons, Peking claims that 'there is no avoiding a third world war,' Bonn plans to equip the Bundeswehr with nuclear arms.

There are worldwide comments on the talks held by the military-industrial complex of Federal Germany with the racist regime of South Africa and the Brazilian fascist dictatorship on cooperation in nuclear energy. Unlike Brazil and South Africa, Federal Germany has no natural uranium. It would like to become a nuclear power but cannot manufacture nuclear weapons on its soil because it is bound by the Potsdam agreement and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Brazil and South Africa, however, have signed no agreements committing them in this respect and are willing to supply the FRG with the requisite raw materials and testing facilities in exchange for financial and technological aid.

These, then, are the ominous implications of the alliance between the West German monopolies and their South African and Brazilian partners. The peoples of Latin America, Africa and the rest of the world are in serious danger and the example of Brazil reveals the extent of this danger.

Brazil wants to be a major armed force in Latin America and the world. It has been preparing for war and is a threat to its neighbors. This is because the present regime is of a fascist character,— it is an outspoken terrorist dictatorship of financial capital. However, it has certain distinctive features, for it is a dictatorship serving national and foreign, primarily U.S., monopolies. Foreign monopolies dominate both the economy and government and have relegated the domestic monopolies to the position of junior partners.

On the other hand, it should be obvious that imperialism takes into account the vast area of Brazil, its population, mineral resources and economic potential, as well as its strategic position in the South Atlantic and the fact that it borders on almost all South American states. This prompts it to treat Brazil as a privileged intermediary.

In effect, this follows from the imperialist policy of 'transferring power,' aimed above all at continuing neo-colonialist expansion in new conditions. The U.S. relies increasingly on intermediaries, wrote *O Estado de Sao Paulo* citing the London *Economist*. Brazil is cast in the role of a stabilizing factor on the continent.

Commenting on this new policy, Crimmins, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, said that the United States had deliberately reduced (*sic*) its

predominance in the Western Hemisphere, hoping that its southern neighbors would play a more active role. He claimed that they had actually done so in many fields.

Brazil took an active part in the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, contributed directly to the military coup which overthrew General Torres in Bolivia, and openly backed Bordaberry in Uruguay and Pinochet in Chile. It plans to play a still more 'effective' role as a policeman of U.S. imperialism in Latin America.

Militarization and arming are typical of fascism. In the 1967-73 period the Brazilian government purchased about $1,000m. worth of armaments abroad, chiefly aircraft and ships. Spending on the armed forces amounts to $1,200m. a year. Private Brazilian enterprises of the war industry, including shipyards, are estimated to employ 100,000 workers.

Speaking of the military potential of Brazil, General Reynaldo Mello Almeida, commander of the First Army with headquarters in Rio de Janeiro, said that the Brazilian armed forces, now 270,000 strong, have up-to-date weapons. Brazil could mobilize at least 10 million men in 60 days.

Militarization was expanded after the National Congress approved plans for a Brazilian war materiel production center, to be known as IMBEL. This center will encompass all munitions factories, coordinate the manufacture of war materiel by private plants and control public and private investments in the war industry. It will also be responsible for arms imports.

The dictatorship, alarmed by the economic difficulties arising from the 'Brazilian economic miracle,' plainly sees arms production as a means of increasing the value of its exports and stimulating economic growth.

Well-informed sources indicate that U.S., West German, French, Belgian and British companies show interest in this 'business' and are willing to build arms factories in Brazil with a view to exporting the output to other Latin American countries and to Africa. In this way monopolies want to bypass the control over arms exports established in their countries. At the same time (this is the important thing) they help in turning Brazil into a major operational base guaranteeing imperialist domination in Latin America and certain regions of Africa.

The 'privileged' status of Brazil's generals undoubtedly whets their geopolitical appetites. It encourages them to lay claim to a role in shaping other people's destinies and seek access to the most powerful means of mass destruction.

The regime refuses to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty on the plea that it would curtail national sovereignty and prevent Brazil from using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It would have the

public believe that the treaty with West Germany is a 'peaceful' step 'benefiiting' Brazil's economy and 'confirming' its national sovereignty. That, of course, is camouflage.

The agreement provides for a complete nuclear production cycle ranging from the prospecting of uranium ore to the recycling of the fuel used in the eight reactors to be built in Brazil in the next 15 years. The projects, which will cost $10,000m., are to be financed by West German banks. The FRG will supply the reactors and the technology of recycling fuel.[1] This will pave Brazil's way for the manufacture of nuclear weapons, for it is only one step from the delivery of atomic power stations to the designing and manufacture of the bomb.

What the Brazilian gorillas are really after was betrayed by General Mello Almeida, who said that the agreement between Brazil and Federal Germany would make it possible to head off pressure from countries producing atomic energy or arms. Aggressive utterances of this nature explain why the gorillas' nuclear policy has moved on from contracts with U.S. trusts to an agreement with West German monopolies.

The progressive forces of Brazil have always favored the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. An early step in this direction was taken by setting up research institutes that evolved their own technology. Professor Marcelo Damy says that as far back as 13 years ago Brazil possessed a technology for using atomic energy on the basis of natural uranium, and stresses that Brazil could benefit from using thorium, of which it has ample deposits. Other scientists, including José Goldemberg, insist on the need to design reactors using natural uranium as a means of generating nuclear energy on the basis of domestic technology.

However, pressure from multinational companies, such as the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, compelled the dictatorship to compromise on national sovereignty in this field as well. The original projects were abandoned and a power station is under construction at Angra dos Reis, Rio de Janeiro State. It will be equipped with reactors using enriched uranium, with light water as a moderator.

This solution will in no way benefit the country. Indeed, it will make Brazil more dependent on the United States, which will resell Brazilian uranium in enriched form, that is, at a higher price. Furthermore, the contract with Westinghouse grants the U.S. the right to control every Brazilian nuclear plant using American raw materials. Professor Damy says the reactor will be a sealed box and the Brazilians will only be allowed to push buttons.

The regime calls Brazilian scientists and engineers 'dreamers isolated from reality' or 'inventors of the wheel.' By signing the treaty

with the FRG without them — without so much as consulting them — it gave them another slap.

Through a press censored by the police or made to 'censor itself,'[2] the regime is now trying to make the people believe that the treaty helps Brazil to consolidate its sovereignty and will enable it to become a great power before long and to break out of the 'vicious circle of underdevelopment.'

An indication of 'independence' is seen in the condemnation of the Brazilian-West Germany treaty by certain U.S. quarters. However, the emphasis is on cynical statements insulting to Brazil that are made by spokesmen of American trusts, which refuse to share profit from the exploitation of the Brazilian people with their West German partners.[3] At the same time the Brazilian press ignores the misgivings voiced by sober-minded Americans in view of the threat of nuclear proliferation posed by the treaty.

Differences between the Brazilian dictatorship and the U.S. over this matter should not be overrated, any more than those between the U.S. and West Germany. The interests of the imperialist powers and their allies concide whenever it comes to searching for loopholes to dodge the implementation of international peace and disarmament agreements, specifically those signed at Helsinki. Besides, Brazil does not seek deals with the FRG alone. After signing the treaty with West Germany, the President of Nuclebras signed an agreement with France to build in Brazil a Minerve reactor for testing superproductive reactors and expanding their construction. A further agreement — with the U.S. — has been announced.

The dictatorship talks about 'independence' to conceal glaring facts of subjection to imperialist monopolies (West German in this case), the continuing denationalization of Brazilian industry and the economy as a whole, and of growing plunder of the nation by multinational trusts.

To say nothing of a monstrous increase in debt, the treaty with the FRG will undermine the government monopoly on radioactive raw materials, since 20 per cent of the uranium mined in cooperation with the Germans is to go to the FRG.[4] Incidentally, it was this provision of the treaty that aroused special interest in West Germany, which has no nuclear raw materials of its own.

The treaty with the FRG will result in greater technological dependence. Professor José Goldemberg, the physicist, warns against the danger of complete dependence on West German technology in a field universally recognized to be dynamic and fast-developing. Professor Roberto Hukay, for his part, said that by using foreign knowhow, the country will find itself in permanent technological dependence if it

signs an agreement with Germany, the United States or some other country.[5]

Judging by West German press comments, the deal is the biggest concluded since the rise of the FRG and will stimulate the West German economy for a long time to come. But how will it benefit the Brazilian economy?

The Geisel government is faced with serious balance of payment problems. These problems were aggravated by the sharp increase in imported oil prices (Brazil imports about 80 per cent of its oil at a cost of roughly $3,000m.). This might seem to justify the government's interest in developing a nuclear industry. But then this is not the only way to guarantee that the economy will be adequately supplied with the power it needs for its growth. Many experts deny that the country's hydropower potentialities, such as those in the southwest, have been exhausted. Indeed, the power potential of the rivers in this area is not fully used, to say nothing of the huge potential (100 million kw at least) of the rivers of the Amazon valley.

On the other hand, experts are very doubtful about the economic advantages of the technology offered by the FRG. Professor Huday points out that the jet nozzle, or the technology of enriching uranium which the agreement provides for, is still at the laboratory stage. The power station to be purchased will be the first to use it. This makes it an economic hazard. If the jet nozzle proves economically unprofitable, Brazil will be saddled with an ineffectual nuclear energy system.

Another important problem facing Brazilian scientists is environmental pollution, which may assume dangerous proportions when the projected nuclear power stations have been built. The people, who suffer even now from various forms of pollution, will become a victim of radiation with all its tragic consequences.

Thus even a cursory examination of certain aspects of the Brazilian-West German treaty disproves the assertion that it pursues peaceful aims, upholds the principle of sovereignty and is economically expedient, and shows its real objectives.

As a result of the implementation of a costly and economically unsound treaty, Brazil will become both a nuclear test ground and a manufacturer of atomic weapons. In contravention of existing international agreements, West Germany's militarists and revanchists will gain access to nuclear arms while the irresponsible fascist gorillas of Brazil, who are bound by no international commitments, will be enabled to use nuclear blackmail against the peoples of Latin America and Africa fighting for national independence and social progress.

This situation seriously endangers world peace and is fraught with the threat of new military ventures. It runs counter to the interests of the Brazilian people themselves, whose national liberation hinges

above all on the preservation of peace. A Brazil ruled by a fascist dictatorship, transformed into an imperialist military base and threatening its neighbors can be neither free nor sovereign.

Brazil's Communists therefore expose the treaty with West Germany as a menace to world peace and an inroad into the Brazilian people's sovereignty. Being patriots and internationalists, we call on the people to insist that Brazil sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. This is the only way to prevent it from becoming an atomic test ground and joining the nuclear arms race. It is the only way to guarantee that the plant, technology and nuclear energy to be put within our country's reach will be used for peaceful purposes and will promote economic progress.

The campaign for the signing of the non-proliferation treaty is part of the struggle to overthrow the fascist dictatorship. Only a democratic government can take effective steps to free the people from the stranglehold of monopoly, safeguard natural resources and establish a rigid government monopoly on radioactive raw materials. It alone would foster the development of the country's own technology in every field, including nuclear energy, and plan research really needed by the people. Such a government would not allow enormous sums to be invested in criminal research for military purposes at a time when the people suffer from hunger, poverty and backwardness.

With the Brazilian people fighting against the fascist dictatorship, for peace and the signing of the non-proliferation treaty, action by world opinion and the international solidarity of all Communists, democrats and patriots of the world are growing in importance. None can afford to be indifferent to the destiny of the Brazilian people or world peace, both of which are endangered by imperialist, militarist and revanchist intrigues and the bellicose policies of dictatorial fascist governments, in particular the government of Ernesto Geisel.

The implications of the Brazilian-West German agreement go far beyond one country or one continent. All progressive movements, organizations and prominent leaders and all peace fighters must raise their voice in protest and unite in order to prevent Brazil from becoming a nuclear power.

1. Besides, Brazil will sell nuclear technology and reactors to other Latin American countries without granting them the right to produce nuclear fuel of their own.

2. 'Self-censorship' is press censorship delegated to the heads of the newspapers or periodicals concerned. — *Ed.*

3. Brazilians were understandably angered, in particular by the statements of Senator Pastore, who speaks for the monopolies. They are an affront to the Brazilians' national dignity and constitute impermissible meddling in the country's affairs. This is not the first time we have heard statements of this nature, nor will it be the last, for our country depends on imperialism. Hence there is no equating the legiti-

mate anger aroused by such statements with support for the policy of the Geisel government, which is carrying on from where its predecessors left off.

4. This infringement of monopoly is dealt with in the manifesto adopted by the Brazilian Society of Physicists and unanimously approved by the latest meeting of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science.

5. The separation technology envisaged by the treaty requires a large quantity of helium. Professor Damy says that helium is a rare gas obtainable only in the United States and that the U.S. would not supply it without strings. It follows that instead of the hoped-for independence in this field there would be considerable dependence and control.

Political flexibility, ideological implacability

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

Of late the leaders of Guyana's ruling party — the People's National Congress (PNC) — have been talking much about socialism as a real perspective opening to the country. Similar views, as we know, are voiced in some sections of the world public. It is said, for instance, that the PNC has control of the whole state machine, including the police and army, that there are no ultra-rightist organizations of any influence (and hence no danger of a reactionary coup), and that the biggest political force — the People's Progressive Party (PPP) — holds firm anti-imperialist positions and enjoys extensive support among the population. All that is really so, and yet we maintain that the road to socialism in Guyana is far from easy and has to be fought for stubbornly.

The purpose of this article is to elucidate the PPP's view of the socialist perspective in Guyana. But first of all I would like to present some of the realities in Guyana to enable the reader himself to judge the nature of the political course pursued by the present government and ruling party.

World opinion knows mainly the government's activity on the international scene. On the whole it is progressive in character. Guyana has established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, People's Republic of China, Cuba, the GDR, and other socialist countries, takes part in the non-alignment movement, and supports the liberation struggle of dependent countries. We support and welcome all these steps by the PNC.

Relatively less is known about the government's home policy, and hence I would like to examine it in greater detail.

The People's National Congress has held power for more than 10 years now. What are the results of its rule? In early 1974, leading government spokesmen were expressing alarm about an impending economic collapse.[1] The excuse proffered was the 'oil crisis.' But long before the impact of the 'oil crisis' was felt, Guyana's economy was already in serious trouble. The country's present difficulties result from foreign domination of the economy left intact from colonial days and the fallacious strategy of economic development. All these years the emphasis was laid on infrastructure development (building of roads, dams, airport, harbor, jetties, public buildings, etc.) at the expense of industry and agriculture. The share of agriculture and industry in the Gross Domestic Product declined.

The inflation in the capitalist world from which about 95 per cent of imports originate, has led to soaring prices. Under the PPP government, prices were stable and essential foods were available in abundant supply.[2] The cost of living index figure rose modestly by about nine points in the seven-year period 1957-64. Under the PNC regime, it rose by 41.6 points.

Shortage of commodities due to restrictions and bans on imports of essential foods, and consequently black market prices, have added to the housewife's nightmare. The result is poverty and malnutrition on a wide scale. In a report of the Trades Union Congress,[3] Professor Clive Thomas pointed out the low levels of production of major meat and dairy products. He said that calculations using the government estimates show a per capita consumption level of 3-4 ounces of beef per week, about one and a half of pork and about three of poultry.

The balance of payments situation was aggravated greatly by the rising prices of imports, the outflow of profits on foreign investments and by the payment of foreign debts which increased fivefold between 1964 and 1974.

To finance the cost of the inflated bureaucratic machine and debt payments, indirect taxation particularly steeply increased. The consumption tax alone increased from $5 million in 1970 to $37 million in 1974.

Social services have also been cut. The share of the budget for the people's welfare declined from 45 per cent in 1964 to 35 per cent in 1974. Medical care is becoming out of reach for the average Guyanese. The major health institution, the Georgetown Public Hospital, is obsolete and ill-equipped. It experiences shortages of nursing and other staff, and of drugs. For education, the allocation of the national budget declined from 16 per cent in 1970 to 11 per cent in 1974. The free milk and school feeding scheme inaugurated by the

PPP government has been withdrawn. Schools are overcrowded; 26 per cent of the children who are eligible to attend cannot do so because of a shortage of places. Schools are also under-staffed.

The Guyanese people's problems are further aggravated by an unusually high rate of unemployment, estimated at about 30 per cent. And there is no provision for unemployment relief under the National Insurance Scheme.

In housing, the situation remains alarming. Rents, which now consume about one-third of the wages of the worker, are increasing. The majority of households in the capital, Georgetown (and nearly a half of them have five and more persons), have a one-room combination of bedroom, kitchen and living room. This overcrowding will be intensified as more and more persons trek from the rural areas to Georgetown.

There is also widespread corruption, discrimination and squandering of public funds, a mounting crime and delinquency rate, and prostitution.

The regime is bent on owning and controlling the mass media and on silencing its opponents. In February 1972, it assumed powers to control the importation of newsprint, printing equipment and materials. Because of this control, a license has been refused the publishers of the PPP daily, *The Mirror*, to import equipment. And because of delays in issuing licenses for the importation of newsprint, the paper was forced to cease publication on three occasions for a period of about two months in 1972-73 and for six weeks in 1974. The regime is also purging the University of Guyana of revolutionary critics.

To maintain itself in power, the government resorts to extensive electoral fraud and to military-bureaucratic methods of stamping out opposition. Soon after the infamous 1973 elections,[4] the PNC regime re-enacted the National Security Act, which provides for preventive detention, restriction of movement of persons, powers of search without warrants, increased powers of the police, etc. PPP premises are raided and meetings broken up. This year the army and police suppressed a seven-week strike of sugar cane plantation workers.

With the 71 per cent representation in the National Assembly, the regime proposes to amend the Constitution to destroy the fundamental rights of the people — rights which from the days of slavery and indentureship the people struggled for and obtained under the PPP government. All this is being done with utterances that 'freedom is a living reality in Guyana' and that these actions are 'based on love for the people.'

Thus, the PNC activity cannot be assessed one-dimensionally. On the world scene it has been marked by many progressive actions,

whereas at home it is more often than not at variance with the aspirations of the working people. Moreover, even in home policy there is a growing discrepancy between the declarations of the ruling circles and their deeds. On the one hand, the government is taking steps to restrict foreign monopoly (it has nationalized some companies), attacks capitalism and advocates socialism, urging the PNC rank and file to study Marxism-Leninism. On the other, as we have seen, the most obvious result of the PNC's 10-year rule is the worsening position of the Guyanese working people.

What is the explanation of this 'duality' and contradictoriness? First and foremost, the PNC government, petty-bourgeois and reformist in its class nature, is highly susceptible to external, especially reactionary, influences.

Several factors have influenced the PNC leaders. Discontent is growing among the masses whose conditions are deteriorating daily. The PNC rank and file want fundamental change which will bring an end to unemployment and declining living standards. They have been influenced by the social gains made by the working people in the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries. For 25 years they have been hearing from the PPP that only socialism is the answer. Today the numerous PNC supporters know well that in socialist countries an end has been brought to unemployment, hunger, misery and exploitation. Experiencing political and ideological pressure from our Party and in view of the mounting economic difficulties, the government was forced to follow the lead of the progressive developing countries, pursue an independent foreign policy, advocate measures such as the national ownership and control of natural resources, and talk about socialism.[5]

On the other hand, the representatives of the small and middle bourgeoisie in the PNC with ambitions to becoming industrial or commercial capitalists, or occupying highly paid posts in the state apparatus or on the boards of nationalized companies, are either opposed to any change or want only limited reforms. It is under the influence of this wing that the government does not venture to break with imperialism, is making deals with it, paying lavish compensations to the owners of nationalized enterprises, and still leaves intact Booker's and the foreign banks and insurance companies which determine in fact Guyana's fiscal and credit policy.

The changed world balance in favor of socialism cannot but affect the situation in our country. The policy of peaceful coexistence imposed on imperialism by the socialist community headed by the Soviet Union, détente and the diminishing danger of a military world conflagration, are sapping the positions of anti-communists throughout the world, including our country. We are glad that the PNC has

been forced to swallow its anti-communist sentiments. But here again the PNC leaders are acting with an eye on imperialism, taking account of its changing strategy. For instance, following the lead of the USA they reconsidered their attitude to the People's Republic of China and voted for the seating of China in the UN, but at the same time they are peddling the 'two super-powers' line which equates socialist USSR with imperialist USA. Figuratively speaking, the PNC leadership wants to maintain one foot in the imperialist camp, while reaching out half-heartedly with the other to the socialist camp.

How does imperialism view and respond to the developing situation? Clearly, it is not very happy. Its discomfiture is all the greater because of its failure through the years to build a coalition of small right-wing groups as a viable alternative to the PPP. Our Party is gaining increasing political support. Consequently, imperialism is forced to continue to support the PNC despite its talk about socialism. However, imperialism is not unduly worried about talk unless it is translated into action.

Knowing our people's urge for socialism, imperialism is trying to keep Guyana within the capitalist orbit through multilateral if not bilateral aid, cultivating so-called 'socialism with a human face' (based on anti-Sovietism), granting scholarships to young PNC members, holding all sorts of seminars and sponsoring no-expense-barred tours to the USA, indoctrination of police and military personnel, infiltrating agents into our Party, practising terror, and strengthening the ultra-rightist forces. All that, beyond doubt, influences the position of the ruling party and the regime as a whole.

How should our Party act in this far from simple situation? It should be said outright: the PNC leaders' talk about socialism is no more than a tribute to the times, expressing their fear of losing the support of the masses who pin on socialism their hopes of a better future. If the PNC is serious about advancing toward socialism, it should first of all radically change its home policy, bring about deep socio-economic reforms, put an end to unemployment and poverty, raise the living standards of the masses, respect civil rights and freedoms, and stop making advances to imperialism.

But perhaps the PNC leadership has lately reconsidered its views and is sincerely bent on pursuing, as it says, an anti-imperialist line and building socialist in Guyana? Considering the past deals of the PNC with imperialism, one cannot be too sure. We do not forget that the regime has on more than one occasion demonstrated its unscrupulousness. Opportunists and pragmatists, its leaders have always adapted to the circumstances. We wish, of course, that the PNC's future actions should dispel our doubts. But we must remember that

the PNC is not the PPP — we cannot expect it to proceed in the same way Marxist-Leninists would.

To evolve correct tactics in the present situation, we strive to assess developments from scientific positions, dialectically, without bias, guided by the real state of affairs. And Guyana's reality is such that some aspects of the government activity in the recent period are progressive and we cannot close our eyes to this fact. The main thing for us is that these actions have the effect of weakening the positions of imperialism in Guyana. The new situation therefore demands a more flexible political approach on the part of the PPP in the interest of the revolutionary process.

Up to 1970, the PPP was correct in strongly criticizing the PNC regime because of its outright anti-working-class, pro-imperialist, undemocratic, corrupt and discriminatory[6] policies. In subsequent years, in view of the mounting repressions and especially the 1973 electoral fraud, we were justified in our campaign of non-cooperation and civil resistance.

We are now going over to positions of critical support of the regime. If we continue with the old line we face the danger of opposing for the sake of opposing and thus playing into the hands of the reactionaries.

There is also another aspect of the problem. We know that the CIA has toppled many a government pursuing an anti-imperialist line. The consequences are too well known: a reign of fascist terror, extermination of Communists and other patriots. Does this danger exist in Guyana? At present, as we have said, there is no such danger, but it cannot be ruled out completely: the government engages in the dangerous practice of sending military and police personnel for training and indoctrination in the United States, Britain and Brazil. But we remember that when leaders like Nkrumah, Sukarno and others tried to confront imperialism, they were attacked by their own generals. Civil freedoms have been violated in Guyana, but the situation is far worse in Brazil, Chile, Indonesia or Bangladesh. Our support of the PNC does not mean that we want to save the present government. No, we want to save the nation.

Critical support does not mean unconditional support. It means just what it says — giving support for any progressive measure, opposing any reactionary moves.

As we have said, there are more than enough grounds for criticizing the government. Our Party will continue to criticize the regime if its actions run counter to the interests of the masses. It will apply pressure on the PNC and also take its own initiatives in this direction.

In the present conditions special significance attaches to struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism. Our position of principle is as

follows: despite political and ideological differences, we are prepared to cooperate with all who are sincerely interested in deepening the anti-imperialist process, in our society's advance to socialism. This also applies to the PNC.

But how do the PNC leaders visualize the concept of socialism? They have in mind not the socialism which has become a reality in the Soviet Union, the GDR, Czechoslovakia and other countries of Eastern Europe. When the PPP was in government, the PNC advocated 'democratic socialism,' falsely accusing us of wanting to destroy democracy by abolishing elections, etc. Subsequent events demonstrated that, upon coming to power, the PNC itself took that road. Today its leaders advocate 'cooperative socialism,' claiming that cooperatives would be the means to bring socialism. But real socialism means public ownership of the means of production. While supporting the cooperative movement, we know that turning nationalized enterprises into cooperatives is not the way to radically change the existing socio-economic structure and build socialism. Rather, it is the way to construct a new form of capitalism, what one PNC minister recently dubbed 'people's capitalism.' To bring socialism nearer, it is imperative to nationalize all foreign monopolies, as well as key national industries, banks and insurance companies, i.e., to complete the stage of anti-imperialist democratic change preceding the socialist stage.

Without majority involvement, without people's democracy, there can be no socialism. There must be democracy at all levels — central and local government, trade union, industrial. All that is non-existent in today's Guyana.

We flatly reject the insidious propaganda that there is no difference between our Party and the PNC. The purpose of this ideological subversion is to establish a one-party system, which would mean a minority dictatorship. We must maintain our identity as the PPP. We must vigorously fight against any or all attempts to liquidate our Party. The Party is deeply rooted in the working class and the masses. It is true to say that in Guyana today there is no important facet of life which the PPP did not pioneer. The people of Guyana owe many of their progressive gains, including national independence, in large measure to the PPP. Without it, the anti-imperialist process and advance to socialism would be impossible.

The PNC leadership faces an alternative: either it will arrest the anti-imperialist process or, relying on the support of the population, carry forward the anti-imperialist transformations and take the country onto the non-capitalist path in the direction of socialism.

1. Economic collapse was averted largely because of the unprecedented increase in the export price of sugar.

2. The second government of Cheddi Jagan (1957-64) drew up a five-year economic development plan providing for limiting the activity of foreign monopolies, diversifying the structure of production and setting up a national finance system. It also took steps for solving the agrarian question, abolishing unemployment and raising living standards. — *Ed.*

3. Unites nearly all trade unions of the country, is a member of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. — *Ed.*

4. At the 1973 elections, the army intervened, seized ballot boxes and conveyed them not to the counting centers but to army headquarters where they were tampered with.

5. The burning ambitions of the PNC publicity-conscious leaders to become world renowned as progressive fighters against imperialism played their part there.

6. The population of Guyana consists of two big ethnic groups — Indians and Africans. The former support the PPP and the latter, the PNC. —*Ed.*

Some features of U.S. capitalist development

Hyman Lumer
Member of Political Committee,
Central Committee, CPUSA,
Editor of *Political Affairs*

These days in the United States of America the 200th anniversary of the first bourgeois revolution on the American continent is being observed in both official and popular circles. Official observances stress the theme that U.S. capitalist democracy is the best of all possible worlds, and that it is the product of 'individual initiative in a competitive society,' by which its vindicators mean capitalism.

Observances in popular circles, on the other hand, strike a different note. They reflect the prevalent sentiment of a growing majority of the population, expressed in many ways, including public opinion polls conducted by capitalist sources. This sentiment represents the conviction that it is time for a radical change of the U.S. economic system.

The U.S. bicentennial observances have called to mind the Declaration of Independence which affirmed that all human beings are endowed with 'inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,' and that 'whenever any Form of Government becomes

Continuing letters from the USA on the bicentennial of the revolution in the United States. See *WMR*, July 1975.

destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government . . .'

Abundant evidence supports the public's view that these unalienable rights have been subverted and largely nullified in the course of U.S. capitalist development. The record of this development shows incontrovertibly that not only has 'individual initiative in a competitive society' passed into limbo long ago, but that huge corporations have come to determine and direct the country's socio-economic, political and ideological life in the interest not of the mass of its citizens, but of the tiny minority of super-rich owners of corporate wealth. This may be seen from a review in outline of the main features of U.S. capitalist development.

From the Revolution to the Civil War

An objective analysis of the historical past of the major imperialist power, in my mind, is of topical value not only to Americans. There is also the need for such an evaluation, for example, in the newly independent nations, especially where the choice of the way of development — capitalist or non-capitalist — is intensively debated. Since a comprehensive analysis of this kind cannot be made in a magazine article, this one will dwell only on some of the features of capitalist evolution there.

The origins of U.S. capitalism go back to the first British settlements in North America at the opening of the 17th century, beginning with the settlement of Jamestown in 1607. Companies organized by merchants and nobles, armed with land grants and monopoly privileges by the British Crown, brought to these shores masses of British poor, many as indentured servants agreeing to a period of bondage in payment for their passage. These became the small farmers and artisans who formed the base of the New England economy, the objects of exploitation by merchant capitalists and wealthy planters.

In the South, a different economy developed: large cotton, tobacco and sugar cane plantations operated with Black slave labor. The inhuman institution of Black chattel slavery played a prominent role in U.S. economic development, as did the struggle to abolish it.

In the seaport cities and towns, particularly with the development of the fishing and shipbuilding industries, a class of wage laborers emerged and the beginnings of factory production appeared. With this came the formation of the first labor unions and eventually the first strikes.

For the British merchant capitalists the colonies became a vast source of profits. At the same time there emerged colonial merchant and landowner classes who, on the one hand, joined in exploiting the

toiling masses, and, on the other hand, were themselves subjected to the domination of British merchant capital.

The conflict between the colonies and Britain was inevitable. British mercantilism sought to exploit the colonies by restricting their trade and development of industry in its favor, by compelling them to buy British goods and by imposing onerous taxes on them. The Revolutionary War (1775-1783) which ensued and the achievement of independence from British rule removed these restrictions and opened the doors to capitalist development.

The upsurge of industrial development began during the war and continued at a growing pace after the war. By 1800 the factory system was fairly well advanced. In the ensuing decades capitalist development flourished and capitalist wealth grew, but at the cost of the most brutal exploitation of the growing mass of wage workers and the rise of bitter, bloody class struggles. They did so also at the expense of the Indian peoples, who were robbed of their lands and possessions and subjected to genocidal slaughter. It was during these years that the foundations were laid for the mounting fortunes of the merchants, bankers, land speculators and other capitalist elements.

There remained, however, one serious obstacle to industrial development: the slavery-based plantation system of the South.

The Southern plantation system with its slave labor prospered and grew, and the slaveowners fought to extend chattel slavery as a legal institution in the new states established as westward migration proceeded. But this brought them into sharp conflict with the rising industrial bourgeoisie, whose need for 'free' wage labor, land and markets compelled them to oppose the expansion of slavery into these areas. The small farmers and the wage workers themselves found their interests threatened by the introduction of slave labor.

The clash between these two antagonistic social orders led to the Civil War (1861-1865). Though the North originally fought only against the extension of slavery,[1] it soon became apparent, as Karl Marx had pointed out, that it could defeat the South only through the outright abolition of slavery. Under the pressure of progressive forces and the military situation President Lincoln was forced to issue the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. With this revolutionary act, Northern victory was made sure, and with the wiping out of slavery the immense potentialities for the development of U.S. capitalism were fully opened up.

The rise of monopoly capitalism

In the South, the Union victory in the Civil War led to the Reconstruction period in which bourgeois democratic rights for all sections of the people came into effect for the first time. But by 1877,

through the connivance of the Northern industrialists and the plantation owners, these gains were wiped out and the freed slaves were reduced to the status of sharecroppers subjected to inhuman exploitation imposed through the instrumentality of a most brutal system of discrimination, segregation and bestial persecution. This pattern of racial oppression and brutality has since been extended to the entire country and to other oppressed peoples — Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native American Indians and Asian-Americans. The super-exploitation of these peoples, comprising about one-fifth of the population, is today a major source of extra profits for U.S. big business. This has given a special importance to the struggle against national and racial oppression, against all forms of racism, in the struggles of the U.S. working class.

The growth of industry, greatly stimulated by the Civil War itself, continued rapidly in the years following.

From 1859 to 1899 the number of industrial establishments rose from 140,000 to 512,000, the number of wage workers in them from 1.3 million to 5.3 million, and the gross value of their products from $1.9 billion to $13 billion. In this process of expansion the existence of vast unsettled areas in the West had an important impact. The vast areas of unsettled land went not primarily to working people but with the connivance of the state, to capitalists for the building of railroads and exploitation of the natural wealth of these territories. In the process the Indian population was either decimated or confined to reservations on the poorest sections of the land.

The unsettled areas in the West drained off numbers of workers seeking a better existence, leading to problems of labor shortage, to a constant flow of immigration, and to somewhat higher wage levels than those of European workers. All this gave a strong stimulus to mechanization and the search for new labor-saving devices, and contributed greatly to the exceptional rate of technological advance of U.S. industry.

With the rise of mechanization and mass production techniques came a corresponding rise in the size of industrial establishments, a process of concentration of capital in growing amounts in the hands of individual capitalists. At the same time, in the course of competition, smaller enterprises went under or were absorbed by the larger ones. Or firms merged in order, by combining capitals, to strengthen their competitive position. Thus concentration, accompanied by centralization of ownership, led increasingly to the emergence, in a given field of production, of a small number of large firms dominating production and sales. Here lay the road to monopoly.

Indeed, by 1900 monopoly had achieved a position of dominance in a number of key industries, and especially in the basic industries. In

1901, it is worthy of note, U.S. Steel alone produced nearly two-thirds of the nation's entire steel output.

V.I. Lenin, in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, notes that in the U.S. by 1909: 'Almost half the total production of all the enterprises of the country was carried on by *one-hundredth part* of these enterprises! ... From this it can be seen that, at a certain stage in its development, concentration itself, as it were, leads straight to monopoly, for a score or so of giant enterprises can easily arrive at an agreement. ... This transformation of competition into monopoly is one of the most important — if not the most important — phenomena of modern capitalist economy. ...' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 197).

Central in this process was the development of the corporation as the structural form of business organization, and the development of credit, primarily through the rise of commercial banks. Banks mushroomed during the post-Civil War years. From 1865 to 1900 the total number of banks increased from 1,643 to 10,382 and their total assets rose from $1.4 billion to $10.8 billion.

Investment banking made its appearance, its foremost exponent being the House of Morgan (now Morgan, Stanley and Company). The Rockefeller empire was founded with the incorporation of the Standard Oil Company of Ohio in 1870 with a capital of $1,000,000. It became the base of an oil monopoly which, about 1891, acquired its own bank, through which it penetrated other industries, promoting mergers and the formation of major enterprises with controlling interests maintained largely through the bank.

This period witnessed also the rise of the big insurance companies, with huge accumulations of funds for investment. Somewhat later there came on the scene the investment trusts, institutions combining the funds of large numbers of small investors and using these to seek controlling positions in major industrial and financial enterprises.

Thus, with the development of industrial monopolies came the merger of industrial and banking capital, with bankers becoming also industrialists, and with the emergence of a new type of capitalist, the financier, whose role was to gain control of industrial and financial corporations.

Growth of the financial oligarchy

If the latter part of the 19th century witnessed the emergence of monopolies and of finance capital, the first half of the 20th saw their expansion to enormous proportions. Two features characterize this period.

The first is the multiplication of corporations and the mushrooming of the giant corporation, particularly in manufacturing, transport,

mining and finance, as a feature esepcially prominent in U.S. capital. More and more, the ownership of the country's economic assets has fallen into the hands of a small group of corporate giants. In 1948 the top 200 manufacturing corporations held 48.2 per cent of the country's fixed capital assets; by 1971 the figure had risen to 61 per cent.[2]

The main consequence of this process of corporate growth and concentration has been the growing power of monopoly. In industry after industry, a handful of firms has gained sufficient control of production and the market to do away with competition and fix prices by agreement. There is still considerable production by small competitive firms. But in general, for many decades, production and prices have been mainly determined not by competition but by monopolistic agreements and price-fixing.

The process of concentration, moreover, has not come to an end but is a continuing one. Of the 500 leading industrial corporations, of which *Fortune* has been keeping account for some 20 years, the magazine writes in its May 1975 issue: 'There is no doubt, then, that [they] are a substantially greater chunk of the U.S. economy than they were when *Fortune* began compiling these lists.'

But all this presents only one part of the picture. These giant corporations are not independent entities; they are in turn part of the financial empires joining banking and industrial capital, of which we have already spoken. In the forefront of these are eight major finance capital groups which taken together constitute a financial oligarchy, in which the big banks play an increasingly dominant role and through which a couple of thousand leading finance capitalists effectively control the economy of the country. The center of power of this oligarchy is situated in Wall Street.

Mergers and the rise of conglomerates

The process of concentration has occurred largely, of course, through the internal growth of enterprises. But in considerable and growing measure it has occurred through the merger of separate enterprises. Especially noteworthy is the rise of mergers of large corporations. In recent years they have involved mainly the mushrooming of groups of new conglomerate corporations pieced together of firms turning out totally unrelated products.[3]

Initially, conglomerate mergers were motivated primarily by a desire for greater financial stability through diversification of interests. The more recent mergers were motivated largely by striving constantly to expand by absorbing added enterprises of whatever kind. A number of these have entered the ranks of the top industrial corporations. In the top 100 industrial corporations are International Telephone and Telegraph, Ling-Temco-Vought, Litton Industries, Gulf

and Western Industries, Textron. Most of them have a base in military production.

The rise of the conglomerates is new manifestation of concentration and centralization of U.S. capital; it also represents a new dimension in the parasitism of monopoly capital. And it has strengthened the role of the big banks and finance capital. Much of the financing of the expansion of conglomerates comes from long-term loans from banks or insurance companies, whose position of dominance has been greatly increased.

Foreign investment: the multinational corporations

In his definition of imperialism, Lenin stresses among its basic features the fact that 'the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance' (Vol. 22, p. 266). In this lay the basis of the development of the system of colonialism.

U.S. imperialism was a latecomer on the scene. In 1908 direct foreign investment totalled only $1.6 billion and by 1945 they had grown to $8.1 billion. It is since World War II that U.S. foreign investments have skyrocketed and that the United States has emerged as unquestionably the world's leading imperialist power. By the end of 1973, direct private investment abroad had grown to $107.2 billion. And whereas the chief areas of investment had formerly been Canada and Latin America, these had now been substantially surpassed by investments in Western Europe. The totals for the three areas were: Europe $37.2 billion, Canada $28.05 billion, Latin America $18.4 billion.[4] This shift in the geography of U.S. foreign investments does not mean, however, any lessening of the plundering of the resources and exploitation of the workers of the developing countries by U.S. imperialism.[5]

Thus there has come into being the multinational corporation, multinational not in ownership but in the international scope of its operations. Instead of a U.S. corporation with foreign subsidiaries we now have a world corporation with subsidiaries in many countries including the United States. But control remains in the hands of U.S. finance capital. To be sure, other capitalist countries have also given birth to multinational corporations, but these are far outstripped by those of the United States in size and scope of operations. The sales of the foreign subsidiaries of these U.S. companies are estimated at some $200 billion a year, a sum 4-5 times their volume of exports and exceeding the gross national product of most developed capitalist countries.

The internationalization of production by the multinationals for the sake of greater profits has led, therefore, to a growing need for

international solidarity among the workers of different countries against a common foe. It demands an end to racism and national chauvinism which pits the interests of U.S. workers against those of other countries and an end to the shameful class collaboration of the Meany trade union bureaucracy with the multinationals and with U.S. imperialism as a whole.

Monopoly capital and the state

The American Revolution was part of the bourgeois-democratic revolutionary process which with the rise of capitalism challenged the sway of feudalism. Its product was the bourgeois state, of which the *Communist Manifesto* says: 'The Executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.' The state served to legalize and enforce the system of capitalist property and exploitation. More, in the early history of the country it was a source of primitive accumulation through vast land grants and giveaways of the country's national wealth. In later years the national debt and the manipulation of government securities became a further source of accumulation. Robbery of the government treasury by the capitalist class is, in short, not a new phenomenon.

With the rise of monopoly capital the state became the instrument of rule not merely of capital in general but especially of the monopolies. And with the outbreak of the First World War and the October Revolution, which gave rise to the general crisis of capitalism, the merger of monopoly capital with the state apparatus took on new proportions. At the time Lenin wrote: 'The imperialist war has greatly intensified and accelerated the process of transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism. The monstrous oppression of the masses of toilers by the state — which is becoming merged more and more with the all-powerful capitalist combines — is becoming ever more monstrous' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 383).

The ties between the federal government and finance capital were greatly enhanced during World War II and they remained so with the subsequent launching of the cold war and the establishment of a permanent war economy. Instead of being sharply reduced as they were after World War I, U.S. military expenditures have continued at a high level throughout the period since World War II, amounting altogether to well over a trillion dollars. Growing out of the cold-war policy, they have given birth to what President Eisenhower called the 'industrial-military complex' — a group of corporations which receive the lion's share of military orders.

The close ties of monopoly and the state are expressed also in the fact that agencies of the executive branch of government are honey-

combed with representatives of major corporations, while retired Army and Navy officers have found comfortable berths as officers of leading corporations.

State monopoly capitalism is the product of the general crisis of capitalism, compelling it increasingly to lean on the economic resources of the state to prop up its profits at home and its depredations abroad. And with the current deepening of the crisis, this compulsion has grown. It is the product, too, of the growing socialization of production, of the scientific-technologcial revolution and the growing role of science as a productive force. The state is called upon to make the growing outlays for research and development required by modern technology. The state is called upon, through its powers of taxation, borrowing and spending, to fatten finance capital at the expense of all other sections of the people. The state acts as the protector of foreign interests of the monopolies. The state seeks to 'regulate' the economy, to mitigate its cyclical fluctuations. But it does so by benefiting the monopolies at the expense of the working people, by sharpening the contradiction between production and consumption inherent in capitalism.

The struggle of the working class

With the rise in industrial production in the 19th century came the rise of an industrial proletariat of considerable proportions and a sharpening of the class struggle. Workers in U.S. mines and factories were subjected to exploitation no less brutal and inhuman than that of their counterparts in Europe. But the workers fought back. Union organization spread and struggles of growing intensity developed. The first nationwide organization, the National Labor Union, appeared as early as 1866, though it lasted only a few days. The Knights of Labor was formed in 1969, but remained a secret organization until 1878 when it entered into open activity and struggle. And in 1881 the American Federation of Labor was born.

In 1874-75 there took place a seven-month strike of anthracite coal miners, followed by the infamous frameup of the Molly Maguires.[6] Major textile strikes took place in Fall River, Massachusetts. Also in 1877 a railroad strike of major proporations occurred. The year 1885 witnessed another bitter coal strike, and in 1894 there took place another miners' strike and the great Pullman railroad strike.

Central in the struggles of this period was the fight for the eight-hour day, highlighted by the strikes on May 1, 1886, which became the origin of May Day as the universally celebrated workers' holiday. This was also the occasion of the infamous Haymarket frameup, in which four working-class leaders were hanged and one either committed suicide or was murdered by the police.

The rise of monopoly capital was accompanied almost from the start by struggles against the trusts, struggles originating with small producers threatened by them. In 1890 the Sherman Anti-Trust Act was passed by Congress, prohibiting restraint of interstate or foreign trade. In 1914 this was supplemented by the Clayton Anti-Trust Act and in the 1930s further legislation was adopted. Such movements and legislation, emanating from small businessmen and farmers who suffered at the hands of the monopolies and sought to return to a past age of free competition, proved totally fruitless in restricting the growth of monopoly capital.

It is only in the present world, with the rise of state monopoly capitalism and the increasingly political character of the class struggle with the working class seeking to utilize the resources of the state for its benefit rather than that of the monopolies and allying itself with all other sections of the people oppressed by big business, that an anti-monopoly movement of a different character has come into being. It is a movement based on the working class in alliance with the Black people in their struggle for liberation. It is directed not toward the restoration of free competition but toward curbing the power of the monopolies, toward establishing democratic controls over their operation, toward nationalization of key industries which, ultimately, establishes the basis for transition to socialism. Such is the nature of the democratic struggle taking place in the United States today.

In the forefront of this struggle stands the Communist Party of the United States, founded in 1919. The Party, the product of a long history of development going back to the American Workers League founded in 1852 and headed by Joseph Weydemeyer, today is the leading force in the fight for a socialist USA.

This socialist USA is the bright future being shaped today as the anti-monopoly struggle, led by the working class and its allies in the favorable conditions of the turn toward détente, gains momentum amid the observances of the U.S. bicentenary.

From this brief review of the main stages of capitalist development in the USA it is possible to see more clearly the sharpening of the class struggles, the inevitable victory of the working class and its allies.

1. From 1772 to 1860 the number of Negro slaves increased nearly 10-fold, reaching roughly four million.
2. *Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1973*, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 483.
3. In 1968, some 90 per cent of the mergers had the aim of establishing conglomerate corporations.
4. *Survey of Current Business*, August 1974. Vol. 54, No. 8, Part II, p. 16.
5. For an analysis of recent trends of U.S. imperialist exploitation in developing countries see the author's article on 'U.S. Imperialism in Southern Africa' (*Political*

Affaris, July 1973), and 'U.S. Economic Exploitation of Latin America' (*Political Affairs*, October 1972).

6. Molly Maguires is the name given by the bourgeois press to a non-existent terrorist organization of Irish miners said to be secretly operating in Pennsylvania in the 1860s and 1870s. The aim of this fib was to justify the brutal repression of the U.S. coal miners' leaders.

The Socialist International and Africa

Amath Dansoko
Member of Political Bureau,
African Independence Party
of Senegal

A STRATEGY OUT OF STEP WITH THE TIMES

Everybody knows the imperialists' neo-colonialist methods of subordinating developing countries to monopoly capital But there is also a more disguised variety of diktat and interference, when expansion goes under the signboard of 'democratic socialism' and is carried out by people of Asian or African origin. That is the nature of the policy of certain elements in the international Social-Democratic movement. And there could not be a more graphic illustration than their maneuvers in Africa.

In July 1975 political parties of 26 African countries held a conference in Tunis on 'Planned Liberalism and the African Roads to Socialism.' Its behind-the-scenes patron was the Socialist International. The holding of such a conference, the methods of preparing it, and the choice of participants gave rise to many a question, notably: What was the reason for this unprecedented and large undertaking?

Africans have long since learned the real worth of European Social-Democratic policy on the colonial question. On our continent its political course was always identified with the colonial adventures of imperialism. Take the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt when the French government was headed by a Socialist or the prominent participation of the French Socialist Party in all the governments that fought the colonial war in Algeria. Take the part played by the Belgian Socialists in the Congo tragedy or the capitulation of Britain's Labour cabinet to Ian Smith, chief of the Rhodesian racists.

The conflict between the liberation movement and the Socialist International was so sharp that Social-Democracy had to lie low for a long time before it could venture on a 'bridge-building' strategy in free Africa.

But the very first direct contacts with the African parties precipitated a scandal. Under pressure of the Labour Party delegation, who feared criticism of its surrender in the Rhodesian issue, Africans invited to the 10th Congress of the Socialist International in Stockholm (1966) were denied the floor. In reply, the African representatives boycotted the hastily called face-saving 'briefing.'

The latest phase in the Socialist International's relations with Africa opened at the end of the 60s. The Socialist International made the pretentious offer to teach the new states how to settle their problems on Social-Democratic lines. True, as the 11th Congress of the Socialist International in Eastbourne (1969) proved, the highly touted 'answer' to the needs of the young states really amounted to nebulous talk about poverty, redistribution of wealth, higher productivity in underdeveloped areas, and the like. The organizers of the Congress produced the myth of the menace of 'negative anti-imperialism,' casting a cloud on the consistent struggle of the Afro-Asian peoples against colonialists and neo-colonialists. Drafting its recommendations, the Working Commission of the Council of the Socialist International went out of its way to hush up the revolutionary gains of the socialist-oriented countries, while extolling 'African socialism' which, the social-reformists claimed, applies the 'socialist doctrine' to the African realities to best advantage. Special praise was heaped specifically on the social-reformist and in substance bourgeois 'socialist doctrine of Senegal's President Leopold Senghor.

In an article entitled 'The International and Africa,' Hans Janitschek, the General Secretary of the Socialist International, admitted that Africa was outside the pale of the non-communist left (thereby admitting the extreme weakness of reformist parties in Africa), and stressed that the long-term task of the Socialist International in the region was to draw 'African socialism' into the mainstream of international Social-Democracy. And the conference in Tunis was assigned an important part in this strategic line. Though the scheme had germinated in Europe, its real initiators had at the outset endeavored to observe an African decorum.

The idea of calling a conference of Africa's 'Social-Democratic parties' issued from the negotiations between Senghor and President Bourguiba of Tunisia in July 1973. Later, Senghor declared repeatedly that it should create a continental organization closely associated with the Socialist International. But the undertaking looked dubious on a continent where there were very few parties of the

Social-Democratic orientation (the Socialist International has relations with only five). Hence, the initiators decided to enlarge the conference.

Invitations were sent to progressive parties, and also to members of the rightist regimes of the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Gabon and other countries expounding 'free enterprise.' In fact, there is nothing to distinguish these regimes from that of, say, Senegal, apart from its 'socialist' vocabulary. It was also decided to invite representatives of liberation movements. But alongside the progressive organizations there were also such undisguised agents of extreme international reaction as the representatives of the FNLA and UNITA of Angola.

It was officially announced that invitations to Tunis were being sent to all African ruling parties and opposition parties operating legally. But, in effect, a large group of organizations and regimes was openly snubbed. This applies to such Marxist-Leninist parties as the Communist Party of Réunion and the Progress and Socialism Party of Morocco, the progressive military regimes in Ethiopia, Dahomey and Madagascar. The moderate Senegal Democratic Party, the only legal opposition party in the country, was also overlooked. Somalia was invited, it is true, but only because its head of state, Siad Barre, was then chairman of the OAU.

The methods of selecting delegates spoke of the initiators' desire to create a semblance of representativeness, on the one hand, and to strengthen the group of parties and regimes of a reformist or undisguisedly bourgeois orientation, hostile to the ideas of revolutionary democracy and scientific socialism, on the other. From the beginning, the sights were set on limiting the number of participants of progressive convictions, on isolating the revolutionary-democratic forces. In the circumstances, the ruling revolutionary-democratic parties of the Guinean Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Tanzania and Mozambique could not send delegations.

The biased choice of African participants is a clear indication of the organizers' reluctance to seriously and constructively examine so crucial a question for the continent as the choice of ways of development. It is an anachronism at this time, marked by the existence and growth of the mighty socialist system, to discuss the problems of socialism without the participation of representatives of the socialist countries, and Communist and Workers' parties.

The organizers tried to malign the ideas of scientific socialism and the views of revolutionary democrats popular on the continent, to prod Africa toward rapprochement with imperialism, to block broader cooperation with the socialist world, and to discredit the non-capitalist way. Meanwhile, the ideas of Social-Democracy and right opportunism were propagated to the utmost. To avoid eventual expo-

sure, they were clothed in appropriate 'African garb,' and Senghor was picked as the most suitable figure to expound the ideological and political propositions cherished by the reformists, and to set the desired tone for the discussion.

In his report, presumptuously entitled 'An African Re-Reading of Marx and Engels,' Senghor advanced as the main postulate his favorite thesis on the African 'mystique.' With the ardor of a Messiah he declared scientific socialism an ideology alien to Africa, and tagged on one more thesis to the effect that the 'dogma of class struggle' was inapplicable to African conditions. The speaker did not trouble himself to produce tangible proof. He was content to oppose scientific socialism with the shoddy reactionary propaganda of 'rich and proletarian nations' used by both ultra-leftists and the extreme right in their attacks on the existing socialism and the liberation movement. Senghor made no reference at all to the internal confrontation of classes in the separate countries, though this, as everybody knows, is in evidence all over Africa.

The report of this 'expert' on African realities boiled down, in fact, to pure propaganda of the shopworn opportunist idea about the incompatibility of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete situation on our continent. It may be proper to recall that European social-reformists always resorted to this ploy in their attempts to emasculate the world-historic relevance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. It was not surprising, therefore, that having taken the cue from revisionists, Senghor stepped so easily on the anti-communist path of his tutors and patrons.

Anti-communism was the chief postulate in the report of the Senegalese president, and this not only because the ideological cocktail he presented consisted of anti-Marxist speculations of renegades and Western spiritualist and obscurantist philosophy. Every word pronounced by the speaker was an undisguised attack on the revolutionary democrats and Communists. For Senghor they are all 'foreign agents' and 'small black slaves.' This is obviously cold-war language, doubly intolerable because it is addressed against leaders of progressive African states who enjoy equal standing with Senghor in the OAU Assembly. He accuses the Communist movement of wanting to impose a 'uniform' model of development on the new states, and denies world socialism's decisive role in creating the conditions for the unprecedented upsurge of the liberation struggle in Asia and Africa. His report has all the marks of an act of ideological subversion, with the lack of arguments compensated by insinuations against the progressive forces. Its purpose is to isolate the peoples of the developing countries from their natural ally, the socialist community,

and to prevent growth of the national-liberation movement into a mighty offensive against the basis of capitalism.

The anti-communist propaganda and attacks on scientific socialism were firmly repulsed by delegates of the progressive states and movements. They retorted vigorously to some of the speeches, which were of a subversive nature. This was as it should be. The number of followers of scientific socialism is growing steadily in Africa. President Sekou Toure of the Guinean Republic, whose prestige on our continent is unassailable, stressed recently that the Democratic Party of Guinea is opting for historical materialism, which does not conflict with the views of the Guinean people. Scientific socialism has become the ideology of the Congolese revolutionaries, who have achieved major gains in building a new society. This is why the intervention by Pierre Nze, member of the Political Bureau of the Congolese Party of Labor, was so convincing and emphatic. He denounced the anti-communist lies and stressed the need to defend the forces of socialism and national liberation against overt and covert enemies.

The delegations of the socialist-oriented countries — Algeria, Congo, Somalia — presented the model of a serious and constructive approach. They came to Tunis to share their experience of national construction, and to substantiate the necessity of progressive anti-imperialist change. And they proved that Africa's revolutionary-democratic parties approach the crucial issues much more broadly and deeply than the bourgeois-nationalist and reformist.

Under the influence of the convincing speeches of the Algerian and Congo delegations, the participants rejected proposals introduced in the draft of the Final Declaration for calling the conference every two years and converting its steering committee into a permanent body. Thus, they frustrated the main aim of the Socialist International. The Final Declaration, and notably its economic part, is a profound disappointment for many of the participants in the conference.

Lastly, the initiators failed in their attempts to give the conference the image of 'purely African enterprise.' All doubts on this score were dispelled with the coming to Tunis of emissaries of the Socialist International (under guise of correspondents) — Jean Rous, a former Trotskyist and Senghor's ex-adviser, now in the leadership of the French Socialist Party, and Günther Markscheffel, former editor of the German Social Democratic journal *Vorwärts* and African affairs specialist of the SDP. They were highly active throughout the conference and especially during the discussion of the final texts.

The relation of forces at the conference prevented the delegations of progressive parties and organizations from putting up a coherent platform for Africa's independent and revolutionary development. But they did succeed in preventing the partisans of the directives of

international Social-Democracy from imposing their resolutions, and blocked adoption of virulently anti-communist declarations.

The Socialist International representatives and their followers in Africa continued to maneuver after the conference ended. They have not abandoned their scheme of forming a permanent body for liaison with West European Social-Democracy. The Senegalese and Tunisian press are spreading the false report that the conference had established such a body and had authorized it to prepare a new conference. The Socialist International has not given up its designs, is trying to advance them with Senghor's help, as his recent negotiations with Mitterrand, leader of the French Socialists, seem to confirm. Maneuvers of this sort must be constantly watched by the progressive forces in Africa, and call for the utmost vigilance.

The resounding failure of the organizers of the Tunis conference is convincing evidence that they have deluded themselves about the epoch and the continent. No plans or maneuvers, however ingenious and whoever their authors and executors, can stop the objective and logical movement of the African peoples to final liberation. Only scientific socialism can show the shortest route to this goal.

Trade unions and independence of Canada

Bruce Magnuson
Industrial Secretary,
Communist Party of Canada

The scientific and technological revolution and the ongoing and growing process of concentration and centralization of capital, production and distribution expressed in mergers, the emergence of multinational corporations and conglomerates — both U.S. and Canadian — embracing a whole series of diverse concerns, present the Canadian working class and its growing trade union movement with new problems. Today hundreds of thousands of new sections of wage and salary workers are seeking union protection against the onslaught on their living standards by the monopolies and their government. The unions are seen as their basic organizations of struggle to protect labor against capital. To fulfill their purpose the trade unions must defeat right-wing policies of class collaboration and betrayal of labor's interests, and replace them with policies of class struggle.

As the Program of the Communist Party, *The Road to Socialism in Canada*, points out: 'The interests and aims of U.S. and Canadian monopoly come increasingly into conflict with those of the majority of Canadians whose national, social and economic aspirations are fundamentally opposed to the betrayal and exploitation of our country by monopoly and its government.'

In the majority of cases, the Canadian trade unions are branches of international unions.* This serves to restrict the rights of Canadian members in the economic and political fields. Over the years the Canadian workers have fought for and achieved a measure of autonomy in union affairs. The struggle for full autonomy still has to be won. As the Program of the Communist Party points out: 'The fight for autonomy lays the basis for the achievement of an independent and sovereign Canadian trade union movement. This will decisively strengthen the political struggle of the working class for genuine Canadian independence against monopoly rule.'

Since its foundation in 1921, the Communist Party of Canada and its members have worked consistently to advance the unity of the working class. To this end the Communist Party advocates and fights for full autonomy in the trade unions, and for complete inner union democracy, as the essential prerequisites for the earlier possible achievement of an independent, sovereign and united Canadian trade union movement.

Communists see in the trade unions the most vital force in the fight against United States domination, as well as against Canadian state-monopoly control. An independent, sovereign and united trade union movement would greatly strengthen the possibility of international trade union unity, an imperative in contemporary conditions when imperialism seeks to solve its problems at the expense of the working class. International labor unity is an urgent requirement to advance the struggle for universal peace and security.

While thus championing an independent, sovereign and united trade union movement, Canadian Communists strongly oppose those who approach this question from the standpoint of bourgeois nationalism rather than from that of proletarian internationalism. In this respect we are forever mindful of what V.I. Lenin wrote about the class basis of nationalism and internationalism as early as 1913:

'Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism — these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26).

*By 'international unions' is meant only U.S. and Canadian unions, i.e., unions based in the United States and with membership in both countries. — *Ed.*

The aim of the Communist Party of Canada is the winning of an independent, sovereign and united trade union movement; a movement firmly united in fraternal solidarity and cooperating fully with unions of all nations, socialist and capitalist, on the basis of working-class internationalism; a movement unequivocally committed to solidarity with all peoples against imperialism, and for labor and democratic unity against the policies and aims of state-monopoly capitalism, and for a socialist Canada.

The present character of U.S.-Canadian trade union relations cannot be understood in isolation from the history of U.S.-Canadian relations in general.

International unions grew up over a number of decades in the 19th century. However, it was not until after the U.S. Civil War and Canadian Confederation in 1867 that the unions reached a stage of development when they found it necessary to form central bodies to formulate policies and defend their common interests on a local and national scale in their respective countries.

The American Federation of Labor was formed in 1881 and the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada was founded in 1883. This permitted Canadian and American workers in similar trades and industries to pool their economic strength in collective bargaining, while remaining autonomous and independent to formulate policies on national problems through their respective national bodies. The various international unions maintained a double affiliation and paid a prescribed affiliation fee based on their membership to the American Federation of Labor and the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, depending on whether these members were citizens or residents of the U.S. or of Canada.

It was not until the year 1898 that the two national bodies exchanged fraternal delegates. The records show that in that year a Canadian fraternal delegate attended the American Federation of Labor Convention as the representative of an autonomous Canadian Trades and Labour Congress.

Furthermore, the fraternal delegate from the AFL attended the TLC Convention with full cognizance of Canadian sovereignty. The record further shows that *no authorized* change has ever taken place in this relationship.

However, it was not long after this that the American Federation of Labor Executive Council began interfering in the internal affairs of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. Having removed any and all forms of organization not conforming to its narrow concept of pure craft unionism operating on a politically 'neutral' and business-union basis, it demanded that the Canadian Trades and Labour Con-

gress do likewise by expulsion of the non-conformist Knights of Labour,* and other groups, in 1902.

The AFL Executive Council refused to organize the unorganized and opposed and expelled the Committee for Industrial Organization and its newly constituted affiliates in the 1930s. Canadian Communists fought strongly against the implementation of this policy in Canada. It was the struggle of Communists for organization of the unorganized and for trade union unity in the 1920s and early 1930s in the U.S. and Canada which prepared the ground and laid the basis for the industrial organizational drive in the mass production industries in the middle and late 30s.

In Canada, Communists organized and led over 40,000 workers united in a left-led central body, the Workers' Unity League. In 1935 this central body was dissolved in the interests of trade union unity, and its constituent unions merged with other unions in their trade or industry. It was this which sparked the rapid advance of the union drive in new areas like Auto, Steel, Lumber, Mining and others. This facilitated the rapid advance of the Committee for Industrial Organization's organized drive when it spilled over from the USA into Canada in 1936-37 and on.

The Communists' struggle against AFL pressure on the TLC for expulsion of the CIO unions from the Canadian body was widely supported by both the members and leaders of national and international unions in Canada. As a result, the right-wing efforts to split the Canadian trade union movement were held in abeyance for over two years, and were finally forced through behind the backs of the membership in January 1940. Following their expulsion from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the CIO unions along with some other Canadian unions joined together in establishment of a second Canadian trade union center known as the Canadian Congress of Labour.

Only 10 years later could the Canadian public learn about some details of the impudent interference of reactionary American union leaders in trade union affairs in Canada. In March 1949 Percy R. Bengough and John W. Buckley, at that time President and Secretary-Treasurer respectively of the TLC, published, on behalf of its Executive Council, a document on the ruinous results of the AFL *diktat*. It cites 'flagrant examples' of the AFL leaders' gross interference in the affairs of the Canadian body. Under their pressure the United Mine Workers, a progressive union, was expelled from the TLC in 1939. Nearly the same lot befell the Machinists Union.

*A secret organization formed in 1869 in the USA with membership consisting of both white and black workers, originally committed to a radical trade union policy. — *Ed.*

'That is the way it has gone for years,' the document said. 'No consultation or consideration deemed necessary. Just issue orders with a total disregard of how the Canadian membership and the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada was affected.'

The TLC listed two demands made upon the Canadian trade union center by the AFL: 'expel all Communists and scrap the present Constitution by changing delegate representation'; two demands which the TLC officers described as an 'audacious attempt to disfranchise Canadian members and to make the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada a stifled appendage of the American Federation of labor . . .'

At the height of the cold war in the 1950s, the AFL and CIO merged in the United States into the present AFL-CIO, of which George Meany is the president. His right-wing, reactionary position is well-known and has finally brought the AFL-CIO into almost complete organizational isolation from the world trade union movement, including the ICFTU which it helped to bring into being during the early postwar years.

During these years, Canadian Communists were in the forefront of the struggle for an independent class position on the part of the trade union movement, as opposed to a policy of transforming the trade unions into instruments of cold war and in support of American imperialist policy. For this the Communists were outlawed, expelled and persecuted by the hierarchy of the U.S.-based international unions, whose leaders supported U.S. imperialism.

The Trades and Labour Congress and the Canadian Congress of Labour merged into the Canadian Labour Congress, in 1956. Representative of all national and international unions in Canada, with the exception of the Confederation of National Trade Unions in Québec with some 200,000 members, and some smaller groupings, the CLC today speaks for some 2.5 million members.

The economic base of reformism and opportunism in the labor movement in North America consisted in imperialist exploitation of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. This fact enabled the imperialists to pass on a small share of their super-profits to a section of the workers in the form of higher wages and relatively better conditions and thus form a basis for class collaboration. Inasmuch as the Canadian monopolists share in colonial super-profits and in U.S. imperialist expansionism, this process has also had its effects upon the Canadian labor movement.

Extensive propaganda by the monopoly bourgeoisie has carefully cultivated the idea that the generally higher living standards of North America are due to the 'inherently progressive' nature of capitalism

on this continent. The influence of this propaganda has tended to make capitalism acceptable to important strata of workers.

As the Program of the Communist Party of Canada points out: 'This relatively high living standard was not due to any "progressive" character of imperialism in North America, but was brought about by the way in which the productive forces were developed in a country without a background of feudalism, except for some elements of it in French Canada, and by a continuous flow of ready-made immigrant labor. As a result of settlement in a new and underdeveloped country, without landlordism, free homestead land for a long time made for a scarcity of labor and produced a pattern of higher wages than in Europe, which set standards that still operate. To this must be added the fact that U.S. and Canadian imperialism emerged from the First and Second World Wars very much richer than they were at the beginning of these wars. They did not experience the destruction of war, but instead reaped vast profits and were able to develop the productive forces at the expense of the peoples of Europe and Asia, and from the armaments race which followed the Second World War.

'Another factor making for extending the base of reformism . . . was and is the special exploitation of millions of immigrant workers which enabled the capitalists to concede somewhat better living standards to sections of native-born Canadians and some of the earlier immigrants.

'Thus, the battle for a working-class policy and for working-class unity incorporates an ideological struggle against capitalist illusions in the labor movement.

'The actual conditions of life of the workers under capitalism undermine these illusions. The exploitation of the workers by monopoly becomes more intense; the workers wage wider and sharper struggles for their needs.'

Two years after the merger of Canada's two main trade union centers into what is now the Canadian Labour Congress, this Congress embarked upon a new step in the direction of independent labor political action. This process, started by joint efforts of the CLC and the social democratic Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), resulted in the early 1960s in the founding of a new party, the New Democratic Party.

The Communist Party, which conducts a consistent and many-sided struggle against reformist ideology and for the integration of Marxism-Leninism with the broad labor movement, nevertheless saw in this new social reformist party development a positive challenge to the old-line capitalist parties, a process that could weaken their influence and strengthen the struggle for independent working-class and democratic political action.

Seeing the struggle of the people around their economic, social and

political needs and aspirations as the decisive factor in determining the course of social development, the Communist Party works to win the trade unions, the NDP and the broad democratic movement in the struggle for peace, Canadian independence and against monopoly rule.

During the decade of the 1960s the sharpening class struggle led to a process of differentiation in the NDP and the emergence of a left wing in the party. At the same time the main obstacle to effective working-class and democratic unity is right-wing social democracy and anti-communism. This calls for an intensified struggle on the ideological front against right-wing social democracy, as well as against Trotskyism, Maoism, right and 'left' revisionism and opportunism.

The defeat of state-monopoly capitalism demands unity of the working class and all democratic forces in a new political alliance. The Communist Party works for a democratic, anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist alliance, based on the working class, the national and democratic forces in French Canada, the farmers, the middle strata, the non-monopolist bourgeoisie, all those affected by monopoly policies.

In Canada today the situation can be characterized as one in which there is a growing class and political consciousness permeating the working-class movement. This is clearly indicated by a rapidly growing strike movement, particularly in the public services, and extending into areas of highly skilled professional employees in industry, communications, transport.

In almost every one of these struggles the workers are confronted by the power of the state, the monopolies, the capitalist politicians, the bourgeois mass media, making it more and more a political struggle. To an ever increasing extent the workers are becoming aware of the worldwide impact of socialism and deeper meaning of the struggle between reformist and revolutionary policies in the trade union and working-class movement.

Along with this is the difference between the position of the USA as the foremost imperialist power and Canada as a secondary imperialist power. The U.S. monopolies' dominant position in the Canadian economy has sparked significant movements among the people for Canadian independence. This finds a reflection in the trade union movement as well.

While the Meany leadership in the AFL-CIO gives all-out support to U.S. imperialism, calls for continuation of the cold war and strongly campaigns against détente, the CLC has taken a much different position on foreign policy, including détente. The Meany leadership openly supports imperialist policies, the corporate exploitation of

the working class, and the parties of monopoly. The Canadian trade union movement has for some time past engaged in independent political action by actively involving itself in the creation of the NDP through which it seeks to advance some of labor's political aims.

The special conditions facing U.S. and Canadian workers arise from the operations of the U.S.-based multinational corporations. There is every reason for agreement on coordinated efforts in bargaining and other relations with the corporations, for the exchange of ideas and information, and for mutual assistance in struggles involving the multinational corporations.

Canadian organized workers are now expressing more than at any time their desire and demand for new relations based on equality and fraternity with the U.S. trade union movement. This demand arises at a time when Canada has come under intense and growing economic and political pressure from the U.S. to bail out U.S. imperialism, which seeks to extricate itself from deepening crisis at the expense of the American workers and the workers of other countries. U.S. ownership and control of the commanding heights of the Canadian economy places Canada in a particularly vulnerable position.

Objective developments in the capitalist world today tend to reduce the ground for class collaboration advocated by social reformists. The social base of reformism is shrinking. Reformist trade union leaders are increasingly unable to contain the mass pressure from below for unity and mass struggles. In this situation it becomes possible to compel reformist union leaders to abandon their anti-communist stance and to cooperate with progressive unions and other forces of the left, united around a realistic and practical program for advance.

In 1968, the Canadian Labour Congress became compelled to delete the anti-communist clause from its constitution. Two years later, in 1970, the CLC Convention was faced with an avalanche of resolutions from its local unions, demanding that it act to unite the house of labor. At the same time the delegates demanded more Canadian autonomy as the basis for independent Canadian management of the affairs of the Canadian members of international unions. As a result the Convention of that year adopted a statement which set out modest guidelines on limited autonomy for all its affiliates, which U.S.-based unions later ignored or refused to act on.

By 1972, when the Ninth Biennial Convention of the CLC convened in Ottawa, a Common Front of three central labor organizations in French Canada had just come through a general strike of 210,000 public and para-public employees to obtain a higher minimum wage. A great debate ensued on the issue of trade union unity. The result of this debate was the adoption of a resolution instructing the incoming Executive Council to work toward and to consummate, if

possible, the bringing into affiliation of all legitimate and bona fide unions in Canada that are prepared to accept the aims, principles and Constitution of the Canadian Labour Congress.

The adoption of this resolution represented a rather significant turn in policy. Several months later, two large unions under progressive leadership that had been expelled in the cold war drive against Communists and progressives were admitted back into the house of labor by the Executive Council of the CLC.

By the time the 10th Constitutional Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress opened in May 1974, it became clear that a quarter century of struggle by the Communist Party against cold war, discrimination, splits and victimization of Communists and other left and progressive forces, and for working-class and democratic unity had reached a new and higher level.* While it would be wrong to overestimate the changes recorded in terms of new trends emerging at this particular convention, it would be even a bigger mistake to overlook and underestimate a process of change already well advanced, and which will continue to advance.

It is no exaggeration to point out that the dominant influence, the predominant ideas influencing the debates at this convention were those of the genuine left political spectrum, and particularly of the Communists. These ideas permeated the thinking of the great majority of so-called reform-minded delegates. In fact, there emerged at this convention, albeit in embryonic form as yet, a coalition of those reform-minded and leftward-moving forces who seek: a new anti-monopoly economic policy; a policy of peaceful coexistence in international affairs; an independent sovereign and united trade union movement in Canada; equality of rights between the English-speaking majority and the French-speaking minority within Canadian Confederation; more militant policies in the struggle for democratic reforms and against the corporate capitalist state and monopoly structure, and for a more articulate leadership to advance toward these goals.

Of the nearly 2,500 delegates in this the largest convention ever of the CLC, the great majority came from the ranks of local unions and labor councils throughout Canada.

The convention called for separate Canadian affiliation to global

*In the summer of 1973, the Communist Party issued a statement declaring that if the AFL Meany-Lovestone leadership and international union officers refuse to cooperate, and oppose the legitimate aim of Canadian labor, the 1974 Canadian Labour Congress Convention should adopt such measures as are required to ensure that labor in Canada become a powerful and united force in the struggle for the genuine independence of Canada, for progressive economic and foreign policies, for an end to monopoly rule. Over 100,000 copies of this statement were distributed on Labour Day of that year.

trade union organizations, and the freedom of Canadian branches (of U.S. unions in Canada) to participate fully in the economic, social and political life of Canada. In addition to these, the convention provided for enforcement by granting the authority to suspend an affiliate for non-compliance.

For the first time in Canadian history, the English-speaking majority of delegates at a labor convention recognized the problems facing the French-speaking minority within Canadian Confederation. CLC President Donald MacDonald declared: 'We must, with the leadership in Québec, seek ways and means of adapting and coordinating the implementation of Congress policy in that province in such a manner as to ensure the best interests and welfare of Québec workers are safeguarded, and unity and solidarity of the Canadian labor movement as a whole is neither jeopardized nor destroyed.'

While the economic policy statement adopted by the convention leaves much to be desired in terms of specific pressure on the government by the trade unions, on international affairs it adopted what could be described as a policy of peaceful coexistence, in that it focused on disarmament and the struggle for world peace 'as the central tasks of this generation.'

A process of transition toward a new structure, more militant policies and a reform-oriented leadership has begun in the Canadian Labour Congress. On Political action the CLC still confines its political activities to electoral support for social democracy. But new trends toward more extra-parliamentary activities are emerging along with the militant and unprecedented strike movement on economic issues.

There are good reasons to think that this process will continue toward more far-reaching changes in the direction of working-class and democratic unity, for Canadian independence, peace and a stronger role for Canadian labor in international affairs.

Faith in victory

Interview with Oliver Tambo, Acting President of African National Congress of South Africa (ANC).

In face of the isolation and revolutionary offensive against the racist regimes in Southern Africa, the last bastions of colonialism and racism, Pretoria is employing the policy of so-called dialogue. What are the substance and aims of this policy?

The dialogue policy is a clever tactical move of the South African regime to shore up its racist order and get out of isolation in the world and, especially, on our continent. The South African racists are offering economic and financial aid to get the African states to help preserve the pillars of the existing regime and to cut off support for the struggle of the Zimbabwe and Namibian peoples.

The 'dialogue' strategy was first put into motion in the mid-60s through secret diplomatic channels. But the progressive forces in Africa and the rest of the world were quick to grasp and expose the purpose of this racist maneuver. The avalanche of public protests compelled certain African leaders to reject 'dialogue.'

The collapse of the Portuguese colonies and the weakening of Ian Smith's racist regime in Southern Rhodesia created a drastically different situation in the south of the continent. This was a mighty spur for the liberation movement in South Africa and has aggravated the crisis of its social structure. So, in addition to the almost complete external isolation, the regime was confronted with an explosive situation at home.

In the autumn of 1974 the regime again approached the African states with its offer of a 'dialogue,' and said it was prepared to effect meaningful changes in South Africa. Vorster even said that in the course of six months the world would be surprised to see what had been achieved. This was a clever, but perfidious move. Following the downfall of the fascist regime in Portugal the tide was moving so fast in the south of our continent that the rulers in Pretoria were gasping for breath. They needed time to rally their forces. Time was what they hoped to gain by their 'dialogue' tactic.

Hence, Vorster set out on his African tour with a carefully selected itinerary. His main concern was to create the impression that the problems of the Africans in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia could be settled by 'peaceful means.' If his blandishments had fallen on willing ears, he would have succeeded in splitting the united front

of African states and weakened their support of the national-liberation movement in the south of Africa.

The scheme could have succeeded. There are still people on our continent who entertain the illusion that a solution in South Africa can be found through cooperation between the racist regime, on the one hand, and Zimbabwe and Namibia, on the other. There are still people who mistake insignificant concessions that leave the pillars of the racist regime intact for a revision of colonial policy against the black population. There are still people who think that the big changes in Africa and elsewhere in the world have altered the outlook of the rulers in Pretoria, that Vorster has begun to think and act in terms of 'détente.' But all the evidence points to the contrary. It is over a year (not the promised six months) since Vorster's many loud declarations, yet no visible change can be discerned in the socio-economic situation of the African, Colored and Indian people.

Progressive democratic Africa is hitting back at conciliation. This is evidenced by the main documents adopted by the special session of the OAU Council of Ministers in Dar es Salaam in April 1975. The Dar es Salaam Declaration on South Africa,* and the resolutions on Namibia and Zimbabwe, show that Vorster's scheme of splitting the anti-racist front of OAU countries has failed and the struggle for the earliest complete elimination of the last bastions of racism and colonialism in Africa is picking up monentum.

The session reaffirmed the OAU position toward the South African regime. It is for isolating the racists as completely as possible in the political, economic and cultural domains: No trade of any sort, no diplomatic relations of any sort! The Dar es Salaam Declaration is a hard-hitting document against the 'dialogue' strategy, and has strengthened African solidarity against the racist regimes in South Africa and Zimbabwe.

The danger of 'dialogue' is not over. The regime is following divide-and-rule tactics and making 'individual' overtures toward the countries of the continent, working for separate relations in an effort to destroy the united anti-racist front. And one must admit with deep regret that there have been cases when the anti-racist, anti-fascist solidarity of African states was breached.

We do our best to keep contact with all African states and brief them on the implications of the maneuvers of the South African regime.

What has been the effect of the collapse of Portuguese colonialism, particularly of Mozambique independence, on the national-liberation struggle in Southern Africa?

*Approved by the 12th OAU Assembly of heads of state and government (July-August 1975). — *Ed.*

The victory of the people of Mozambique, we hold, marks an abrupt turn in the history of Southern Africa. It has a direct bearing on the stiffening of the attitude of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland toward Pretoria policy. They have been strengthened by their association with the OAU. Their governments, though still heavily dependent on South Africa economically and politically, have begun to act more independently. It is beginning to sink in that independence can be enduring only if all Africa gains her freedom.

The impact of Mozambique independence on the national-liberation movements in the south of Africa has been tremendous. It has galvanized their ranks, and has strengthened their mutual ties. The times are gone when the future looked uncertain if not altogether dark. It had been sheer courage and an indomitable sense of justice that drove the freedom fighters in the past. Now, with the effective results of the national-liberation struggle before our eyes, it has become easier to fight. This is why we are united in our desire to see FRELIMO succeed in the reconstruction of Mozambique, united in our desire to see Zimbabwe liberated and majority rule prevail, and united in our knowledge that the people of Namibia will soon be free and independent.

The Vorster regime is unhappy over the victory in Mozambique. True, Pretoria's 'dialogue' line has been that it has no objections to an African government in Mozambique and is prepared to have good-neighbor relations with it and all other African states on the borders of South Africa. It expressed the wish and readiness to give Mozambique financial aid, technical know-how, and food.

But one would have to be very short-sighted to believe in the good will and sincerity of the regime. Vorster and his regime must be very unhappy about FRELIMO's home and foreign policy, the basic ideology of FRELIMO, and unhappy also about the influence of the victory of the Mozambique people on the oppressed people of South Africa.

The progressive changes on the continent are an inspiration for the revolutionary forces in South Africa, and have redoubled their faith in final victory. However militarily powerful the racist regime may be, however numerous its imperialist supporters, it cannot avoid defeat. But the revolutionaries in our country know that victory does not come about by itself. They are prepared for the grimmest of trials. Vietnam has shown what a people can do, what sacrifices it can make. The masses of our people, too, are determined to win liberation.

What new features have appeared in the home policy of the South African regime?

The biggest source of danger for our people is the fiendish policy of

separate development in the bantustans.* Apartheid has this new twist: frontiers are being thrown up not only between 'whites,' 'coloreds' and 'blacks,' but also between the African ethnic groups. The racists are trying to divide our people tribally and lead them up a blind alley through their agents.

The bantustans are small scattered enclaves, poor, barren, politically, economically and socially weak, encircled by the white state and wholly dependent on it. They are reservoirs of cheap labor. Even if they should be declared independent some day, it will be independence in name only, and, certainly, the racists will drive these so-called states against each other in the tradition of the divide-and-rule policy. So it is only a new signboard covering up efforts to maintain the racial and social status quo.

The racists are now trying to build up and encourage a so-called middle class. For a long time there had been no bourgeois class, no middle class worth speaking about among the black population in South Africa. The ruling class had artificially held up the birth and growth of capitalist elements in African society. Now, it has changed its tactics and is stimulating the process (again, artificially). This will produce a 'black' bourgeoisie which is expected to defend the system out of self-interest.

The rulers in Pretoria hope to save the regime through feverish militarization. Their intention to acquire nuclear arms is a particular cause for alarm. It will be recalled that they have not signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, are mining large quantities of uranium ore and have the technology for its enrichment. That may enable them to make atomic weapons. There is evidence, too, that they are cooperating with military-industrial circles in the capitalist world, particularly the FRG and Brazil, in building an atomic industry.

There is some talk of late that the Pentagon will replace the British in controlling the naval base in Simonstown. It is an old ploy of the South African regime to say that South Africa is important for imperialism's global strategy. Vorster keeps reminding the Western powers, which have a stake in what they call stability on the African continent, that they are committed to supporting and protecting South Africa and its regime.

Have you something to say about the objectives and tasks of the African National Congress at present?

It is important that world opinion should understand the true nature of the people's movement in our country. Some people are still inclined to think that the struggle of the black population is a struggle

*See Y. Dadoo, 'The Crisis of Apartheid,' *WMR*, Feb. 1975.

for civil rights. But this obscures the national-liberative character of our movement.

Perhaps this is partly due to the over-emphasis at certain times on the struggle against apartheid, instead of the struggle against the entire system of national and class oppression, and partly to the fact that the struggle is being fought in a so-called sovereign state, for 'sovereign' is what the racists pretend it to be. When independent Africa and the whole world demand an end to this disgraceful and barbarous system, the Pretoria rulers upholding apartheid arrogantly maintain that this is 'interference' in their sovereign, internal affairs.

The ANC declares that our movement is a national-liberation movement, that it is fighting not simply for civil rights, but for the overthrow of the colonial regime and that it is committed to struggle for the seizure of power by the masses of the people. Everybody should know that after Britain turned over power to the white minority in 1910, and after the seizure of power by Ian Smith and his clique in Zimbabwe in 1965, the African peoples in the two countries remained colonialized.

As for the 'sovereign' status of South Africa, it is pure fiction. The entire state machinery, the judiciary, armed forces and all other government agencies are filled with whites, who are less than 20 per cent of the population. Those who call it sovereign, forget the country's real owners — the indigenous population. All claims to sovereignty and independence have no grounds in the truth. Our land will not acquire sovereignty and independence until the masses of the people take power. This is what the people are fighting for, and why they are making untold sacrifices.

The ANC has never in principle renounced a negotiated solution of the liberation struggle, but in South Africa such a solution has proved impossible. If the regime had really and honestly wished to negotiate, it would have met with serious people, outstanding men who have looked death in the eye and have suffered imprisonment, men who are articulate and profound in their thinking, and who hold realistic views. But the years passed, the regime became only more brutal and inhuman, and evinced no sign of wanting to negotiate.

The upswing of the popular movement in recent years has forced the hand of the racist rulers, has made them maneuver. The reforms which they paraded as the beginning of a 'dialogue' concerned only the marginal areas of the way of life and of the system. These have been negligible reforms if looked at from the standpoint of a real reconstruction of our society. And even so the slightest 'relaxation' of the regime was won by the people at very high cost. Yet it is a source of satisfaction that the people's movement in South Africa has compelled the racists to go on the defensive. It is clear that the 'dialogue'

strategy demonstrates not the strength of the racist regime, but its weakness.

Our people, the ANC which expresses their will and defends their interests, have learned from many years of struggle and sacrifice that peaceful efforts to alter the existing system are futile, that 'dialogues' will not bring down the racist regime, that freedom is not begged but conquered.

The enemy has taken stock of our movement's determination and of the deadly peril for it of the people's desire to take up arms and fight for their freedom. But he has drawn the wrong conclusions and hopes that by abandoning such troublesome particulars as 'petty apartheid' (social and physical segregation) he might by means of dialogue preserve the pillars of the present order. There is not the slightest hint of any serious intention on the part of the Pretoria rulers to effect any drastic changes, and none can be expected in the foreseeable future.

This is why the ANC has decided to raise the liberation movement to a new and higher level. Its strategic objective is to mobilize the masses of the people for seizure of power. The movement has entered the stage of armed struggle. This is in conformance with the wishes and demands of our people.

A special part in the battle for freedom belongs to the African working class. It is the main productive force and the most powerful lever of our struggle. Its potential is tremendous, and once this potential is brought into motion the regime is bound to collapse.

The workers' organization, political consciousness and militancy are growing. The workers are beginning to understand that oppression and exploitation and labor-capital relations will continue as long as the working class is deprived of political power. And their present fight for their class interests is merging with the general rising tide of the national-liberation struggle. The ANC has set out to organize and mobilize the workers, to draw them into the trade unions, to frustrate the scheming of the class enemy, who wants to place leaders obedient to the authorities in the workers' organizations. And success in our efforts is the key to the success of the national-liberation movement. Struggle for the workers' economic interests is part and parcel of the struggle for the seizure of political power.

The support of progressive forces in the rest of the world, material aid to South Africa's freedom fighters, and actions ensuring the international isolation of racism, are also a most important factor of success in the struggle for liberation.

Let the facts speak

Editor
World Marxist Review

A while ago I came across an item in the *International Herald Tribune*, the U.S. paper circulated in Europe, about the concluding phase of World War II and the role of the chief anti-Hitler powers. The subject has also been dealt with in the Austrian press.

The item came as a surprise. The *IHT* said that the USSR was using the anniversary of victory over militarist Japan to usurp the laurels of the victor. This is what it wrote: 'The Soviet Union, which lavished praise upon itself in the spring on the 30th anniversary of the defeat of Nazi Germany, is now taking credit as well for the defeat of imperialist Japan.' The author says that U.S. diplomats expressed surprise at this 'lavish praise,' since the Soviet Union entered the war against Japan after the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. The article also deals with the situation in China during the defeat of the Japanese Kwantung army in Manchuria, and in this context questions the value of Soviet military assistance to China.

I lived through the war and am still moved by what it has meant for all of us. I may be in error, but it seems to me that some of the pronouncements, like the one in *IHT*, are in crying contradiction to what was said at the time.

Since your journal has carried several articles on the '30th anniversary of victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism, I would appreciate your comments on the questions raised here.

Kurt Weiss
Vienna, Austria

We asked Mongolian historian B. Lhamsuren to answer reader Weiss' question.

The events of the concluding period of World War II are generally known, no matter what interpretation is put on them by those who would question the decisive contribution of the Soviet people and their armed forces in defeating militarist Japan and bringing the war to an end. The historian deals with facts, and the facts are as follows.

By the summer of 1945, when the Japanese army maintained an unbroken battlefront from Peking to Singapore, the U.S. and Britain had about 550,000 ground troops in the Pacific. Even allowing for naval superiority, the Anglo-American forces could not quickly break

Japanese resistance and inflict a decisive defeat. In fact, the Anglo-American command reckoned that victory over Japan would cost about one million lives[1] and could be achieved in 1946-47, if not later.[2]

When it launched military operations against Japan, the Soviet Army had more than 1,500,000 seasoned troops concentrated on three fronts, the Trans-Baikal, and the First and Second Far Eastern, stretching over 5,000 km. Besides, there was the Soviet Pacific Fleet, the Amur River Flotilla and impressive air support. Together, this gave the Soviet armed forces superiority over the enemy from the very first days of the offensive and predetermined the course of military operations. The Soviet Army was faced by Japan's main force, the elite Kwantung Army of about one million men,[3] up to two-thirds of all the tanks and more than half of all the artillery of the Japanese ground forces. In less than a month, the Soviet Army, operating in conjunction with units of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Army, routed the Kwantung Army, the troops of the Japanese puppet state of Manchoukuo and of Inner Mongolia. Japanese casualties were in the neighborhood of 700,000. 'The Soviet Union's entry into the war,' Japanese Prime Minister Suzuki stated shortly after military operations in Manchuria began, 'places us in an absolutely hopeless position.'[4] And this is the opinion of U.S. General Chennault, the U.S. Air Commander in China: 'The Soviet Union's entry into the war against Japan was the decisive factor in accelerating the end of the war in the Pacific, and this would have been so even if the atom bomb were not used.'[5]

Now, some observations on the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They were acts of barbarism and had no military justification. They took the lives of more than 400,000 civilians, but did not alter the balance of strength, for the main Japanese army, which at that period numbered about seven million, was in no way affected. Japan continued the war and, as Churchill wrote in his memoirs: 'It would be a mistake to suppose that the fate of Japan was settled by the atomic bomb.'[6] The story about the exceptional part the U.S. armed forces played in defeating Japan was meant to justify America's 'special mission' in the Far East. It also served as a cover for the U.S. aggression against the people of Korea and Vietnam, and is now being used to justify the U.S. armed presence in the Far East.

The Peking leadership has started a hopeless controversy with history. An article in the *People's Daily*, titled '30th Anniversary of the War of Resistance to the Japanese Invaders,' declares — of all things — that China, relying on her 'own forces,' played the 'decisive role in defeating Japanese fascism.'[7]

Again let us turn to the facts. When the USSR entered the war against Japan, the Chinese People's Liberation Army was in a very

difficult position. By early August 1945 the Japanese had concentrated large forces and surrounded the Eighth Army, the backbone of the PLA, at Pingchuan. Only the swift advance of the Soviet 17th Trans-Baikal Army saved the Chinese. The Eighth Army Commander, General Chao Weng-tsinh, was to write later: 'we found ourselves in an exceptionally difficult situation. The Red Army saved us from defeat and we are especially grateful to it.'[8]

The Soviet Army liberated more than 1.3 million sq. km. of Chinese territory, including the country's most developed area, with a population of over 40 million. All the materiel and ammunition captured from the Japanese was turned over to the People's Liberation Army. And this was attended by important economic, political and diplomatic assistance, which created favorable conditions for victory of the people's revolution.

These, then, are some of the facts concerning the Soviet contribution to eliminating the last seat of World War II. They convincingly expose the lies now being spread by bourgeois and Maoist propaganda.

B. Lhamsuren
D.Sc. (Hist)

1. S. Morison, *American Contributions to the Strategy of World War II*. London, 1958, p. 71.
2. V. Israelian and L. Kutakov. *Aggressor Diplomacy*. Moscow, 1967, p. 395.
3. *History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People, 1941-45*, Moscow, 1963, Vol. 5, p. 548.
4. *A History of Modern Japan*. Moscow, 1955, p. 264. (Translation from the Japanese)
5. *The New York Times*, August 15, 1945.
6. Winston Churchill, *The Second World War*, Vol. 6, 'Triumph and Tragedy.' Boston-Cambridge, 1953, p. 646.
7. *People's Daily*. September 3, 1975.
8. *Liberation Mission of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Second World War*. (Ed., A. Grechko). Moscow, Politizdat, 1974, p. 425.



Workers' class consciousness: levels and trends

Josef Schleifstein
Director, Institute of
Marxist Studies,
Frankfurt am Main

Johannes H. von Heiseler
Staff member of the Institute

Moulding and fostering the workers' class consciousness is an important prerequisite of success for the progressive forces of Federal Germany. In line with Leninist principles, the German Communist Party makes a special effort to raise awareness of the experience gained by the workers in social and political struggles to the level of developed political consciousness. In seeking greater ideological and political influence over the masses, Marxist parties pay close attention to problems of the working people's social thinking and class consciousness. These problems crop up constantly in controversies between Marxist and ideologists of the bourgeoisie and right- or 'left'-wing opportunism.

To take realistic stock of the state of the West German workers' class consciousness and the economic, political and ideological conditions for its formation and development, we must, first of all, define the concept of class consciousness. This will enable us to counter idealist and mechanistic views and more fully reveal the role of the subjective factor.

In accordance with the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, when gauging the degree of the workers' class consciousness we must take into account its structure and the interaction of spontaneous and conscious, psychological and ideological components. It is therefore wrong to mechanistically reduce class consciousness to notions spontaneously conceived by the workers in struggle (by representing it, for example, as 'average consciousness') or to deny that the requirements and aspirations of the masses play a definite part in the evolution of their thinking.

The social consciousness and mentality of classes and strata are rooted in their material being, the economic basis of society. They are also conditioned by the interconnection of ideological spheres, superstructural political relations and the complex ideological legacy of past epochs.

The economic and political condition of the working class under capitalism, living conditions generally, the contradictions and class antagonisms of capitalist society with its inherent maladies and injustice, its economic, political, ideological and moral crises and upheavals, its inability to solve pressing social problems, all give rise to opposition and anti-capitalist views and tendencies among the workers. On the other hand, the workers' class consciousness is influenced by bourgeois ideology owing to their condition under capitalism. It does not automatically and immediately encompass every social interconnection, the fundamental class contradiction or the historically transient nature of capitalism. As a result, the spontaneously developing class consciousness, including elementary forms of opposition, remains within the bounds of bourgeois ideology.

An understanding of the class interests of the working class and its ultimate goals does not come to all the workers at the same time and of itself. Hence the vast importance of the subjective factor, first of all of the Marxist party of the working class, which, unlike the rest of the class, already possesses a clear knowledge of the conditions, trends and perspectives of the working-class movement. The class-conscious forces operating among the workers, above all the Marxist party, can foster the workers' class consciousness, organization and militancy by building on their anti-capitalist aspirations and their spontaneous attraction to socialism.

Having analyzed objective difficulties and obstacles to the growth of class consciousness which stem from the social condition of the working class under capitalism and from the methods used by capitalist society to disguise the various forms of exploitation and domination, Lenin described the elementary forms of working-class consciousness that develop spontaneously as trade unionism, or trade union consciousness, and as an 'embryonic form' of class consciousness. 'The "spontaneous element," in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form*,' he wrote (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 5, p. 374).

We must distinguish between these 'embryonic forms' of consciousness and developed class consciousness, which implies awareness of the fundamental interests of the working class. Developed class consciousness or political consciousness, was defined by Marx as the consciousness of 'a class for itself.' It implies awareness of the class contradiction between labor and capital, its bearing

on society as a whole, the need for political class struggle, and the fact that the working class can free itself only by winning political power and eliminating the capitalist system. Needless to say, developed working-class consciousness today connotes awareness of the need for solidarity with the socialist countries, where the working class has already won political power. Consequently, it implies acceptance and assimilation of scientific socialism.

Let us examine in this light the level and development trends of the class consciousness of West Germany's workers today. A seminar on class structure and class consciousness in the FRG held by our Institute in 1973 rejected the view that growing class consciousness is a direct product of the structural and technological conditions of labor. There was also criticism of the opinion that the workers' social condition is the only factor in the level and development trends of their consciousness. This would make it difficult to understand the enormous difference in the class consciousness of diverse contingents of the working class and the uneven development of the working-class movement in different capitalist countries.

The seminar stressed that only in the long term do social and economic conditions — the workers' place in the production process, their social standing, the living and working conditions — begin to play a decisive part in forming the class consciousness. Also important are political and ideological prerequisites, such as the degree of relative political stability in the capitalist country concerned and the related ability to maneuver in capitalist domination; the scope of the workers' class struggle; the alignment of class forces in the recent past and at present; the influence of bourgeois ideology in its various forms and varieties, including the degree of the workers' receptiveness to the ideology of 'social partnership' and social reformism; the strength of the trade unions, their effort in upholding class interests and their role in fostering the working people's militancy; the role of the Marxist forces, especially of the Communist party, in the working-class movement, and the degree of their organizational and ideological influence on the working class.*

It is well known how immense a part the restoration of monopoly, begun immediately after the defeat of German fascism, played in shaping the class consciousness of Federal Germany's workers (the Federation of [West] German Trade Unions officially described the process as re-establishing property and power relations of the past). The cold war and anti-communism elevated to the rank of official doctrine; fierce revanchist and chauvinist propaganda against the Soviet Union, the GDR and other socialist countries; the illusion of

*See *Klassenstruktur and Klassenbewusstsein in der BRD*. Verlag Marxistische Blätter, Frankfurt/Main, 1974.

'social partnership' between labor and a 'transformed' capitalism, coupled with the 'economic miracle' and a favorable economic situation over a relatively long period; the policy of the right-wing Social-Democratic leaders, who fully committed themselves to support state-monopoly capitalism and combat every manifestation of working-class unity and solidarity; slander, outlawing and persecution of the Communist Party — all this inevitably confused large sections of the working class and held up the growth of its class consciousness. Bourgeois ideologists and politicians declared the class struggle over and triumphantly announced the 'end' of the working class. They described the FRG as a model 'middle-class society.' The ideology of 'social partnership' and anti-communism struck deep root among the workers as well.

However, the bourgeoisie proved unable, even in a period so difficult for the movement, to erase from the consciousness of the working class the elementary experience provided by its actual class condition. Empirically, bourgeois sociologists realized that workers in West Germany's major enterprises continued to regard society as split into 'upper strata,' or capitalists, and 'lower strata,' or workers. They had to admit that the workers were anything but certain of their jobs and, indeed, lived in constant dread of unemployment. The working class retained some elements of awareness of its social condition even in those years. However, these elements were not interconnected; the workers were unable to form a comprehensive picture of the future. Many workers held that conditions would not be altered, or doubted the ability of their class to alter them.

The situation began to change, if very slowly and unevenly, about the mid-60s. This was due primarily to the end of the favorable postwar situation, the increasing contradictions of the state-monopoly system, the structural crisis in mining, the miscarriage of the Bonn 'policy from strength' toward the GDR, and other objective developments.

The 1966-67 crisis began to dispel the illusion — entertained by numerous workers — that contemporary capitalism can assure full employment and crisis-free development over a long period. It led to 700,000 layoffs, short-time working and deterioration of the workers' standard of living. The crisis did not immediately produce an upsurge in working-class action. Not until the employers took advantage of it to launch an all-out offensive on the workers' rights, to cut wages and nullify the social gains formalized in collective agreements, did a wave of defensive strikes sweep the country. From the spring of 1967 to the spring of 1968, there were over 200 strikes of this nature in the metalworking industry. Ruhr miners took action to protest the closing

of pits. Both the miners and the metalworkers advanced political slogans.

The 'social partnership' illusions were dimmed still more considerably by the September 1969 strikes in steel, metalworking and mining, which involved 140,000 workers of 69 enterprises. They were not officially called by the appropriate trade union authorities (who are legally obliged 'to keep the peace' for the time of the wage agreements), but by the workers themselves. Through their system of manipulating public opinion, the capitalists promptly called them 'wildcat,' and the trade union leaders 'unofficial' strikes (though they were, as a rule, organized).

The September 1969 actions served notice of far-reaching changes in the thinking of a section of the working class, of its unity and discipline. They were evidence of more vigorous forms of trade union consciousness and the workers' greater willingness to fight for elementary economic demands — higher wages and better working conditions. Among other things, the workers employed a form of struggle new for the FRG: occupation of factory premises.

Sociological studies of the September 1969 strikes by our Institute established that workers conceive the class contradiction in society mainly at enterprise level, as a contradiction between the wage-earners' interests and those of the factory owner. Their discontent is aroused by the widening gap between profits and wages, and by administrative abuses. It does not extend beyond the enterprise to general social problems unless these are visibly connected with the workers' own needs. By their adversary they mean the 'factory owner' or 'factory owners.'* There is no evidence yet of anything more than embryonic forms of class consciousness among the vast majority of strikers in the FRG. The same workers who elect their Communist mates to production councils or to represent them in negotiations at enterprise level during strikes, do not vote for Communist candidates, often their workmates, in political elections.

All the same, the changes witnessed in the workers' consciousness during the militant actions in 1969, are not to be underestimated. To begin with, the dominant classes had boasted for years that the FRG was a capitalist land with 'the least number of strikes.' Not surprisingly, therefore, the bourgeois press traced the strikes to 'French,' 'English' or some other influence — to anything but the West German conditions. Furthermore, the strikes helped workers to see their ability for action at enterprise level and were a start in overcoming years of passiveness. This again confirmed Lenin's thought that workers learn first and foremost from their own experience, and that

*See *Die Septemberstreiks 1969*. Beiträge der IMSF I, Frankfurt/Main, 1969.

experience acquired in struggle raises the morale of the working class. The strikes also showed that the workers were most successful where Communists and Left Social Democrats had the greatest influence in the unions and acted in unity.

The awakening of the class consciousness continued over the years, though the trend was not always upward. The advance was swiftest in the iron-and-steel and metalworking centers. The unions estimate that in the metalworking industry some 700,000 took part in strikes and other wage actions in 1970. The first big strike in 40 years in the chemical industry — a center of monopoly power — occurred in 1971, with strikers numbering 150,000. This was symptomatic, since it was the chemical moguls who had spoken loudest of 'social partnership.' Typical of the strikes was the active involvement of young workers and apprentices.

The special feature of the class battles of 1972 and the summer of 1973 was the participation of workers from other fields, especially small and medium-sized enterprises. The involvement of previously passive segments of the working class, coupled with their more numerous demands, shows that their consciousness is levelling out with that of workers in the big industries. Another point is the high degree of involvement of working women. And, last but not least, a prominent part in the 1973 battles was played (for the first time on such a scale) by guest workers.

The metalworkers' autumn 1973 strikes in Baden-Württemberg showed that the working class will fight not only for wage increases, but also for other improvements in their conditions. They demanded paid breaks, an end to narrow specialization on conveyers, guaranteed wages and job protection for aging workers, and minimum earnings for piece workers. In early 1974 the same demands were made by strikers in the woodworking and synthetics industries.

The September 1969 class battles had been evidence of a regeneration of trade union consciousness among FRG workers usually regarded as belonging to the basic detachments of the working class, whereas those of the summer of 1973 and the strikes in the community services in 1974 evidenced its evolution among other categories.

We welcome the progress in the workers' class consciousness, but are aware of the limitations of trade-union thinking. Our effort is centered on raising the workers to the level of scientific socialism. Moulding the workers' class consciousness, the GCP takes into account the role, needs and aspirations of the masses. And developments have proved us right. As before, struggle for immediate social and economic needs — slurred by neo-reformists and ultra-leftists as 'outdated' and purely 'quantitative' — helps the masses to apprehend their place in society and spurs more definitive action. The major

class battles in capitalist countries with a more developed working-class movement show that social-economic demands are the starting point for the evolution of the class consciousness.

Along with actions for social and economic demands, the consciousness of a definitive section of workers is stimulated by acts of a political nature, such as the movement against 'emergency legislation,' for solidarity with Vietnam, and in support of the Moscow and Warsaw treaties. It will be recalled, however, that active struggle against 'emergency legislation' and Bundeswehr remilitarization — though it did involve the greatest number of workers on record — was fought mainly by the active trade union nucleus. All the same, political movements of this type contain vast possibilities. This was confirmed by the big demonstration on the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism.

A word about the impact on the social-political consciousness of FRG working people of the present crisis — the growing unemployment, part-time working, and the inflation. The crisis phenomena might be said to impede the spread of class consciousness. They generate a conciliatory mood, uncertainty and insecurity, and dampen solidarity. The workers are less willing to advance new demands, and will take collective action only, as a rule, when pushed to defend already conquered ground. Moreover, the unions do not always fully use the workers' readiness for action. They have been remiss in building up the combat ability of the working class.

And yet there are signs that the political and ideological struggle is becoming more acute in the new phase of the general crisis of capitalism. This is evidenced, in particular, by the clearer understanding of the essence of capitalism by the younger generation of workers. The hardships of the working youth, the deficient system of occupational training, reductions in the number of admitted apprentices and a higher rate of unemployment among the youth than in the country as a whole — young workers are not taking this lightly. On the contrary, youth involvement in demonstrations and other actions has grown in recent months.

What are the main obstacles to more rapid growth of the class consciousness of workers in the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism in the FRG? There is a number of reasons why the clearer understanding of social problems of immediate concern to workers has not yet brought about any substantial change in their political attitudes. To begin with, there are the various efforts of the dominant classes to 'integrate' the workers in the state-monopoly system. The state and the big concerns have a large range of means to 'bend' wage- and salary-earners to the existing system. This includes 'property

building,' 'profit-sharing,' bonuses scaled to dividends, offers of loans and housing, and the like.

Another obstacle is the tenacity of reformist notions about the nature of the bourgeois state. Many workers regard the state as a 'neutral mediator' between classes — an idea which the right-wing Social Democrats and social-reformist ideologues have been cultivating for dozens of years. Typically, workers who took part in the 'wildcat' strikes of September 1969 voted for the Social-Democratic Party in elections several weeks later.

Illusions about the 'neutralism' of the bourgeois state and of government policy — especially in the case of a Social-Democratic government — are linked with the anti-communist prejudices spread with characteristic unanimity by bourgeois and social-democratic ideology, and 'left' sectarian splinter groups. Though these prejudices no longer prevent joint aciton by Communists and Social Democrats at enterprise level and in the unions, they hinder the workers from apprehending the experience of struggle in enterprises and extending it beyond the enterprise to society as a whole. In particular, prejudices prevent many active and progressive workers from regarding the GCP as the representative of their political interests. Though they are highly critical of the Social-Democratic leaders in many areas, especially economic policy, they still feel tied to the SDP. The close bonds between the union functionaries and the Social Democrats, too, are to be reckoned with. And yet quite a few of the workers voting for the Social Democrats in elections, are beginning to understand that the SDP leaders represent the interests of the big capitalists, not the workers, and that the GCP is the only party in the country that is consistently anti-capitalist and socialist.

Study of the level and trends of the workers' class consciousness should help our political and ideological effort of introducing the ideas of scientific socialism into the working-class movement. This is of prime importance, we feel, not only for Marxists in our country. Acting on the commonalities in the development of the workers' outlook discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and relying on our realistic assessment of the workers' level of consciousness in our own country, the FRG Marxists hold that the principal task today is to raise the workers' consciousness, based on experience of shop-floor struggle, to a new level — a level where they begin to see that their basic class interests are incompatible with state-monopoly capitalism. To reach this goal, the subjective factor is indispensable. This means the GCP in particular, for it is the only organized force in the FRG with a Marxist program in which the vital interests of the working class are tied in with the anti-monopoly and socialist perspective. Past history shows that the formation of the working class as a class for

itself, that its consciousness, organization and militancy, depend largely on the strength and influence of the Communist Party. This is true of our country as well, where the growth of the GCP into a mass party accords with the interests of the working class, of all progressive forces.

Some aspects of capitalist development in Asian and African countries

A WMR seminar

The seminar was attended by members of the *World Marxist Review* Commission on Problems of the National-Liberation Struggle in Asian and African Countries: Naim Ashhab, CC member, Jordanian Communist Party; Ali Ashur, CC member, Communist Party of Israel; Idris Cox, representative of the Communist Party of Great Britain on *WMR*; Amath Dansoko, Political Bureau Member, African Independence Party of Senegal; Adel Haba, alternate CC member, Iraqi Communist Party; Jose Lava, CC member, Communist Party of the Philippines; Sarada Mitra, National Council member, Communist Party of India; Hamid Safari, alternate Executive Bureau member, People's Party of Iran; Agamemnon Stavrou, representative of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) on *WMR*; Satiadjaja Sudiman, member of the leadership, Communist Party of Indonesia; Omar Taiebi, member of the leadership, Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria. A brief review of the decision follows.

The principal objectives at the present stage of the national-liberation revolution in the former colonies and semi-colonies are economic independence and the overcoming of economic and social backwardness. But in their efforts to achieve these aims the countries must decide what direction social development will take. Some have chosen the socialist orientation, others have taken to the capitalist road.

How do the socio-economic structures of capitalism take shape in Asian and African countries?

What are the specifics of capitalist development?

What are the objective limitations of that development?

These were the questions discussed. Though the participants in the seminar, Commission chairman Sarada Mitra noted, did not claim to offer a complete picture of the social processes involved and debated the issues mainly on the basis of facts and figures pertaining to their respective countries.

Socio-economic structures of capitalism

Numerous facts were cited to show that capitalist industrialization has been proceeding on a relatively broad scale in Asian and African countries. Since the 60s more and more enterprises have been appearing in the manufacturing industries. Heavy industry has been expanding in the more developed countries. In India, for example, investments in heavy industry exceed 50 per cent of the total.

The national bourgeoisie is growing rapidly, capital is concentrating at a high rate, there are more and more millionaires, local monopolies have appeared and are consolidating in such countries as the Philippines, Pakistan and, especially, India. True, bourgeois economists like to point out that they are dwarfed by the giant monopolies of capitalist countries. The assets of Tata, India's leading monopoly family, for example, are only 1.58 per cent those of General Motors, and 1.52 per cent of Royal Dutch Shell. However, Mitra pointed out, the Indian monopolies must be weighed on the Indian scale. In 1967-68 the assets of 75 leading industrial concerns totalled 40,320,000,000 rupees, or more than half the private sector. The first 20 of those monopolies own 1,005 companies and control a great many more. Nevertheless, Mitra stressed, the national bourgeoisie remains a junior partner of foreign monopolies and its attempts to gain parity in the world capitalist economic system are in vain.

Hence the ambiguity of the national bourgeoisie's attitude. Largely the product of imperialism and dependent on it, Dansoko said, the national bourgeoisie seeks greater integration into the capitalist world system. At the same time, it would be wrong to follow left-wing extremists in underrating the contradictions that can and do arise between the national bourgeoisie and imperialism. The urge for greater independence, the struggle against foreign capital for economic control within the countries concerned, objectively drives the national bourgeoisie to nationalistic positions and keeps anti-imperialist sentiment alive among parts of it.

Capitalist relations are also spreading in agriculture. In Asia and a number of countries of North Africa the process stems from agrarian reforms which are wiping out or curtailing feudal and semi-feudal, usurious and primitive capitalist forms of exploitation in the countryside. The objective of reforms in the Philippines, India and Iran is

to raise agriculture by promoting capitalism. This was noted by Lava, Mitra, Safari and Haba.

In most countries the reforms have served to turn some of the former feudals into big capitalist-type landowners. In Iran some of them own 20,000-25,000 hectares of land. In India, former feudals still hold 64 million acres. The overwhelming majority of the poor peasants (81 per cent of the rural population in India) gained nothing from the reforms.[1] At the same time a narrow kulak stratum is being formed. Another form of emergence of a rural bourgeoisie, mentioned by Lava and Haba, is the establishment of capitalist cooperatives, many of them managed by former feudals. In Tropical Africa, Cox noted, the farmer bourgeoisie is thriving in areas that produce cash crops, and, in southern Nigeria, for example, it constitutes a substantial stratum.

It was noted, however, that the local bourgeoisie invest most willingly not in industry or agriculture but in quick-profit enterprises like housing construction, real estate and land speculation, commerce and automotive transport. This is the soil that breeds a bourgeoisie that is national in name, but really ignores the most acute needs of national development.

Simultaneously, there appears the bourgeoisie's antagonist — the working class. In countries where industrial development and capitalism in agriculture have progressed on a sufficiently broad scale the working class has increased noticeably and become a force to be reckoned with. In India, the industrial working class numbers more than 10 million, with agricultural laborers constituting about 30 per cent of the rural workforce.

But all the participants in the seminar agreed that the scale of capitalist changes in Afro-Asian socio-economic structures should not be overrated. Capitalism has been unable to overcome the multi-structural basis of the society or subordinate the precapitalist and small capitalist modes of production, which continue to involve the bulk of the people.

In India, Mitra said, 28 per cent of the industrial output comes from small industries which are simply incapable of making use of modern technological and economic knowhow, and moreover they are increasing faster than big industry. Cottage industries are widespread. In rural areas capitalist forms of farming involve only one-quarter to one-third of the cultivated areas, one-quarter is worked on a feudal or semi-feudal basis, and the remaining half or so are small-scale, precapitalist farms.

In Tropical Africa, said Dansoko, where there never has been big landownership, the way would appear to be open for the development

of capitalist relations. However, capitalist production is still restricted to small enclaves and islands of market farming.

Accordingly, the dominant strata in the social structures of Asian and African countries are those associated with precapitalist and small capitalist modes of production. The peasantry, which constitutes the majority of the population, remains the target of the fiercest exploitation. On its stand, on the ability of the working class and its party to establish a firm alliance with the peasantry, in large measure depends the course of the revolutionary process in the region.

The petty bourgeoisie is also a substantial stratum, and the participants in the seminar recalled the well-known Marxist-Leninist thesis that its position is politically dual. On the one hand, the petty bourgeois aspires to become a capitalist; small production, as Lenin pointed out, breeds capitalism daily and hourly. On the other, it is a class oppressed and exploited by local and foreign big capital. That is why the petty bourgeoisie in Asian and African countries possesses considerable anti-capitalist potentialities. The working class and its party must take them into account in formulating their strategy of class alliance.

Bonds of neo-colonialist dependence

To gain an idea of the growth of capitalism, Mitra stressed, it is not enough to note changes in feudal or other precapitalist relations and structures, but also essential to establish its character. It was noted that the most common feature of capitalist development in Afro-Asian countries is its dependent, subordinate character. That was the case in the colonial period, that is the case today, though, of course, the forms of that dependence have changed, sometimes radically.

In most countries capitalism did not have national roots, Dansoko said. It was brought in by colonialism and continues to be fostered from outside. In the traditional societies of Tropical Africa the basic conditions for the evolution of capitalism were lacking, most notably, there were no appreciable money assets and no free manpower. By encouraging one-crop agriculture (groundnuts in the case of Senegal) the colonial authorities artificially integrated millions of small producers into the capitalist world system. The principal form of economic activity, trade, was in foreign hands. All of which established a capitalism oriented on the outside world, subordinated to the demands of its market, from which it got its growth impulses.

Of course, Cox noted, this does not mean that capitalism did not develop on Asian and African national soil at all. However, the socio-economic structures of capitalism currently taking shape there bear the stamp of dependence, capitalist development is conditioned by partnership with foreign monopoly capital. More, the development

itself, as Lava, Cox and Haba showed, is in large measure connected with changes in the policies of imperialism.

In the colonial period and immediately after independence (the 50s), imperialism pursued a policy of holding back industrialization in an effort to keep Asian and African countries as suppliers of raw material. Lava cited facts showing how U.S. imperialism hindered the development of industry in the Philippines and hampered the growth of the national bourgeoisie during the time of colonial rule and in the first 10 or 15 years after independence. In the social aspect, imperialism relied on the feudal and comprador strata (the commercial and middleman bourgeoisie).

The change in imperialist strategy began in the early 60s. It was forced to reckon with global changes, the most important of which, as Haba noted, were: the growing political, economic and ideological influence of existing socialism, which has become a decisive force on the world arena; the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism; evolution of the peoples' national-liberation struggle into a struggle for social liberation, for a rejection of the capitalist road of development; deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system; development of state-monopoly capitalism, emergence of multinational corporations and capitalist integration; the scientific and technological revolution. Accordingly, Haba continued, imperialism has been formulating a new, neo-colonialist strategy. Essentially it consists in continuing and stepping up the exploitation of former colonies and semi-colonies, striving to this end to tie them in more firmly and organically with the capitalist world economic system and to use them in the struggle against the socialist countries and the developing nations that have taken the road of progressive change.

The participants in the discussion cited numerous facts indicating the fast growth of foreign investments in industry in capitalist-oriented Asian and African countries. In many of them (Indonesia, the Philippines, Senegal, and others) the private capitalist sector is largely foreign-owned. In Indonesia, Sudiman said, direct foreign investment from 1967 to 1974 totalled almost $3.5 billion, or three and one-half times the investments of national capital (not counting around $5 billion in 'aid'). In Senegal, Dansoko said, official statistics show 85 per cent of the so-called 'modern' sector of the economy to be in foreign hands, mainly French.

A considerable portion of new foreign investment is in the manufacturing industries (subsidiaries of foreign monopolies and mixed companies), Cox and Mitra noted. Its share is especially great in consumer goods. Even in a country of relatively developed national capitalism such as India the share of foreign capital in these industries frequently exceeds 60 per cent. This is due to the high rate of profit,

sometimes more than 40 per cent,[2] deriving mainly from low cost of labor.

Lately, foreign capital has also begun to make inroads in heavy industry, notably, iron and steel, petrochemicals, oil and gas (in Iraq, for instance). It is, among other things, Safari said, an offshoot of the scientific and technological revolution and the energy and ecological crises. Imperialist countries seek to secure supplies by building the most up-to-date factories close to energy and raw-material sources; simultaneously they see this as a way of side-stepping the pollution problem.

Foreign capital is acquiring decisive positions in the key industries of emergent capitalist economies. This creates an objective basis for contradictions with the national bourgeoisie, who demand that their respective governments protect their interests. It will be recalled that some capitalist-oriented countries have enacted legislation restricting foreign investment, while others have carried out total or partial nationalizations. As a counter-measure foreign monopolies increasingly resort to the establishment of 'mixed' enterprises (with national capital) or 'national companies' which are, in fact, subsidiaries of the multinationals. As a consequence the national bourgeoisie gets ever more involved with, and dependent on, foreign monopoly capital. Another form of dependence, it was pointed out, is the use of the latest technological knowhow by subsidiaries of multinationals. Heavy industries are being expanded in the developing countries, Dansoko noted, but the research centers, financial sources and markets remain in the developed capitalist countries.

Everyone agreed that capitalist development and neo-colonialism are inseparable, and the former is impossible without the latter. The Communist parties of Asian and African countries take this into account in their efforts to promote independent economic development and support those sections of the national bourgeoisie that stand up for national sovereignty. Communist parties tirelessly expose the conciliatory elements who accept growing subordination to foreign monopolies behind the fashionable neo-colonialist smoke screen of 'interdependence.' 'To point out and warn against it,' the document of the spring 1975 meeting of Arab Communist parties says, 'does not mean severing economic ties with developed capitalist countries; it means establishing these ties on a healthy basis guaranteeing national sovereignty, not infringing on economic independence.'

It was noted in the discussion that lately the developing countries have been making successful advances in this sphere. Referring to the policies of the oil producing nations, Cox even suggested that they were now able to impose their terms on imperialism. However, the majority of the participants stressed that whatever advances national

liberation had achieved in its confrontation with imperialism were due primarily to the support of the socialist countries.

One should not overrate the role of the countries of the national-liberation zone, Dansoko said. The policy of the oil-producing countries would hardly have been so effective if they had only their own forces to rely upon in resisting the onslaught of international imperialism. The basis of success in the Asian and African countries' struggle for genuine independence Dansoko, Ashhab and Stavrou noted, is the existence of the powerful socialist community. This is reflected in the changing positions of the ruling circles of these countries, even those that till now had been known for their loyalty to the interests of imperialism and the international monopolies.

The possibility for achieving some measure of success in advancing economic independence within the framework of the capitalist world economy is realized in the course of stubborn struggles and is fraught with the danger of political upheavals. Not one developing country, Mitra and Ashhab noted, has so far been able to achieve the status of an equal partner in economic dealings with imperialism, they continue to hold a subordinate position in the international capitalist division of labor and on the world capitalist market.

The role of the state

The growing role of the state and its massive intervention in economic and social processes is a characteristic of Afro-Asian capitalist development. In fact, the rise and growth of private capitalism is often the result of deliberate government policy. The formation of the state sector — practically a universal process — is another, even more important, result of state intervention.

In the young countries, the capitalist class needs such intervention, Mitra emphasized. For the national bourgeoisie, still immature and not entirely independent, lacks investment capital (and with the new technology even minimum investments can run very high) and is reluctant to start enterprises that do not promise quick returns. The state sector provides the necessary infrastructure, cheap power, metals, etc. The national bourgeoisie needs state protection also in its complex relations with foreign capital.

In recent years (Mitra continued) India's state sector has been expanding at a faster rate than the private-capital corporate sector.[3] In its social substance, the state sector is state capitalism and its basic functions is to assure a stable bourgeois order. This does not mean (as some contend) that in India it serves only capitalist development. The best proof to the contrary is that the big bourgeoisie and the foreign monopolies do not believe that, and Mitra cited many instances of their adamant resistance to expansion of the state sector.

In a multi-structure economy with elements of different formations, the nature of the state sector is bound to be a dual one. That is so because Afro-Asian governments are largely independent and reflect the will not only of the big bourgeoisie. In India, for instance, the National Congress, the Communist Party Program indicates, speaks for the entire national bourgeoisie. While building up the state sector and offering its service to big private capital, the government tries to limit large-scale and encourage small- and medium-scale enterprise and reserves for itself certain fields of economic activity. In other words, to a certain degree the state restrains operation of the laws of capitalism.

That being so, the state sector can be used to combat foreign monopoly exploitation and the egoistic propensities of big business. It can thus become — indeed is becoming — the basis of India's independent development. And it is highly indicative that the sector was started with the strong support of the socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union. The Communist Party, therefore, regards the state sector, even in its present form, as the material basis for India's possible shift to non-capitalist development.

The Party has that in mind in forming class alliances, particularly with left and centrist Congress elements. For the progressive changes in economic policy needed to make the state sector the basis of non-capitalist development can come only through persevering and purposeful class struggle under the leadership of the working class and its party. There was full agreement on that in the discussion.

In sum, the new role of the state, the dual nature of state capitalism, the absence of a closely united bourgeois ruling class, substantiate the Communist thesis that non-capitalist development is possible even in countries that have gone a long way in capitalist development. Such a possibility is envisaged, specifically, in the programs of the Communist Parties of India and the Philippines. Throughout Asia and Africa the Communists urge strengthening the state sector and using it to promote economic independence.

But development can be in the opposite direction, too, Sudiman said. The Suharto regime in Indonesia has launched a denationalization program, returning most factories and plantations to their former Indonesian and foreign owners and reviving the semi-feudal system in agriculture. That, Sudiman stressed, is the distinguishing feature of Indonesia's capitalist development.

In countries with reactionary, dictatorial regimes tied to imperialism, neo-colonialism and the multinational corporations, the progressive potential of the state sector has yet to come to the surface.

The state sector in Israel, Ashur said, is completely dependent on,

and serves, foreign monopoly and local capital. Compared with other parts of Asia and Africa, Israel has a high level of capitalist development. With strong government backing, foreign and native capitalists have made large investments in the so-called public sector (enterprises run by the Histadrut trade unions, cooperative societies and municipalities) and exert a decisive influence on it.

In Iran, Safari said, the state sector emerged in the process of changeover from feudal to capitalist society, carried out by the reactionary regime. The state controls immense industrial and financial resources and, in the absence of private monopoly, is itself a gigantic monopoly covering the entire process of extended capitalist reproduction.[4] It rejects all claims of the bourgeoisie to an independent financial, economic and political role. The state sector is being extended in close cooperation with international state-monopoly capital, with which it is integrating. Never before has there been such an influx of foreign capital. It is far too early, Safari remarked, to speak of the progressive potential of state capitalism in Iran.

Speakers drew attention also to such negative social consequences of state intervention in public life as the growth of the administrative apparatus, corruption, the rise of a bureaucratic bourgeoisie that can replace the weak national bourgeoisie engaged in production as the social base of capitalist development.

In Indonesia, Sudiman told the meeting, corruption has reached fantastic proportions: 30 per cent of national income goes into bribes. There is even a new acronym, *capbur*, capitalist bureaucrats, and more and more of them are becoming big capitalist entrepreneurs.

Inflation of the administrative apparatus is especially evident in Jordan, Ashhab remarked. That is so because for imperialism Jordan was merely a strategic base and not an object of economic exploitation. This led to excessive development of trade, the service industries, the civil service and the army. Industry and agriculture provide barely 30 per cent of national income. Industrial workers number less than 10,000; the army numbers 70,000. More than a third of all wage and salary earners are in the civil service. On top of this there is a huge parasitic stratum of neo-comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie made up of tribal chieftains, their close relatives, big landowners and the old comprador bourgeoisie. And they call the tune, for they constitute the social base of the despotic regime and of imperialist domination in Jordan.

The Communists are working for broad popular unity in the fight for democracy and against foreign domination, and speakers emphasized that this is objectively directed also against capitalist development.

And so, capitalist development in Asia and Africa depends both on

foreign investments and on the state sector and state intervention. This explains why capitalism is still subordinate, lacks the capacity to expand, though this does not mean that there is no growth at all.

The fruits of capitalist development

India, Iran, the Philippines and several other capitalist-oriented countries have made definite economic progress in recent years.

Much is being said and written in Iran about the economic boom. Under the fourth five-year plan (1968-73), i.e., before the steep rise in oil prices, GNP rose by 107 per cent. India, too, is held up as proof that, even in this day and age, capitalism is the answer to all the problems of the young states. Bourgeois writers cite the substantial rise in India's gross industrial and agricultural output, the emergence of heavy industry and achievements in education and science, including nuclear physics.

Participants in the discussion emphasized, however, that an economic system cannot be judged solely by production figures, in disregard of the social and political aspects of economic growth. And facts and figures were cited confirming the conclusion drawn by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that 'countries which have taken the capitalist road have been unable to solve any of the basic problems facing them.'

Attention was drawn to the disparity between industry and agriculture. In Iran, industry contributed 20 per cent to GNP in 1972/73 and agriculture still less, 16 per cent, though it accounts for 41 per cent of the gainfully employed population. The annual accretion of industrial output was 15 per cent, but only 2.5 per cent in agriculture, and since the population increased by 3 per cent, one is led to conclude that agriculture is in a state of stagnation.

Similar data were given for India. Industry, despite its fairly high level, accounts for only 20 per cent of GNP and agriculture for 50 per cent (with 70 per cent of the population in rural areas). This is holding back the entire economy. Agriculture is woefully backward — average per hectar yields are only about one-tenth of Japan's.

One of the main causes of this uneveness is that subordinate Afro-Asian capitalism has failed to integrate pre-capitalist modes of production into the more modern structure. This inability to give the economy a uniformly modern pattern determines, to a large extent, capitalism's inability to overcome technical and economic backwardness and resolve the social problems it poses.

Another factor is the impact of the world economic crisis. Along with capital, Afro-Asian countries are 'importing' all the crisis elements that are causing so much upheaval in the imperialist countries and are especially painfully felt in the Third World.

The most convincing indicator of backwardness is the poverty of the population. Comrade Mitra quoted Indira Gandhi for the statement that 40 per cent of the Indian population are living below the official minimum of 27 rupees a month, admittedly a very low figure.[5] In Iran, Safari told the meeting, 73 per cent of Teheran families have an income of less than 10,000 reals a month, though the official cost-of-living minimum is from 16,000 to 22,000 reals; 70 per cent of housing has been condemned by the Social Research Institute: 90 per cent of the rural population, according to official data, cannot make ends meet. Soaring prices, the result of runaway inflation in the imperialist countries, have become a way of life in Asia and Africa.

Illiteracy is widespread: 66 per cent of the rural population in Iran, 70 per cent of the total population in India (only 41 per cent of children in the 11-14 age group, and only 24 per cent in the 14-17 group attend school). In Tropical Africa, Idris Cox reported, most children quit school before reaching the age of 12 and so receive only a primary education.

The health services are patently inadequate. Iran has only about 12,000 doctors, nearly half of them in Teheran, for a population of 32 million.

Unemployment has reached menacing dimensions. In India it increased nearly threefold, from 5.3 million to 14m., between the early 50s and 1970, and the figure is estimated to reach 37m. by the end of the decade. All these date refer mainly to the cities, to which agricultural stagnation is sending a steady flow of job-seekers. Dansoko estimates that the unemployed army in Asia and Africa, taken in proportion to the population, is many times bigger than in the period of initial capitalist development in Europe. This gives the ruling classes immense opportunities for bringing pressure to bear on the working class.

Social contrasts stand out in bold relief against this background. There are elite 'consumer-society' groups that copy the lifestyle of the bourgeoisie of developed capitalist countries. In Israel, Ashur said, the share of wages in national income declined from 60.5 per cent in 1970 to 45.2 per cent in 1973, while profits registered an increase of from 50 to 80 per cent in 1973 alone. Estimates for eight developing Asian countries show that the top income group, a mere 5 per cent of the population, accounts for 25.5 per cent of national income, nearly as much as the bottom group, 60 per cent of the population, which gets only 28.1 per cent. The figures for Africa (data on 15 countries) are 34.8 and 22.1 per cent, which means that the top group has a 150 per cent margin.

Little surprise, then, that the working people are more vocal and insistent in their demands for change. The ruling element has re-

taliated by more reactionary government and more repression. And this, speakers noted, is becoming a characteristic feature of countries where capitalism is taking hold.

And so, capitalism in Afro-Asian countries has not solved a single major socio-economic problem: has not abolished dependence, backwardness, poverty or unemployment. What has emerged, the political resolution of the 10th CP of India Congress emphasizes, is a crisis of capitalist development that has exacerbated all social contradictions and made for a new alignment of class and political forces.

The conditions are thus taking shape for uniting large sections of the people representing different modes of production in a broad democratic front based on the fight for economic independence and an end to backwardness and poverty. In this front, speakers pointed out, the working class and its party must play the decisive role. True, in a number of countries the proletariat is still weak, but it is rapidly growing both in the private and state sectors, in industry and agriculture. It has not everywhere acquired class consciousness, but it is the only class capable of achieving national consolidation, and to it belongs the future. Social progress in Asia and Africa depends upon its ability for form a militant patriotic alliance with the peasants, the different groups of the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, and win over to this alliance the anti-imperialist minded sections of the national bourgeoisie. The working class, Stravrou said, must pursue a realistic policy, one that would assure attainment of the cardinal political and economic goals of the anti-imperialist and national-liberation struggle.

It is on these premises that the Communist parties base their strategy and tactics. And in recent years they have made significant progress in bringing together all the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly forces in a number of Afro-Asian countries, notably in the biggest of them, India.

The non-capitalist perspective

There was general agreement at the seminar that capitalist development in Asia and Africa does not follow the pattern of the bourgeois democratic revolutions in Europe and North America. That is so, Taiebi pointed out, because the national-liberation revolution, at its present stage, is being performed in the period of worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism. Even in the young countries capitalism is no longer a progressive, ascendant mode of production. Today, progress is everywhere associated with socialism, and capitalism is everywhere seen as a historically obsolescent system incapable of resolving its inherent contradictions. This becomes evident with the appearance of the rudiments of capitalism in Asian and African coun-

tries and is the principal factor in the instability of the capitalist orientation.

Another instability factor is the character of government, the limited scope of capitalist changes in social and economic structures. The discussison showed that in none of these countries has the government firmly and consistently upheld the interests of only the national bourgeoisie. Reflected in its attitude is the multi-structure economy, so that big business cannot set the country's development course. True, the mode of production associated with big foreign capital can become the leading and dominant one. But this would aggravate all contradictions, including those within the national bourgeoisie itself.

All these factors, Mitra stressed, show that no Afro-Asian country has firmly and finally taken the capitalist way. We can only speak of capitalist development and capitalist orientation amid sharp internal contradictions that can be resolved only beyond the framework of capitalist development. This determines the tasks of the working class and its parties.

In capitalist-oriented countries the struggle is, from the very outset, for non-capitalist development. And it is being waged despite the fact that in most countries the forces of socialism — the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties — are still weak, and in some of them, are yet to be formed. Importance therefore attaches to the fact that the petty bourgeoisie, which together with the peasantry, is the largest class in these countries, has not only an anti-imperialist, but also an anti-capitalist potential. Experience has shown that the petty-bourgeois masses are inclined to accept revolutionary democracy, and that its most advanced groups are working for non-capitalist development and can be won over to scientific socialism. Thus capitalist development can be stopped, and this can happen if not on a socialist, then on a general democratic basis. The socialist orientation is the high road for ex-colonial Afro-Asian countries. The working class, the Communists and other progressive forces can create a broad class alliance capable of leading their country away from the capitalist path without waiting for capitalism to mature and provide the 'classical' social and economic prerequisites.

Realization of all these possibilities, it was emphasized, depends to a large degree on external conditions, on the success of the struggle against neo-colonialism and for economic independence. And this success will come only by relying on the support of the socialist countries and promoting friendship and cooperation with the powerful socialist community.

1. A genuine agrarian reform has been carried out only in the Indian state of Kerala where a United Front government headed by Achutha Menon, a Communist, is in power. In the summer of 1975, the government of Indira Gandhi took steps to accelerate enforcement of the land laws and to radicalize agrarian reforms in other Indian states.

2. E.g., in cosmetic and pharmaceutical industries.

3. The state now controls coal mining, iron and steel, power, heavy engineering, banking, transport, communications and irrigation. It supervises industrial licensing, use of foreign exchange, foreign trade and cooperation with other countries. It is steadily increasing its share in output of consumer goods, notably textiles, and has a decisive part in the capitalist reform of agriculture in the 'green revolution' areas.

4. The state holds a dominant position in transport, irrigation, power, iron and steel, engineering, communications, oil and petrochemicals, i.e., in industries requiring a high concentration of capital.

5. In line with its progressive social and economic program, the government is taking measures to alleviate the position of the poorer sections of the population.

The intelligentsia and its future in socialist society

Bronislaw Golebiewski
Sociologist, Poland

Poland's case bears out the fact that the alliance of the working class and the intelligentsia is not a temporary, tactical thing. It is a long-term objective in the proletariat's historical mission up to and including the attainment of full communist society. It is essential for us today in building developed socialism, in which the Seventh Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party will be an important milestone.

By transforming the intelligentsia from the capitalists' hired help into a truly creative intellectual force of the entire people, socialism offers it new horizons, broadens and deepens its alliance with the working class. The PUWP is a working-class party, However, as Comrade Edward Gierek said at the 13th Plenum of the CC PUWP (1974), it is 'also the party of the Polish intelligentsia, which has always played an important role in our revolutionary movement. Our intelligentsia, which originates from the people, which has received its education in People's Poland, is ideologically linked with the Party, with socialism. Its vast majority is directly engaged in production and works hand in hand with the working class. We are interested in strengthening the role of the intelligentsia, in promoting its initiative

and creative thinking, in its ability to blend professional skill with ideological conviction.'

Why is the task of strengthening the alliance of the working class and the intelligentsia still relevant at the present stage? What is the future of the intelligentsia in the conditions of developed socialism?

In its answer to these questions, our Party emphasizes the common aim of the working class and peasantry, the intelligentsia and other social groups — a classless society. The way to this aim is alliance, the closest social and political unity of the people.

The forming of socialist intelligentsia in the wake of the revolution is a dual process: winning over the main mass of the old intellectuals, and bringing up a new intelligentsia. Experience shows that the higher the level of the productive forces in a country, the larger the intelligentsia is numerically, and the greater, therefore, is the problem of integrating it in socialist construction. Conversely, in a backward country the need of forming an intelligentsia is more strongly felt. Hence, the tasks faced by Communists depend on the conditions.

Take Poland's postwar history. After people's power was installed as the result of liberation from nazi occupation by the Soviet Army and the Polish troops in 1944-45, the PUWP devoted itself to forming a new, socialist intelligentsia that would participate wholeheartedly in the country's rehabilitation, in social reforms, in building up education, training and enlightenment. This was highly important, because the country's intelligentsia had been small in numbers, was largely scattered by the war all over the world, while merciless extermination by the nazis had been the lot of those who remained.[1]

The objective of training a new intelligentsia of working-class and peasant origin was attained fairly quickly. In 1931, manual and mental workers numbered 3.5 million and 600 thousand respectively, and in 1970 — 6.8 million and 3.7 million.[2]

The building of socialism saw a rapid growth of the intelligentsia on the basis of the new production and political relations. This benefited the growth of our society, its material and cultural level. The numerical increase of the intelligentsia, coupled with changes in its professional structure, was the result and condition for the country's intensive social and economic development. Also, improvement of management at enterprise level, the need for highly skilled administrators and of personnel for society's self-government agencies, boosted the demand for specialists. According to the latest census (1970), 655,000 people had a higher education, with something like 31 per cent technical.[3]

These high rates of change in the education and qualification of mental workers will be maintained in accordance with the Seventh CC PUWP Plenum (1972) decision on education and upbringing of the

youth. The main purpose of the education reform is to introduce universal secondary education and align the curricula with the needs and objectives of building developed socialist society. It is estimated that by 1990 enrollment in university-level institutions will double, totalling something like 650 thousand. The high rate of accretion of specialists will raise the percentage of personnel with a higher education in the labor force from five to 10.[4]

The socialist intelligentsia has its roots in the new social system. It plays a prominent part in the managerial sphere, in organizing the economy, and in cultural and educational affairs. But the intelligentsia does not all become socialist after the revolution. Nor does its conversion occur overnight. The forming of socialist convictions on the basis of alliance with the working class takes a definite period of time.

The following, we hold, exercises a strong influence on the development of the alliance of the working class and the intelligentsia in the course of socialist construction.

To begin with, the qualitative change in the intelligentsia's place and role in society. The forming of the intelligentsia in postwar Poland, for example, occurred in conditions of a general rise of the cultural and educational level, for intellectualization of labor is characteristic of socialist society. The production sphere, which requires skilled workers with a secondary technical education, is in a continuous state of expansion. In 1964, for example, there were some 23,000 operators with a secondary education. By 1972 their number had climbed to 150,000. And the process will continue parallel to the growing number of specialists with university training. In due course, almost the entire industrial working class will have a secondary education. The engineer who organizes production and the technician doing a worker's job are widespread in present-day Poland, demonstrating the gradual eradication of the differences between manual and mental labor. The new labor code of 1975 makes no distinction between them in the matter of social rights.

Further, there is an increasingly apparent community of political and economic interests between the working class and the intelligentsia, especially the most numerous intellectual professions most closely connected with production, such as engineers, technicians and researchers, and professions linked with the economics of production, its organization, planning and management.

Last but not least, the social origin of the intelligentsia. In many Polish families the older members are workers, while their adult children are qualified specialists. Nearly 60 per cent of the intelligentsia are of working-class or peasant origin. They were brought up in a socialist spirit and the idea of the leading role of the working class is natural to them, while only some 10-15 years ago a large section of the

old Polish intelligentsia was inclined to dispute it.

Under socialism, the working class gains extensive opportunities for cultural and intellectual development. This leads to the gradual eradication of the old myth about the intelligentsia's 'cultural superiority.' Society's appreciation for the competence and work of the intelligentsia shows, however, that its place in society is adequately esteemed. The Party's policy, which conforms with the aspirations and expectations of all working people, has raised the intellectual to a new height, linking his functions and activity with the interests of the people.

Close cooperation of manual and mental workers in production, society, political affairs, culture and everyday life is in evidence at all levels, especially after the Sixth PUWP Congress (1971), which drew up the strategy of the country's dynamic development. It expresses the desire of industrial labor to master the achievements of scientific and technical progress and, consistent with Lenin's ideas, embodies the principle of a comprehensive approach to the economic, political and cultural tasks of building socialism.

The birth and growth of the new intelligentsia is a natural process in the social and cultural life of a nation on the socialist road, because socialism implies purposeful use of science and technolgoy, heightening of the intellectual level of the masses, development of their social unity. However, the rapid numerical growth of the intelligentsia does not signify that, as certain bourgeois sociologists contend, a new class has come into being in the social-economic sense of the word, or that this eliminates the objective of alliance. On the contrary, the growth of the socialist intelligentsia, the growth of its alliance with the working class, contribute to the disappearance of class distinctions. The creative activity and interests of the intelligentsia are inseparable from the communist ideals, from the building of socialism.

The question of the intelligentsia as ally of the working class must be based on a clear understanding of its function in society. Those who underestimate this function impair the alliance, for, as Lenin said, '... the intelligentsia are so called just because they most consciously, most resolutely and most accurately reflect and express the development of class interests and political groupings in society as a whole' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 7, p. 45). Exaggeration, on the other hand, tends as a rule to raise the role of the intelligentsia to an unjustified absolute, ostensibly able by itself to determine, without the working class, the development of society.

Past experience shows that the role of the working class in creating the system of values of socialist society (serving the harmonious development of the individual and of the socialist way of life) increases all the time (and does not 'pass over' to the intelligentsia, as

some would have us believe). Acquiring new experience in building socialism, the working class is continuously better prepared for its role not only from the professional, but also the humanitarian points of view, by its understanding and perception of culture and art.

But the intelligentsia is, beyond doubt, a partner of the working class in creating a socialist culture and in assuring socialist relations in town and village. And this new role of partner will increase in the stage of developed socialism through the resolution of the following crucial social, economic and cultural problems:

— alignment of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system, which involves continuous struggle against pragmatism and technocracy, against the tendency toward elitism still alive among a definite section of the intelligentsia;

— further development of the socialist ideology and consciousness, moulding and establishing socialist morality, which involves a higher degree of knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory and of skill in applying it by the entire — not only humanistic but also technical — intelligentsia;

— development of socialist democracy and further improvement of the state, especially as concerns its educational function, which requires better training and placing of leading cadres, and a better system of recruitment of administrative personnel from all social strata, especially the working class. Development of socialist democracy implies struggle against the ideology of individualism, sybaritism, careerism and demagogy.

All this work of moulding the new quality of the intelligentsia when building developed socialist society hinges on the leading role of the Party, whose ranks encompass more and more people with university training. The demands they must meet as members of the vanguard of the working people naturally increase.

The alliance of the working class and intelligentsia grows closer and stronger under the Party's guidance during the building of developed socialism in two main directions.

First, through the greater participation of the working class and the intelligentsia in the elimination of class distinctions, chiefly in eradicating the demarcation lines between manual and mental workers. Here the 'unity of professional skill and ideological conviction' referred to by Comrade Gierek is particularly important, because it determines the socialist character of the scientific and technical revolution in Poland. To achieve this unity is the common cause of the workers and the intelligentsia, an object of special concern of the Party's ideological and educational front.

Second, through the increasingly active participation of the work-

ing class and the intelligentsia in eliminating the distinctions in definite social relationships, such as 'town-country,' 'farm labor — industrial labour', and 'condition of culture in country and town.' Under the long-term plan for the development of agriculture and food production adopted by the 15th Plenum of the CC PUWP (1974), investments in mechanization, mineral fertilizers, and processing plants will go up several times in 1975-80. This is sure to raise the rural cultural level. The results of the labor of workers, technicians, designers and developers of modern means of production will exercise an influence on the village. The number of intellectuals employed directly in farming will also increase. The working class and the intelligentsia will jointly introduce in farming modern industrial equipment, a new life style and culture, thus deepening the socialist content of the basic class alliance in People's Poland — the alliance of workers and peasants.

The development of our society over the past 30 years has created enduring ties between the new, socialist intelligentsia, the working class and the peasants, and has given the intelligentsia a clear idea of its role as ally. The Party's economic program, the program for developing and strengthening the people's state and deepening the processes of socialist education and the cultural growth of the masses, reposes squarely on the alliance of the working class with the peasants and the people's intelligentsia.

By promoting the alliance of manual and mental labor, the Party emphasizes the organic and indivisible ties between these two types of human activity. This alliance, says the Document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, 'is becoming an increasingly important force in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.'[5] Effective use of the knowledge, ability and creative initiative of the intelligentsia in socialist society is assured by the leading role of the working class, and the Party's correct and science-based policy of strengthening the social and political unity of the people.

1. Alone in 'Action AB' (extermination of Polish intellectuals) the nazis killed more than 3,500 in 1941-43. This does not include victims of other nazi atrocities. The commission investigating nazi crimes in Poland has still not been able fully to determine the numbers of exterminated Polish intellectuals. At present, it lists 20,000 men and men of 37 intellectual professions. Naturally, this affected the initial phase of socialist construction.

2. See S. Widerszpil. 'Klasa robotnicza i inteligencje we wspolczesnym spoleczenstwie socjalistycznym.' In: *Idee Lenina a miedzynarodowy ruch robotniczy*. Ksiazka i Widza. Warsaw, 1975, p. 62.

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 66.

4. See M. Zawadzki. 'Glowne problemy rozwoju kraju w planie perspektywicznym do 1990 r.' *Ideologia i polityka*, No. 9, 1974, p. 38.

5. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*. Moscow 1969. Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 25.



Bookshelf of political literature

THE FUTURE BELONGS TO SOCIALISM

The growing impact of the socialist world and the gains of the policy of détente are forcing imperialism to find new ways of misleading and dividing the working people by concealing the truth about existing socialism. In these circumstances, the Communists of capitalist countries see their internationalist duty in popularizing the achievements of existing socialism and in carefully studying the experience of socialist construction. This is also the purpose of the Socialism book series of Éditions Sociales, the French Communist publishing house.

The series ranges over a considerable geographical area and includes books on Soviet reality,[1] a historical essay on Mongolia,[2] a concise encyclopedia on Cuba[3] and a book on the educational system in the GDR.[4] Characteristically, the authors analyze life in socialist countries from the standpoint of problems that are in the focus of the French working people's struggles. Jacques De Bonis' *Interview with Gyorgy Aczel, a Hungarian Leader,*[5] is most revealing in this respect.

The background to this book is interesting. In 1972, during a televized discussion with Georges Marchais, General Secretary of the FCP, Alain Peyrefitte, then General Secretary of the UDR,[6] made slanderous attacks on the Hungarian People's Republic. Thereupon Marchais suggested a public discussion between Peyrefitte and Aczel, deputy Chairman, Council of Ministers of the HPR, Political Bureau member, CC HSWP. Peyrefitte accepted the challenge before millions of French televiewers but subsequently backed out and the discussion never took place. De Bonis wrote his book as a substitute for that discussion. 'The French reader,' wrote Roland Leroy, Political Bureau member, CC FCP, in his preface to the book, 'is bound to see how problems of real life, which also exist under capitalism, acquire an entirely different content and meaning under socialism with its special laws, its logic of development and its

perspectives' (p. 5). The questions put to Gyorgy Aczel by De Bonis bear on key problems of contemporary society. The interview deals in particular with economic problems. Bourgeois propaganda argues that the capitalist crisis and the resultant inflation, soaring prices and unprecedented unemployment affect all countries irrespective of social system. Indirectly, Aczel replies, Hungary does to some extent feel the inpact of these phenomena, but the allegation that it has a part in the capitalist crisis is completely groundless. Indeed, Hungary's industrial output in 1974 went up by 8.2 per cent, there is no unemployment and the economy is based on scientifically sound long-range plans. One of the most striking facts is that the price of bread has not changed for the past 20 years. Through the prices of some commodities have risen, real incomes have been steadily growing — as much as 6.6 per cent in 1974.

The nature and motivations of man's behavior under socialism are often misinterpreted in capitalist society. *Interview with a Hungarian Leader* gives French readers an insight into the character of the citizens of a socialist state, who are its builders and masters. It shows that socialism assures harmonious development of the individual, the use of his abilities for the good of society as a whole, the satisfaction of steadily growing spiritual requirements and the attainment of lofty ideals.

L. Gur

USING PAST EXPERIENCE IN TODAY'S STRUGGLE

Learning Lessons of the Past to Build the Future[7] by Jaime Gazmuri is the first book to be published underground since the Chilean fascist coup. Its appearance is a proof of the organizing ability of Chile's revolutionary forces and of their increased capacity for action.

The author, General Secretary of the Worker-Peasant MAPU Party, draws lessons from 'the most serious defeat ever suffered by the Chilean popular and democratic movement' (p. 5). He believes that 'deep-going self-criticism . . . can become a weapon for defeating fascism and carrying forward the Chilean revolution' (p. 8).

Considerable space is devoted to shortcomings in Popular Unity's policy of alliances, which added up to one of its more serious weaknesses. After the 1970 victory, the author notes, the government set out to implement its program amid 'ideological conflicts between working-class and petty-bourgeois concept of the Popular Unity front. The correct concept — upheld mainly by the Communist Party and President Allende — won the upper hand within Popular Unity' (p. 44). However, ultra-leftist views were not completely defeated

either outside or inside Popular Unity and contined to hinder realizations of the approved program.

This problem, Gazmuri writes, 'must be analyzed, both because analysis will help us to understand the problems of the past and, above all, because many of the problems that were solved incorrectly are still extremely relevant' (p. 45).

He notes, first of all, carelessness in 'assessing the structure of society and analyzing the various classes — their rise, their economic, ideological and political characteristics, their interconnections, and so on — with the greatest accuracy' (p. 45).

The book next deals with the weak points of the ideological struggles, which cannot be attributed solely to 'material and technical shortages or to the existence of a well-armed enemy skillful in ideological struggles.' It goes without saying that reaction always has greater material resources than the people fighting for power. In this case, shortcomings stemmed largely 'from the content of our ideological work, from our inability fully to explain the Popular Unity program to the so-called middle strata ... from the difficulty of countering the anti-communist campaign launched by reaction ... as well as from our inability to give the popular alliance expression in the ideological sphere' (pp. 49 and 50), that is enable adherents of different progressive currents, including non-Marxist, to participate in the revolutionary process.

Gazmuri points out that 'Popular Unity failed to secure the political participation of those segments of the population that could objectively accept the main provisions of its program' (p. 60). In this respect, he sees the biggest mistake in the fact that 'the characteristics of the Christian Democratic Party and the role it could play in our country' were not properly taken into account. And he goes on to say: 'Ever since the late fifties, the Christian Democrats have been the most dynamic and most noteworthy political exponents of the views of the so-called middle strata. ... There is no doubt that the hegemonist core of the CDP leadership ... has a center-right orientation and that its basic policy was to make Christian Democracy an alternative to the Chilean popular movement rather than its ally.' But 'while the CDP leadership constantly pursued that policy, it met, just as constantly, with very considerable internal opposition. This means that the party was greatly influenced by forces which can play a revolutionary role ... and are likely to set the perspective ... of political unity between the working-class parties and Popular Unity, on the one hand, and the Christian Democrats, on the other. These are objective conditions making this perspective feasible.' The attainment of this perspective did not, as Gazmuri sees it, become a goal of the Left, and this made for the 'rapid growth of the most

rightist trends in the CDP, which resulted in the party coming to play the role of a "popular" alternative to the Left' (pp. 60 and 61).

The MAPU leader draws from his analysis of past mistakes the important conclusion that the new situation in Chile 'is still more favorable for an alliance with the Christian Democrats. The ultimate position to be adopted by the CDP ... depends upon it. But if we want it to be in favor of democracy and the people, we must follow a policy taking adequate account of past mistakes in regard to the CDP' (pp. 62 and 63).

The book helps to draw lessons from the achievements and mistakes of the Chilean revolutionary movement, and this is highly important if the present and future goals of the revolution are to be reached.

Hugo Fazio

A GREAT AND RADIANT GOAL

A. Grechukhin, a Soviet historian, has written a book on the struggle carried on by the Communist Party of the USA against various anti-Marxist, anti-Party groups and currents from 1927 to 1972.* He shows that strengthening the unity of America's Communists was no easy matter. This is understandable, for the CPUSA is operating in a country where the capitalist world's most powerful state machinery pits its full strength against the Communists, using bribery, violence, blackmail and ideological subversion. U.S. imperialism tries to erode the Party from inside. Party unity was under fierce opportunist attack in the late twenties, the first half of the forties and the second half of the fifties, and revisionists became active in the late sixties and early seventies. Nevertheless, the CPUSA preserved its unity and, indeed, strengthened its positions. When, in December 1959, it convened its 17th Congress, it had defeated the liquidators and shown itself to be an important political force in the country. It had won greater influence among the masses by fighting for social renewal, repelling attacks from right- and 'left'-wing revisionists and vigorously campaigning against racism and chauvinism.

A. Grechukhin's book probes into the reasons for the U.S. Communists' gains. It reveals the main trends of the economic and political development of the U.S. and points to intensifying class contradictions and the growing class consciousness of U.S. workers and farmers. The author deals in detail with the Party's efforts for

*A.A. Grechukhin, *Bor'ba Kommunisticheskoi partii SShA za yodinstvo svoikh ryadov* (The CPUSA: Building Up Party Unity). Moscow, Mysl, 1975. 296 pp.

closer links with the working people. He stresses the enormous importance of the contribution to Party unity made by Charles E. Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster, Robert Minor, Eugene Dennis, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Robert Thompson, Benjamin Davis, Gus Hall, Henry Winston, John Williamson, William Weinstone and other prominent leaders of the U.S. and international Communist and working-class movement, and shows how generations of U.S. Communists strove in the past and strive today for the great, radiant goal — socialism.

O.B.

WHO ENJOYS PEKING'S SUPPORT?

The French Communist paper *l'Humanité* recently commented on some of Peking's latest foreign policy moves. There was an elaborate welcome, the paper wrote, for Franz-Josef Strauss, the head of the Bavarian Christian-Social Union, on his second visit to Peking. Strauss, of course, is known for his ultra-reactionary views. Following talks with Mao Tse-tung and other Peking leaders, he expressed satisfaction at the fact that his hosts share his advocacy of 'West European nuclear independence,' deplore the lack of firmness of certain Western powers in matters of defense, and hold that the Final Act signed in Helsinki is fraught with many 'dangers.'

L'Humanité notes that the Peking leaders favor an 'Atlantic Europe based on NATO' and insist that U.S. military support is vital for Western Europe. The Hsinhua agency welcomed the purchase by NATO countries of 350 U.S. fighter bombers. Significantly, *l'Humanité* remarks, Hsinhua's attitude toward Portugal is identical with that of the reactionary General Spinola, who has spoken of the 'Communist threat to Europe's Western flank.'

The Peking leaders, *l'Humanité* writes, support the most reactionary forces not only in Europe, but on other continents too. At a meeting of the UNESCO Executive Council in Paris, the Chinese delegate refused to condemn the crimes of the Chilean fascist junta. In Angola, Peking supports the reactionary FNLA and UNITA, which have come out against MPLA, the progressive national-liberation movement. In January, when South Vietnam was not yet liberated, Chou En-lai told the Thai Foreign Minister: 'It is essential that U.S. troops remain in Thailand.'

L'Humanité draws this conclusion: Peking policy is motivated by anti-Sovietism, is injurious to socialism, the national-liberation struggle, peace and the interests of the Chinese people.

Eugene Brion

WILL PREVAIL

The cover of the book *A Chronicle of the Latest Tragedy of Cyprus*[8] shows a map of the island, part of which is painted blood-red.

Cyprus cast off the British colonial yoke 15 years ago. But as soon as it had won independence it became an eyesore for imperialist powers set on turning the island into an imperialist aircraft carrier. *A Chronicle* discloses the schemes of reaction: 'Abolishing the state, partitioning Cyprus and annexing it to Turkey and Greece, two NATO members, to preserve the south-eastern flank of NATO' (p. 31). It stresses that the tragic events of the summer of 1974 were not due to inability by the Cypriot Greeks and Cypriot Turks to coexist, for they had done so for centuries. Those events were precipitated by the strategic interests of imperialism, which is out to divide the people at all costs.

The book describes the events of July 15, 1974, and after — the fascist coup and the Turkish invasion. As a result, 6,000 people were killed or are missing and another 200,000 live in poverty in camps. Whole towns, such as Famagusta, were laid waste. On vast citrus plantations the fruit was left unpicked.

Now more than a year later, the consequences of the tragedy remain. The Cyprus question was shifted from Brussels to Vienna to Nicosia to New York. Imperialist brutality and treachery prevent implementation of the resolutions approved by the UN Security Council and General Assembly: withdrawal of all foreign troops, the return of all refugees, and the Cypriots to shape their destiny as they see fit, according to the principles of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. However, Cyprus has numerous friends all over the world, the first among them is the Soviet Union, which identified itself with the Cypriot people and supported their just cause from the first.

The wealth of factual data used in the book reveals the truth about events in Cyprus. It also shows that a people fighting for freedom, peace and progress cannot be defeated.

Georgis Lernis

LIFE STORY OF A HAPPY MAN

Oscar Ryan's *Tim Buck — A Conscience for Canada*[9] tells the life story of the man who was the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada for 33 years, its Chairman for 11 years (until his death

in 1973) and a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International from 1935 until its dissolution in 1943. 'Whatever I am,' Tim Buck said of himself on the occasion of his 60th birthday, 'Marxism and the struggles of the Canadian working class have made me.'

The author's graphic portrayal of an outstanding Communist and writer[10] is, like Tim Buck's life, connected with the history of the struggles of the Canadian working class and the leadership its Marxist-Leninist Party gave to those struggles.

Tim Buck gained his early knowledge of socialist ideas at the age of 16, when he was an apprentice machinist in England. He came to Canada in 1910, at 19 years of age. There he learned about Marx and first read the *Communist Manifesto*. In 1917 with no English translation of Lenin's writings yet available in Canada, an immigrant worker who had read some of Lenin's works in the original told Tim Buck about Lenin and where Lenin and Social Democracy differed. Many years later, in January 1971, on his 80th birthday, Tim Buck spoke on Moscow Radio. 'I am the happiest of men,' he said. 'I am proud that I have devoted all my life to the struggle for the triumph of Leninism.'

In the late 1920s, Tim Buck was among those in the Party who waged an ideological battle against the revisionist and opportunist theory of 'American exceptionalism' and against Trotskyism. William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, writes in the book's foreward that 'Tim understood in a deep sense the Marxist-Leninist conception of the Communist Party as the vanguard of the working class and vigorously fought against those who would revise Marxism-Leninism, or who would stand in the way of its creative development. . . .'

The author vividly describes the years immediately preceding World War II as the period when Canada's 'lush resources were being sold out to U.S. big business by fast-buck Canadian hucksters.' And he comments: 'Those politicians who so contemptuously accused him (Tim Buck. — *M.D.*) and his colleagues of alien loyalties were at that very time briskly promoting Canada's takeover by a foreign power.' This sell-out process came to a head in 1947 with the open change of direction for Canadian monopoly capitalism to a policy of integration with U.S. imperialism.

Tim Buck's call to the Party and the working class, to all democratic forces, to struggle for Canadian independence, and his militant activity made a significant contribution to the country's progressive development and helped unite forces equal to challenging Canadian monopoly and U.S. imperialism. Tim Buck always linked the struggle for Canadian independence with the struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. He was distinguished for

his principled, consistent patriotism and internationalism, which he always saw as integrally related parts of a single whole.

The biography of Tim Buck reveals how profoundly he understood the world-changing significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution and how he never ceased to bring knowledge of the achievements of the Soviet Union to wide masses of the Canadian people.

'Writing a biography of Tim Buck' William Kashtan says in his foreward, 'is in a sense writing the history of the Communist Party with which he was identified all his adult life . . . . It is at the same time a part of the history of the working class and of the Canadian people. The author of this biography is therefore to be congratulated for placing on the record not only the personal character of Tim the man, but of Tim the Communist, the revolutionary, the Marxist, the personality who embodied and expressed the struggle of the working class from coast to coast over many years.'

Mel Doig

THE POTENTIALITIES OF SCIENTIFIC FORECASTING

Interest in forecasting has risen greatly all over the world. Serious research is underway in socialist countries. Z. Czyzowska's recent book, *Social Development in Poland,*[11] is therefore undeniably attractive.

In Poland, Czyzowska shows, development concepts are evolved several decades ahead. She examines a large round of questions involved — housing development, reduction of working hours and the leisure problem, environmental protection, social maintenance, cultural development and public education. She looks into the latest research, discussions, investigations and reports.

Her analysis leads her to conclude that the present epoch opens up vast potentialities for scientific forecasting. The socialist system and Marxist-Leninist theory, she notes, provide a good base for this. The rapid progress of cybernetics and computer technology makes for relatively accurate forecasting.

The book's methodological approach may be illustrated by its treatment of demographic problems. Czyzowska devotes considerable space to the subject, because, as she stresses, 'accurate demographic prognoses — social, economic and biological — are the foundation for nearly all forecasting conceptions' (p. 51).

Biological forecasts reveal that the trend toward greater longevity will continue in Poland until the year 2000. Urban male life expectancy was 66.7 years in 1972, and is expected to rise to 71.3 in 2000.

For females the figures are 73.9 and 76.1 respectively. The decline of infant mortality will also continue. Demographers also predict a few unfavorable tendencies in 1971-90: the population growth rate will drop slightly, and the percentage of young people under 17 will decline, while the number of people of retirement age will rise (especially after 1980).

The book shows that under the socialist system with farsighted planning the ill effects of such tendencies may be reduced or even averted. For example, the state's demographic policy could effectively encourage a type of family that would maintain the generation balance, thus averting the aging of society. The rising numbers of aging and aged, on the other hand, necessitate measures for utilizing their vast store of experience and knowledge, and providing them with a broad enough range of occupations. Preparations should also be made for the expected decline in 1970-78 in the number of schoolchildren (by approximately 20 per cent). This must not catch the schools unaware.

The book stresses that social planning in socialist countries needs improving. Of considerable importance, the author says, is exchange of experience in the CMEA framework — elaboration of long-term forecasts in such areas as demography, education, leisure, and the like.

The book is a thorough piece of research and contains abundant factual material — figures, tables, etc.

T.W.

SETTING THE RECORD RIGHT

Pravda, organ of the CC CPSU, carried an article by Observer, 'In the Interests of Peace and Progress in the Middle East.' It draws attention to the frequent appearance in the Egyptian press of articles designed to cast aspersion on the Soviet Union and its Middle East policy, particularly vis-à-vis Egypt. These absolutely unsubstantiated statements, it says have not been rebuffed by Egypt's policy-makers who, knowing the real state of affairs, should have done so.

The Soviet Union has always built its relations with Egypt on the principled fundamental premises of its foreign policy, the article emphasizes. An irreconcilable attitude toward imperialism and colonialism, and consistent support of the national-liberation movement are components of that policy. Ever since the 1952 Egyptian revolution, the USSR has done everything dependent upon it to promote friendly contacts and all-round cooperation. The leaders of the new Egypt repeatedly indicated the importance of such cooperation in

assuring the country's genuinely independent development. 'The Soviet Union,' *Pravda* says, 'supported the Egyptian people at every stage of their just struggle for freedom and independence.'

Soviet-Egyptian relations were given a fresh impetus with the conclusion of the 1971 Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, which determined their main direction. The Treaty was a vivid expression of the close friendship, mutual support and mutual understanding that distinguish the Soviet Union's relations with progressive Arab states. *Pravda* exposes the charge made by some in Egypt that the treaty was all but imposed by the Soviet Union. The facts point the other way. There is this statement of President Sadat: 'We wanted this treaty, and we signed it, thereby adding new guarantees for the successful conclusion of our struggle. I wanted this treaty with the Soviet Union for the future of this and succeeding generations.'

Economic cooperation helped strengthen Egypt's political and economic independence. Economic contacts — and this is especially important — have contributed to the qualitative restructuring of the Egyptian economy, eliminating its one-dimensional pattern, the legacy of long years of colonial dependence. The Soviet Union has been assisting Egypt in the construction of 148 industrial enterprises, of which about 100 are already in operation. Among the major projects are the Aswan hydropower complex and the Helwan iron-and-steel combine. Nonetheless, there are some who, on the pages of certain Egyptian newspapers, are at pains to vilify the great projects carried out by the Soviet people for Egypt and the Egyptian people. 'Yet the authors of these lie-larded articles,' *Pravda* remarks, 'use the electric power generated at Aswan and eat the bread grown by the fellaheen on fields irrigated by the water of the Aswan reservoir.'

The most slanderous attacks and distortions are aimed at Soviet military assistance. The fact is deliberately forgotten that Egypt's armed forces were built up with the assistance of Soviet specialists, that it was with USSR assistance that Egypt's military potential was fully restored after the 1967 Israeli aggression, and that there was a steady flow of Soviet arms to Egypt and Syria in October 1973. The high quality of Soviet weapons was demonstrated on the battlefield. Since the October war the Soviet Union has been consistently promoting friendly military cooperation with Egypt in accordance with their agreements. 'But this,' *Pravda* stresses, 'is a two-way affair. Cooperation cannot develop if one side sets out to undermine it.'

The article recapitulates the Soviet position on the Middle East. In particular, the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community believe that intermediate measures are acceptable only as part of an overall settlement. The mechanism for that exists, the Geneva peace conference in its full composition. The USSR is against using

this mechanism 'merely as a screen for the approval of moves made outside the conference framework.'

Arab criticism of the recent Egyptian-Israeli agreement on partial withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai is one more convincing proof that the Soviet position accords with the vital interests of the Arab peoples. The Sinai agreement is 'being criticized precisely because under it Egypt gets back a tiny part of its territory, while the agreement blunts the question of liberating remaining occupied territory, nearly 90 per cent of Sinai, and the territory of other Arab states,' *Pravda* writes. The agreement is also a blow to the efforts to secure the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine. More, the introduction into the disengagement zone of U.S. personnel, as provided for by the agreement, adds a new element wrought with far-reaching dangerous consequences.

Conclusion of the agreement was bound to come as a blow to Arab unity, the article says. The blame for that does not lie with the Soviet Union, as some have tried to make out.

Attempts to undermine Soviet-Egyptian cooperation will not alter the Soviet Union's principled foreign policy, *Pravda* emphasizes. That policy aims not only at retaining everything good in relations between the two countries, but also at deepening these relations. The message the Soviet leaders addressed to the President of Egypt on the 23rd anniversary of the Egyptian revolution expressed the Soviet Union's readiness to continue to promote 'relations of close friendship and all-round fruitful cooperation between the USSR and the Arab Republic of Egypt on the basis of common interests in the fight against the designs of the forces of imperialism and aggression, for the peace, independence and social progress of the peoples.' *R.S.*

1. S. Zeyons, *La Revolution des femmes au coeur de l'Asie sovietique*, 1971, 183 pp.; M. Monod, *Deux ou trois choses que je sais de l'Union sovietique*, 1973, 217 pp.
2. J. Legrand, *Le choix mongol. De la feodalité au socialisme*. 1975. 287 pp.
3. A. Carrel, G. Fournial, *Cuba socialist de A à Z*. 1975. 281 pp.
4. G. Bouvard, P. Pellenq, *L'Enseignement en RDA*. 1973. 287 pp.
5. J. De Bonis, *En direct avec un dirigeant hongrois: Gyorgy Aczel*. 1975. 183 pp. The book was published in France and Hungary simultaneously. Its author is now Editor-in-Chief of *France Nouvelle*, the FCP weekly. The Socialism series includes *Culture and Socialist Democracy* by György Aczel (*Culture et democratie socialiste. Sur la politique culturelle hongroise*).
6. Democratic Union for the Defence of the Republic, a party of the ruling French bourgeoisie.
7. Jaime Gazmuri, *Aprender las lecciones del pasado para construir el futuro*. Chile, Ediciones Nueva Democracia, 1974. 63 pp.
8. *Chroniko tis Sinchronis Kypriakis Tragodias*. Nicosia, CC AKEL, 1975. 319 pp.
9. Oscar Ryan, *Tim Buck — A Conscience for Canada*. Toronto, 1975, 302 pp.
10. Tim Buck wrote, in particular, *30 Years. 1922-1952: The Story of the Communist Movement in Canada*.
11. Z. Czyzowska. *Spoleczny rozwoj Polski*. Warsaw, KiW, 1975, 334 pp.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Contents for 1975

(Numbers 1-12)

	No.	Page
FEATURES		
Arismendi, R. How victory was forged	5	15
Bagdash, Kh. International policy and national struggle of the Communists	10	10
Baryl, J. Agrarian policy in the interests of the people	9	22
Batmunkh, J. Dawn over Asia	8	3
Bilak, V. The general and the specific in revolution	1	20
Communique of Budapest Preparatory Meeting	2	3
Courtieu, P. Toward an alliance of the French people	2	15
Ebert, F. So that war shall never again start from German soil	4	4
Eskandari, I. In battle for independence	5	22
Frelek, R. Europe's new look	1	47
Gerns, W. The political instability of capitalism	10	22
Gierek, E. Great charter of peace in Europe	10	3
Ghioldi, R. Socialist democracy, an inspiring example	1	61
Grechko, A. The great victory and its lessons	3	3
Growing social contradictions and class struggles	2	34
Hänninen, O. Collaboration of Finland's working-class parties: experience and problems	2	25
Husak, G. Great landmark in world history	5	4
Ibrahim, B. A powerful bulwark against imperialism	3	21
Imperialism's 'powder-kegs'	4	38
Jaruzelski, W. The class role of the army in socialist society	7	16
Jespersen, K. The ideological struggle in the new European conditions	12	3
Jespersen, K. U.S. imperialism and the destinies of Western Europe	6	13

	No.	Page
Kashtan, W. Positive changes in the world and new possibilities in the revolutionary struggle	6	3
Kekkonen, U., Honecker, E., Menchinelli, A. The foundation for new relations in Europe	9	6
Korcak, J. Decisive factor of stability and progress in Europe	7	8
Laurent, P. The beginnings of a brighter future	3	17
Losonczy, P. Going along the Leninist road	4	13
Markowski, P. In the name of European peace and security	8	12
Mies, H. The October Revolution and our time	11	3
Mladenov, P. Socialist diplomacy is people's diplomacy	11	14
Muhammed, A. The socialist community is our dependable ally	1	53
Muhri, F. The main contradiction of contemporary capitalism	2	5
Muhyi Al-Din, Kh. The liberation struggle on the upgrade	5	37
Nemes, D. People's democracy; a form of transition to socialism	1	39
Norden, A. A decisive condition for victory	1	29
Ponomaryov, B. Socialism's role in the present-day world	1	4
Rashidov, S. The socialist way of life and national consciousness	9	9
Rossi, M. Neo-fascism in Italy	4	22
Schaffer, G. Opportunities for peace must not be lost	4	32
Scharf, E. Effective support in struggle	3	19
Scharf, E. Forces of peace and socialism on the offensive	12	11
Teitelboim, V. For the complete independence of our America	9	30
Thirtieth anniversary of the defeat of German fascism	4	3
	5	3
Thirty years of socialist progress	1	69
Tuominen, E. The correlation of parliamentary struggle and the mass movement	11	23
Venetsanopoulos, V., Wrebiak, T., Doig, M., Pittman, J., Sierra, S. The right to peace	9	3

	No.	Page
The victory in Vietnam and its international significance	7	3
Willard, G. Traditions of the Resistance live on	5	29
World War II in figures	5	49
THE PARTY		
Aliaga, S. Communist Party of Spain National Conference	12	31
Bejda, V. The scientific and technological revolution and the ideological front	10	107
Billoux, F. When we were ministers	8	59
Brief reports, Party news, etc.	3	140
	6	41
	7	143
Ciobanu, L. Women in public life	3	133
Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean	8	69
Costa, C. Decisive economic battle	8	30
Flavien, J. Topic of the day; the peasantry	4	90
In parliament and outside it. *Round-table discussion*	3	121
Jakab, S. The traditional and the new in cadre policy	7	33
Keuneman, P. The strength of Communist principles	12	20
Kossak, J. Democracy, ideology, creativity	5	80
Lamberz, W. Ideological work today	6	23
Lange, I. Active builders of the new life	12	37
Leinonen, R. Program for regional development	10	120
Marin, R. The masses will decide the outcome of the battle	12	25
The Marxist-Leninist Party of our time. Closing of the international exchange of opinions	5	70
Matthews, B. Theory throws light on the road of struggle	4	84
Milhau, J. Theoretical activity of the French Communist Party	9	96
Mosquera, A. Situation analysis and forms of struggle	10	114
Ovari, M. New stage in building developed socialism	8	21
Paredes, M.R. The Party begins with its basic unit, the nucleus	4	78
Pittman, J. American Communists on the ways of their country's progress	11	65

	No.	Page
Rao, C.R. Awareness of historical responsibility	5	59
Saarinen, A. The strategic aim of the Finnish Communists	9	93
Schmirgeld, J., Sudiman, S., Haba, A., Namsarai, Ts., Volkov, A. The communist alternative	8	41
Vasquez, P. Unity against the dictatorship	6	32
Venetsanopoulos, V. From underground to legal status .	8	66
Wettengel, R. Political maturity of Party cadres	11	76
Wolf, H. The vanguard of the working class and the dynamics of social development	2	84
Yata, A. A constructive national alliance program	7	26
Zaharescu, B. Program for comprehensively developed socialism	2	94

THEORY

Adamo, H. The old and the new in anti-communism ...	5	88
Characteristics of developed socialism. *International research team*	1	83
Chatain, J. The anti-monopoly alliance and small and medium business	10	101
Cogniot, G. Lessons of the First Revolution	7	77
Communists in the struggle for democratic unity. *International theoretical symposium*	6	45
	7	41
	8	73
The competition of the two world systems in the present stage. *International academic conference*	6	46
Dimitrov, D. Notes on the theory and policy of the Socialist International	9	82
Escala, A. The socio-political positions of the intelligentsia	11	58
Golebiewski, B. The intelligentsia and its future in socialist society	12	117
Hager, K. Marx's theoretical predictions and our time	3	91
Iscaro, R. Some problems of the revolutionary movement	5	96
Ivanov, K. The guiding force	1	98
Jaroszewski, T. Labor, the individual and creativity	9	51
Krolikowski, W. Socialism and the technological revolution	9	44
Mies, H. Mounting social conflicts in the FRG	4	44

	No.	Page
Müller, L., Macaluso, E., Panicidis, G., Kenny, R. The peasantry in the struggle for democracy and socialism	10	94
Ngouabi, M. Scientific socialism in Africa	5	105
Pastorino, E. In the vanguard of the anti-imperialist struggle	9	73
Pelachaud, G. 'Zero growth': ideology and politics	6	72
Perlo, V. U.S. decline and fight for living standards	4	54
The present-day problems of socialist democracy and its perspectives. *Theoretical conference*	2	41
	3	100
The problems and prospects of socialist democracy. *International theoretical conference*	1	81
Revolutionary democrats and the socialist orientation. *International research group discussion*	11	32
Rosales, J. Revolution, socialism, theology	6	80
Schleifstein, J., von Heiseler, J.H. Workers' class consciousness: level and trends	12	104
Sinha, I. The condition and revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry	11	48
Social progress and détente. *International research group*	9	58
Some aspects of capitalist development in Asian and African countries. *A WMR seminar*	12	96
The working class and its allies. *International Marxist discussion*	7	67
Zarodov, K. Leninism on consolidating the victory of the revolution	4	65
Zhivkova, L. Socialism and the cultural revolution	10	87

POLITICAL PANORAMA

Aalto, A. Reflections on the general election	12	42
Abdel-Samad, N. Tension persists	9	117
A.M., Dirjo, Perezagua, A. Letters to freedom	9	130
Aptheker, H. The class character of the American Revolution	7	100
Arafat, Y. The way to restoring the violated rights of the Palestinian people	2	123
Ashhab, N. The sights on realism	6	97
Avramova, B., Venetsanopoulos, V., Kadulin, V. Avante, Camarada, Avante!	3	57

	No.	Page
Balagtas, F. Trends of change in the Philippines	7	116
Bjarnason, E. The technological revolution and the labor movement	1	114
Braga, C. A 'miracle' propped up by U.S. bayonets	5	126
Burdzhalov, F. The crisis and the economic struggle of the working class	9	107
Calan, J. Peace linkup in space	9	106
Chandra, R. Jubilee of the fighters for peace	11	127
Collective security in Asia	6	108
Cook, D. Changes in the British student movement	5	115
Correia, A.N., Dansoko, A., V.R. Decolonization: gains and difficulties	9	123
Costa Gomes, F. We shall overcome our difficulties	1	108
Cunhal, A. Portugal's new road	3	23
Dadoo, Y. The crisis of Apartheid	2	104
Dansoko, A. The Socialist International and Africa	12	72
Dobrescu, E. Accumulation policy and the living standard in Rumania	11	103
Edelman, F., Brown, F., Kabrhelova, M., Reddy, T., Blinova, Y. Women in the fight for peace and security	10	69
Fazio, H. The dark night will end	5	128
Gonzalez, B. New trends in rural Panama	6	124
Gonzalez, J. Against the dictatorship	4	97
Graber, M. Unequal partnership	10	61
A great alliance. *An interview*	1	111
Hadjeres, S. From liberation front to construction front	1	127
Ismail, A.F. The dawn of revolution	4	104
Jagan, C. Political flexibility, ideological implacability	12	55
J.B. Another battle won. Letter from Uruguay	7	114
Khenin, D. For a policy of reason	2	114
Krasniewski, J., Murai, G., Rudenko, I. Students in the new world	6	114
Krishnan, N.K. A sharp turn	10	33
Lagadinova, Y. The status of women — a criterion of social progress	7	108
Letters	8	139
Lhamsuren, B. Let the facts speak	12	93
Lopez, J. The people of Spain: on strike	4	119
L.S. Anti-communism, weapon of counter-revolution	10	53

	No.	Page
Lumer, H. Some features of U.S. capitalist development	12	62
Magnuson, B. Trade unions and independence of Canada	12	77
Millas, O., Almeyda, C., Teplizky, B., Garreton, O., Parra, B., Vega, J.E. Chile: fascism will be overthrown	10	44
Millas, O. From economic subversion to fascist putsch	11	95
Murray, A. Scotland and the national problem in Britain	3	47
New trends in socialist farming. *A collective report*	11	111
Nguyen Dinh Chi. All peace-loving forces are with us	1	125
Nguyen Ngoc Thuong, Sidphasay, N. Triumph of fortitude, courage and solidarity	11	88
Padilla, L., Sanchez, O. Marching toward the future	11	83
Papaioannou, E. For a sovereign and united Cyprus	3	29
Papaioannou, E. For solution of the Cyprus problem	10	57
Perceval, L. The crisis of capitalism and the environment	11	131
Petrusenko, V. Road of revolutionary achievement	8	120
Pittman, J. From cradle of bourgeois freedoms to state-monopoly capitalism	7	97
Prado, J. del. Decisive stage of the revolution	8	111
Prestes, L.C. New serious threat to world peace	12	48
Prazsky, J. Détente and its opponents	8	134
Prazsky, J. The problem of crisis and war today	3	85
Prazsky, J. Realities of the times and imperialist policy	6	129
Prazsky, J. Victory of reason and relapses of recklessness	10	81
Sabolcik, M. Price policy under socialism	3	38
Samad, N. Tension persists	9	117
Silva, K.P. Fighting the crisis; the pressing task	5	135
Tambo, O. Faith in victory	12	87
Touma, E. The limits of 'partnership' in U.S.-Israeli relations	6	91
Tran Trong Quat. With trust in peace and détente	2	132
Velasco Alvarado, J. The revolutionary process, independence and international relations	2	121

	No.	Page
Vieira, G. The masses in motion	7	87
Weis, G. Unprincipled alliance	4	113
Yar, E. The position of women	1	123
Zapirain, L. Terror — the last resort of Francoism	11	91
Zhukov, E. A symbol of political awareness	6	105

THE PRESS

Behr, O. CMEA and raw materials prices	5	139
Brion, E. The fate of moral values	6	136
Brion, E. Valid lessons of history	2	138
Brion, E. Who enjoys Peking's support?	12	127
Doig, M. Life story of a happy man	12	128
Doig, M. A man's choice	6	138
Fazio, H. Using past experience in today's struggle	12	124
Gur, L. The future belongs to socialism	12	123
Hajek, F. Essential for progress	7	132
Lenin's doctrine of the press in action	4	123
Lernis, G. The just cause of Cyprus will prevail	12	128
Mileikovsky, A. New prescriptions, old maladies	7	124
Modzelewski, E. The purpose of human activity	2	136
Mosquera, A. Political posters in Colombia	6	142
New books	6	139
	7	137
O.B. A great and radiant goal	12	126
O.L. The leading force of society	2	134
O.L. No island of Utopia	5	141
The Party press	7	139
Pittman, J. The colonialist today	6	134
Pittman, J. A festering wound	7	134
Richta, R. Confused prophets	10	132
R.S. Setting the record right	12	131
The 75th anniversary of Lenin's *Iskra*	11	139
T.W. The potentialities of scientific forecasting	12	130
Vinogradov, V., Igritsky, Y., Shkarenkov, L. The inertia of bias	9	137
WMR circulation year 1974	1	139
Yegorov, A., Heyden, G. Immortal revolutionary doctrine	10	126

	No.	Page
FACTS AND FIGURES		
Brief information about Communist and Workers' Parties		
African Independence Party of Senegal	6	39
Communist Party of Turkey	6	38
Dominican Communist Party	6	40
League of Communists of Yugoslavia	10	141
Nicaraguan Socialist Party	7	141
Sudanese Communist Party	7	140
Syrian Communist Party	10	142
Tunisian Communist Party	10	143
United Party of Hatian Communists	7	142
Dashichev, V., Sluch, S. Reality versus preconceptions	3	41
IN MEMORIAM		
Huberto Alvarado	2	142
Jacques Duclos	6	141
Rajani Palme Dutt	2	142

DEAR FRIENDS,
THE EDITORIAL BOARD, EDITORIAL COUNCIL AND MULTINATIONAL STAFF OF *WORLD MARXIST REVIEW* SEND YOU THEIR BEST NEW YEAR WISHES.

Latin America in the Struggle against Imperialism, for National Independence, Democracy, People's Welfare, Peace and Socialism

Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, Havana, June, 1975. Foreward by **Henry Winston**. Assessment of conditions in Latin American countries, perspectives for revolutionary struggles, significance of the development of socialism in Cuba, relation to world revolutionary forces, positive role of the Soviet Union, importance of international Communist unity, condemnation of betrayal by the Chinese leadership.

56 pages 40¢

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

205 West 19th Street — 9th Floor — New York, NY 10011
INCLUDE 20¢ POSTAGE ON ORDERS UNDER $2.00
PREPAY ALL ORDERS IN U.S. DOLLARS
COMPLETE CATALOG ON REQUEST

30 Years

THE STORY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN CANADA 1922-1952

by Tim Buck

Reprint of the 1952 edition.
With a new introduction by William Kashtan
224 pages Paperback $3.95

Progress Books
487 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada. 368-5336

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WO1X 8PS, England.

Progress Subscription Service
487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, M5V IT4, Canada.

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism, 5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi 55, India.

FRENCH EDITIONS:

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et d'Information, 9 Boulevard des Italiens, 75 Paris 2e, France.

Librairie Rousseau, 36 rue J.-J. Rousseau, Genève, Suisse.

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières, 96 ouest, rue Sherbrooke, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

Librairie du Monde Entier, 162 rue du Midi, Bruxelles, Belgique.

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

Dar Hilal, 16 Mohamed Iz Al-Arab St., Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt.

ETH-Thagafa el-Jadida, Al-Tahrir Square, Bagdad, Iraq.

BENGALI EDITION: Manisha Granthalay Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee St., Calcutta 12, India.

BULGARIAN EDITION: 'Russki' 6, 'Hemus', Sofia, Bulgaria.

CZECH EDITION: Artia, Praha 2, Nové Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden, Brodgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark.

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

GERMAN EDITIONS:

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

'Globus', Vertrieb ausländischer Zeitschriften 1200 Wien, Hochstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb Zürich, 8004 Zürich, Cramerstrasse 2/Ecke Zweierstrasse, Switzerland.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITION: Papajanis Stephanos, Emanuil Benaki 25-6° Athens, Greece.

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace and Socialism, P.O.B. 9525, Haifa, Israel.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI, Ajay Bhawan, Patna 4, India.

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

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via della Botteghe, Oscura 4, 001 86 Roma, Italy.

JAPANESE EDITION: Nauka Ltd. 2, Kandu Zinbocho 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbatar Mongol Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I. Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715, Oslo 1, Norway.

POLISH EDITION: RSW, 'Prasa-ksiazka-ruch' BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional, Av. Santos Dumont, 57, 2° Lisboa-I, Portugal.

PUNJABI EDITION: Punjab Book Centre, 1038 Sector 22-B, opp. General Bus Stand, Chandigarh, India.

RUMANIAN EDITION: I.C.E. 'Libri', Calea Victoriei 126, Bucaresti, Rumania.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, Smolenskaya-Sennaya 32/34, Moscow 121200, USSR.

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo. Apt. Aereo 1253, Bogotà, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A. Filosofia y Letras 34, Copilco Universidad, Mexico 20, D.F. Mexico.

Ideologia y Politica, Fr Rufino Torrico N° 671-Of. 401, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracás, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Editorial 'Anteo,' Entre Rios 103³, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panamá, Rep. de Panamá.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

TURKISH EDITION: 1 Berlin 10, Postfach 100 229, West Berlin.

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp khâu Sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi, Democratic Republic of Vietnam.