WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

May 1976, Vol. 19, No. 5 75¢

Migrant workers /136

Whither U.S. foreign policy? /88

Interviews with African leaders /68

Significance of 25th Congress CPSU /3

The fight for land in Portugal /39

Free Angel Soler! /59

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD Problems of MARXIST Peace and Socialism REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

May 1976, Vol. 19, No. 5

Features

3 International significance of the 25th CPSU Congress
B.N. Ponomaryov

18 The working class in the anti-imperialist alliance
R. Arismendi

31 Spring will come into its own
B. Sinclair

Party experience

39 The fight for land, part of the revolution
A. Gervasio

49 Socialist society's spiritual potential
H-J Hoffmann

59 Terror cannot stop the march of history
R. Marin, R. Arismendi, J. Colle, V. Teitelboim, E. Mancera

Viewpoints

68 The goal: a society without exploitation
M. Siad Barre, F. Mendes, J-P Gombe, Delegations of TANU and Afro-Shirazi Parties, G. Rabesahala

88 Whither U.S. foreign policy at the Bicentenary?
H. Winter

95 Against the interests of the Arab peoples
A. Haba

97 Trade as a factor for peace and social progress
A. Barcak

Comment

106 The problem of power in the transition period
Z. Karkabi

114 On the ideological evolution of Maoism
G. Girginov

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

The press

Book reviews

123 The biography of a class
L. Din

126 U.S. professor vs. Academician Sakharov
A. Toll

Facts and figures

131 What the five-year plan gave the Soviet citizen

136 Migrant workers in capitalist Europe
M. Shneider

Notes on international organizations

139 Women's International Democratic Federation
F. Edelman

141 World Federation of Trade Unions
E. Pastorino

143 A break with the Maoist past

144 Political posters and visual propaganda of the CP USA
J. Pittman

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

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada.

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

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $6.00 a year. Single copies 75 cents. Overseas $9.50.

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

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

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

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

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



International significance of the 25th CPSU Congress

Boris Ponomaryov
Alternate Member of PB and
Secretary of CC, CPSU

The 25th Congress of the CPSU met at a point when mankind had reached an important frontier in its historical development. This is largely the result of the successes of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, the marked progress in assuring peace and preventing a thermonuclear world war. Socialism has considerably strengthened its positions. The anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist struggle of the laboring masses has gained in intensity. The authority and militancy of the working class has grown. Many Communist parties and other democratic forces have made significant progress. The gains of the national-liberation movement have widened the scope of revolutionary-democratic transformations in dozens of countries.

Today the connection between world progress and the Soviet Union's steady advance to communism is more obvious than ever.

This found special expression in the militant spirit of proletarian internationalism that pervaded the Congress and in the enthusiasm with which the delegates of Lenin's Party welcomed their comrades in the fight for our common lofty and noble aims. For the Soviet Communists this was, in a way, an encounter with millions of friends from all parts of the world, from North America to New Zealand, from Scandinavia to South Africa. The fraternal delegations could feel the steady and strong pulse of the Soviet Union. And they took away from the Congress a graphic picture of what our Leninist Party and the Soviet people achieved in the past five years and of the great tasks ahead. They told the Congress of their own work, problems and struggles, often waged in the most difficult conditions. This panorama of the international revolutionary movement revealed its immense richness, multiformity and irrepressible dynamism.

The whole world commented on the calm confidence and substantiated optimism of the Central Committee report delivered by the Party's General Secretary, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev. This outstanding Party document gave an interpretative generalization of the manifold and complex problems the Party is solving. The profound examina-

tion of problems in which not only the Soviet people, but the people everywhere, have a keen interest; the combination of practical solutions with their theoretical substantiation; examination of the pressing tasks of building communism in their broad international context, in their bearing on the work of consolidating the positions of world socialism, in the general context of the struggle for international peace and security, for social progress — all this combined to give the Congress a truly international tone and significance.

The 25th CPSU Congress was a demonstration of the Soviet people's achievements *in all fields of communist construction*. As L.I. Brezhnev noted, the ninth five-year plan was unparalleled in terms of absolute growth of industrial output, investment and scope of social program. The USSR now holds first place in the world in output not only of coal, iron ore and cement, but also in steel, oil, mineral fertilizers and certain other items.

The basic socio-economic targets have been reached. This applies, above all, to the main goal set by the 24th CPSU Congress, viz., raising the people's living standards. Per capita real incomes are up by nearly one-fourth. Grants and other benefits out of public funds are up 40 per cent. Housing conditions have been improved for 56 million people.

'*Under the leadership of the Communist Party,*' the Central Committee report emphasized, '*a new and long step was made in the ninth five-year plan period in building the material and technical basis of communism, in raising living standards and assuring the country's security.*'

All this is eloquent evidence of the strength and social health of the Soviet system, of its limitless opportunities, its ability to solve the most complex economic and scientifico-technical problems in the interests of the working people.

What are the reasons for this uninterrupted growth of the Soviet economy from year to year, from decade to decade? Why is the Soviet economy free of recessions, crises, inflation, monetary upheavals, bankruptcies, unemployment, and all the other things that are part of the capitalist system?

The advantages of the Soviet economy are rooted in the very nature of socialist society. Economic development, its orientation, pace and proportions, are determined not by monopolies fighting cutthroat competition to maximize their profits, but by the socialist state, which expresses the interests of the people. And guided by these interests, the CPSU and the Soviet government see to it that the publicly-owned means of production are used in the most rational and effective way. The striving for constant perfection, to have things go better and better, keep the economic and socio-political mechanism

working at top efficiency in the interests of all the working people — this is an inherent feature of the Communist Party and the socialist system, which has but one aim, the people's well-being.

Both in the reports to the Congress and in the speeches of delegates representing 15.5 million Soviet Communists, there was the firm conviction that the targets of the new, 10th five-year plan will be attained. In discussing what had been accomplished and what still had to be done, the delegates spoke in businesslike tones and with a strong sense of responsibility.

The assignments of the 10th five-year plan, formulated in the Central Committee report and in the report presented by Comrade A.N. Kosygin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the Main Guidelines of USSR Economic Development in 1976-80, take into account the more long-range perspectives and continue the line worked out at the 24th Congress.

This implies, above all, further improvement of prosperity standards, better working and living conditions, substantial progress in public health, education and culture — in all things that help to form the new man, further improve the socialist way of life and multiply the country's economic potential. The 10th five-year plan centers on higher efficiency and quality. The Party is giving priority to all-round acceleration of scientific and technical progress and higher productivity.

Such, in substance, is the Party's economic strategy in conditions of developed socialism, as determined by the 25th CPSU Congress.

The past five years have seen *impressive achievements and victories of world socialism* won by the joint efforts of the fraternal socialist countries. Addressing our Congress, their leaders stressed that the decisive precondition for these achievements was and remains the inviolable militant alliance of the Communist Parties of the socialist states. This alliance is the earnest of the continued development of the socialist world, which has become an irreversible reality of our era.

The advantages of socialism stand out saliently against the background of the deepening general crisis of capitalism, now in the throes of the most serious economic upheavals since the war. It is no exaggeration to say that never before has the superiority of socialism over capitalism, a system based on profit, exploitation and oppression, been so glaringly clear. The superiority of our planned economy over the capitalist, and of the socialist forms of the organization of society over the bourgeois, has become more obvious still. This largely explains the growing interest in recent years of the broad popular masses in socialism.

The attraction of socialism is now determined by the great role it

plays in world development. The socialist community is doing everything to spare mankind the menace of world war, and is paving the way to a new pattern of international relations based on respect of national sovereignty and equal cooperation. Peoples fighting for freedom and independence can rely on it. As Comrade Fidel Castro declared at the Congress: 'The objective facts are demonstrating with increasing eloquence that universal peace, human progress and socialism are all interconnected.'

The 25th CPSU Congress is one more historic proof of the invincibility of Marxism-Leninism. Everything the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries have achieved would have been inconceivable without the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory. It provides the only correct understanding of the laws and perspectives of social development, making it possible confidently to steer our course in highly complex situations, choose the right road and optimal methods of political action.

There is no other theory, and this has been confirmed by many decades of practice, for refashioning the world in the interests of the working people and for the building of socialism, that new society free of exploitation and oppression. There have been, and still exist, dozens of reformist 'models' of socialism and diverse 'sociological' concepts, but there is not a single country where they have rid the people of the evils of capitalism and have built a socialist society. Diverse leftist adventuristic 'theories' have likewise met an ignominious end. One example of that is the evolution of Maoism, which has led the Chinese people away from the highroad of building socialism and has plunged the country into the chaos of voluntarist 'leaps,' 'cultural revolutions,' a fierce internecine struggle and, on the international scene, has placed China side by side with the most rabid reactionary forces.

All the voguish talk about Marxism-Leninism having become 'obsolete' is refuted by the triumphant march of the new world, of the revolutionary forces. They are scoring successes precisely because they are guided by the theory of scientific socialism.

Those who try to present Marxism-Leninism as a collection of dogmas are wasting their efforts. The dynamism of Soviet society and of the socialist community proves the very opposite. The strength of Marxism-Leninism, the 25th CPSU Congress emphasized, lies in its uninterrupted creative development. That is why it is a reliable basis for the advance of socialism, socialist revolution. The 25th Congress set an example of creative approach to pressing social problems and furnished new and convincing proof of the universal applicability of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's report

and other Congress materials represent an important contribution to the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

The 25th Congress demonstrated the strength and grandeur of Lenin's Party, which expresses the will of the working class and of the entire people and is their political leader. By consistently following the Leninist norms of Party life and implementing the 24th Congress decisions, our Party has become stronger still; the action-ability of its organization has heightened, and the activity and initiative of its membership have increased. One of the most remarkable features of the Congress was the way it showed the work of literally all levels of the Party, from the Political Bureau and CC Secretariat to primary Party units. And that is only natural, for the Party's leading role is materialized in the activities of Party organizations at all levels and with the active participation of its cadres and all Party members. This enables the Party to take account of and represent the multi-faceted interests of all strata of society, all groups of working people, all nationalities of the Soviet Union. The Party's strength and authority stems from its close unity with the people, from their boundless confidence in the Party, its ability to provide constant and effective leadership in every sphere of public life.

The Congress devoted special attention to the key factor of Party leadership, the *Leninist style of work*. This, L.I. Brezhnev said, implies 'a creative, scientifically grounded approach to all social processes, an approach totally alien to subjectivism. It presupposes exacting demands to oneself and others, rules out complacency and combats all manifestations of bureaucracy and formalism.'

Foreign Communists attending the Congress were greatly impressed, as was also world public opinion, by the fact that criticism and self-criticism had such an important part in the proceedings. There was frank, direct discussion of shortcomings, unsolved problems, everything that is hampering the Soviet people's still faster advance to communism. And all this was discussed against a background of tremendous achievement in communist construction. This sober, critical approach to every aspect of our work is a Bolshevik tradition, a law for the entire Party, an inalienable feature of the Leninist style of Party leadership. 'All the revolutionary parties that have perished so far,' Lenin said, 'perished because they became conceited, because they failed to see the source of their strength and feared to discuss their weaknesses. We, however, shall not perish, because we are not afraid to discuss our weaknesses and will learn to overcome them' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 33, p. 311).

And true to Lenin's behests, the CPSU is constantly working to center criticism on the very substance of our work, so that it helps our advance. The purpose of criticism and self-criticism, as the 25th

Congress emphasized, is objective appraisal of all aspects of the work of one or another organization, one or another cadre, so that shortcomings are comprehensively analyzed and removed, so that confidence in and respect for our cadres go hand in hand with exacting demands.

Socialist humanism, in its many aspects, was comprehensively discussed at the Congress. Socialism is a collectivist system and its humanism is humanism for millions of working people. This is expressive of the very essence of socialism, which liberates man from exploitation and all manifestations of oppression, of lack of confidence in the future, of alienation and separation, of the need to serve as cannon fodder in the aggressive gambles of imperialism and reaction. Socialist society is doing everything to help man to feel that he is never left to the mercy of fate, that he lives in an atmosphere of good will, surrounded by the solicitude of the state, society, the collective and his comrades.

Embodied in the 25th Congress documents is our Party's unfailing fidelity to the Leninist principle that genuine democracy is impossible without socialism, just as socialism is impossible without the constant development of democracy. The anti-communists are now concentrating their attacks on our political system. They are seeking to prove that under socialism economic and social progress is not accompanied by the development of democracy, or even involves restriction of political freedoms.

The experience of the socialist countries clearly shows that all such assertions are totally unfounded. Without day-to-day and conscious creative effort by the masses, without their active participation in the affairs of state, our country would never have scored its present achievements in the economic, cultural or other fields. It was the socialist revolution that ushered in an era of genuine popular rule and made the mass of the population, the people headed by the working class, the master of the country, responsible for its present and future. It has given every honest worker the opportunity to acquire human dignity, become a full-fledged citizen of a state in which 'labor rules supreme.'

Socialist democracy is, above all, an instrument of social development in the interests of socialism, the people. As L.I. Brezhnev stated at the Congress: 'For us democracy means everything that serves the interests of the people, the interests of building communism.'

The Congress documents, its preparation and its proceedings demonstrated anew that development of socialist democracy is always in the center of the Party's attention. The new USSR Constitution will be a big forward step in this respect.

Taking an overall view of the international significance of the

CPSU's accumulated experience in building socialism and communism, we can say:

— the CPSU's experience, open and available to all, contains in a concentrated and generalized form the essence and living image of mature socialism;

— it includes the main principles, based on Marxism-Leninism and tested in practice of building a society free of exploitation and oppression;

— this experience confirms the constantly growing role, in the process of socialist construction, of the Communist Party, the supreme political organization of the working class and all working people;

— it proves that the growing activity of the masses, their active, conscious transformative constructive effort is an indispensable condition for building socialism and communism;

— the CPSU experience convincingly shows that success can be scored only by consistently combining national and international tasks, only by ably and correctly applying the common laws of the struggle for socialism and socialist transformations to the concrete conditions of the given country.

The 25th CPSU Congress is a new and important contribution to the political and theoretical experience of the Leninist Party. It demonstrated to the entire world the great vitality of the Marxist-Leninist theory of building socialism and communism.

The 25th CPSU Congress forcefully reaffirmed the Soviet Union's stable, consistent and clear Leninist policy of peace. It follows from the very nature of socialism, embodies the vital interests of the masses, the working people, who do not need war. That is why Soviet foreign policy is not dependent on any transitory circumstances and does not know conjunctural fluctuations, whether election campaigns or any other circumstances. It is a stable and powerful factor in preserving peace, preventing thermonuclear war and assuring international security. Progressive opinion the world over, as indicated by the wide response to the Congress, feels that the foreign policy so clearly defined by the 25th CPSU Congress is in the interest of the whole of mankind.

No one can now refute the fact that the Soviet Peace Program has in the five years since the 24th Congress wrought new and fundamentally important changes in world affairs. The cold war has had to give way to détente, and explosive confrontations are being replaced, despite imperialist resistance, by cooperation between states with different social systems, on the principles of peaceful coexistence. The socialist countries now enjoy more favorable international conditions to continue their peaceful construction, and all the peoples enjoy

more favorable conditions to strengthen their security and uphold their independence.

Thanks to the persevering and purposeful efforts of the Soviet Union and also of other fraternal countries and the democratic forces in the West, it was possible, in the course of preparing and carrying out the Conference on European Security and Cooperation, to overcome the resistance of the bourgeois circles and groups that tried to sidetrack the Conference from its basic tasks. As a result, the Conference became an important event not only for Europe, for it helped to diminish the menace of world war and strengthen the principle of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union's foreign policy, its irrefutable and obvious achievements, have dealt a telling blow to anti-communism and have seriously undermined the myth of Soviet 'aggressiveness.' World public opinion has come to realize that 'socialism and peace are indivisible.'

At the same time, in L.I. Brezhnev's report and speeches by delegates and guests, attention was drawn to the fact that, though the positions of the more reactionary and bellicose circles have weakened, and though their opportunities to conduct a 'positions-of-strength' policy have diminished, universal peace is by no means guaranteed and the danger of world war has not been removed.

The facts bear that out. The imperialist arms drive continues, with the result that the nuclear arsenal of the imperialist countries is two million times greater than the atom bomb the U.S. dropped on Hiroshima. Imperialism is working as never before to perfect its war machine. New nuclear bombs, new aircraft, new tanks, new missiles — all this betokens the emergence of more modern and more powerful means of mass annihilation, capable of the most monstrous destruction. This buildup of destructive weapons continues to poison the international atmosphere and presents a constant danger to the successes achieved in détente.

The military budgets of the countries of the aggressive NATO bloc continue to increase. Tens of billions of dollars, marks, pounds, francs go into guns and bombs, millions of working people are deprived not only of their piece of butter, but also of their piece of bread, and the already inadequate appropriations for education and public health are used up too. The continuing militarization of Western countries is one of the causes of inflation, monetary upheavals and growing consumer goods prices.

All sorts of extreme right-wing, anti-communist groups have lately been stepping up their pressure on the policy of Western countries. Fear of the gains of real socialism and other democratic and liberation forces is causing confusion in imperialist political centers. One hears

the most contradictory things from there: promises to adhere to the policy of easing international tensions, and cold war threats; protestations of readiness to negotiate, and calls for a military buildup as a means of diktat and intimidation.

All this shows that the nature of imperialism is unchanged, as the 25th Congress stressed. Imperialism is responsible for the fact that preparations for a new world war have not yet been stopped. To end this waste of forces and means, which runs counter to common sense, is beyond the understanding of any normal person and is fraught with a disastrous thermonuclear conflict, means solving the most important and most pressing problem of all.

This was the keynote of the foreign policy program which L.I. Brezhnev put forward in the CC Report to the 25th Congress. In the present international situation, which cannot but cause concern, the 'Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples' is like a sunbeam illuminating the road — the only correct one today — leading away from the threat of nuclear war to a lasting, genuinely democratic peace. Written in the annals of our age are slogans that appeal to the hearts of all men on earth and call for active effort to:

— stop the arms race;
— end all nuclear weapons tests;
— ban and destroy chemical weapons;
— prevent the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction;
— reduce military expenditures;
— conclude a world treaty banning the use of force in international relations.

The proposals of the 25th Congress were fully supported by the representatives of more than 100 Communist and national democratic parties. This is the authoritative voice of the world communist and liberation movement. Communists carry aloft the banner of peace and call for unity under this banner of all who do not want wars of extermination and realize that a trend of development fraught with endless military confrontations is entirely impermissible.

The thoroughly realistic proposals of the 25th Congress for an end to the arms race, for the banning of nuclear tests and for all states, including the Soviet Union, to reduce their military budgets are perceived with trust also because they come from a country whose defense power is indisputable and which has never sought unilateral advantages. The Soviet Union insists, as everyone knows, on concrete disarmament measures based on strict adherence to the principle of equal security.

The activity of opponents of détente and the stepped-up efforts of

those who expect to use the present situation in capitalist countries for reactionary purposes make it imperative for the peoples themselves, for the broadest masses, to influence also foreign policy in still more organized fashion and more resolutely than ever. The international situation imperatively demands increased activity on the part of the workers, peasants, salary-earners, people active in science and culture, men and women of different views and convictions, all who are willing to say an emphatic 'no' to a new war and a resolute 'yes' to peace and international security. Dissemination of the ideas and proposals of the 25th Congress will doubtlessly energize their struggle.

Closer unity and cooperation among fraternal socialist countries is a key provision of the foreign policy program of the 25th Congress. Our Party has always followed this line and will do so in future. A strong and closely knit socialist community is a most important factor in increasing the joint contribution of real socialism to a durable peace.

Our Party declared at its 25th Congress that the focus is now on the whole range of problems of materializing détente and of reducing, and ultimately removing, the threat of world war. The provision of international conditions ruling out the possibility of a world war would be greatly facilitated by solution of such problems as eliminating the remaining seats of tension, first of all by settling the Middle East crisis on a fair basis; completely removing all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression and destroying seats of colonialism and racism; abolishing discrimination, removing all artificial obstacles to international trade and doing away with every manifestation of inequality, diktat or exploitation in international economic relations.

There are those in the West who try to make bilateral and multilateral cooperation between East and West serve their selfish political aims and to use it for interfering in the internal affairs of socialist countries. The 25th Congress gave a fitting rebuff to such attempts. The CPSU has always maintained that international cooperation should become an instrument of peace and progress. This is why the Soviet Union favors maximum use of the whole complex of agreements and treaties concluded between socialist and capitalist countries in the previous period. This applies, first and foremost, to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. To refuse to go any further in Europe would mean not only failing to use the real opportunity of transforming it into a continent of peace and peaceful coexistence, but also encouraging those who would like to call into question what has already been accomplished.

The new proposals advanced by the 25th CPSU Congress indicate a realistic way out of the impasse into which mankind is being driven

by the imperialist policy of war preparations, arms race and confrontation. Imperialism and its defenders and accomplices have nothing to oppose to the theses contained in the proposals of the 25th Congress. They simply continue to harp on what they call the 'Soviet menace.' Yet the General Secretary of the CC CPSU has said for all to hear that there is no such menace, that it is non-existent. And this is confirmed by the entire content of Soviet foreign and home policy. The CC Report sets out the Soviet position on relations with countries of every part and every region of the globe. The CPSU proceeds from the underlying idea of Soviet foreign policy, which is to maintain and promote peace and foster equal and mutually beneficial cooperation in the interests of the peoples of all countries. The Soviet Union's commitment to peace is clearly expressed in its far-reaching, long-range plans of constructive effort in building a communist society in our country.

The timeliness, fullness and constructive nature of the foreign policy program of the Congress and its peace aims are beyond question. The proposals contained in it cut the ground from under the feet of those who persist in demanding a buildup of armaments.

The 25th Congress re-emphasized that the Soviet Union wants peace based on strict, bona fide and universal respect for the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between states. Such a peace is an important condition for the progress of mankind, for it safeguards the sovereign right of every people to shape its future freely, without outside interference.

The deeper the roots of détente, the more frequently the class enemy tries to interpret peaceful coexistence as a form of freezing social and economic processes, or, in other words, as a form of preserving the social status quo. A massive anti-Soviet campaign has been going on in the West in recent months, especially since the eve of the 25th Congress. Its purpose is to 'prove' that the Soviet Union is using détente as a means of 'communist expansion.' This blackmail, organized on a large scale, is intended to force the Soviet Union and other socialist countries into renouncing the class principles of their ideology and policy in the name of détente and recognizing the 'right' of imperialism to interfere in the affairs of other countries, its 'right' to 'export counter-revolution.' The CPSU emphatically rejects this interpretation of peaceful coexistence. It has always held that revolutionary changes can be neither stopped nor imposed. There is no abolishing the objective laws of history, the development laws of human society.

The realistic character and force of the foreign policy line of the 25th Congress are based on the solid foundation of what has been won in carrying out the Peace Program. 'And while world peace has by no

means been guaranteed as yet,' L.I. Brezhnev stressed at the Congress, 'we have every reason to say with confidence that the healthier international climate we now have is convincing evidence that achieving durable peace is not a pious wish but a perfectly realistic task. To accomplish it, we can and must work on, sparing no effort.' These words, hailed both by Congress delegates and guests, expressed the will, resolve and readiness of our Party to persevere in its Leninist peace policy.

The 25th Congress fully revealed in breadth and depth the problem of the main trend of world development in the light of the results attained by the two worlds, the two opposed social systems — socialism and capitalism — at the threshold of the last quarter of this century. The CC Report and the speeches of delegates and guests showed very clearly that the analysis of the development prospects of modern society made by the 24th CPSU Congress and the 1969 International Meeting has been fully confirmed.

The past five years have been a period of steady progress of the socialist countries, of their confident advance to communism via developed socialist society. In these years the world revolutionary process has grown in scope and strength. It has now become more obvious than ever that only socialism can and does solve the social and universal problems of the 20th century.

Furthermore, developments over the past five years have shown once again that the capitalist system is historically doomed. Who today can seriously entertain illusions about the possibility of delivering capitalism from crisis upheavals, from its crying evils and contradictions? Even bourgeois leaders, 'the powers that be,' admit the extraordinary depth and comprehensive nature of the current crisis. They admit it but do not know, and hence cannot propose, any real way out of the social impasse into which bourgeois society has been driven by the ruling class and the political parties expressing its interests.

It is the Communists who make a scientific analysis of the causes of the crisis and explicitly answer the question of how it can be dealt with. They can make this analysis and give this answer because they proceed from the general laws of social development and transformation, which determine the fundamental unity of their struggle for the working people's interests, despite the immense variety of its concrete forms. 'These laws,' says the CC Report to the 25th Congress, 'which are reflected in Marxist-Leninist theory and have been confirmed by practice, were collectively formulated in detail by international meetings of brother parties. A deep understanding of these general laws and reliance on them, in combination with a creative approach and consideration of the actual conditions in the country

concerned, have been and remain a characteristic of Marxist-Leninists.'

The struggle against right- and 'left'-wing revisionism, against attempts to distort or undermine the Marxist-Leninist foundations of the communist movement, is a common cause of the brother parties. Many delegates and foreign guests spoke of this at the Congress. L.I. Brezhnev's statement that Maoist ideology and policy are not only incompatible with Marxist-Leninist teachings, but are directly hostile to them, found a widespread positive response among the foreign guests.

The CC Report and speeches by foreign delegates produced a comprehensive evaluation of the successes of the international working-class, communist and national-liberation movements. They pointed out that the joint anti-imperialist action program of the 1969 meeting has been largely carried out. In the past five years, many brother parties have appreciably reinforced their ranks and have expanded and strengthened their mass basis. In a number of countries, including Italy, France, India, Finland and Portugal, the Communists' positions are so strong that no important problem of political or social development can be solved without regard to their opinion or contrary to the interests of the masses following them.

At the 25th Congress, many comrades from brother parties stressed that the complexity of the situation in which the parties are now operating makes it necessary to take particularly careful account of such important principles as Marxist-Leninist substantiation of their policy, consistency in mass ideological and organizing work, the international significance and implications of their actions, a deep understanding of the essence of national problems and of their connection with overall international development. A correct approach to these questions will help to ensure that the devotion and enthusiasm of Communist parties and the strength and readiness for struggle of the masses following them produce maximum results in the interests of the working class and of social progress.

A major subject of the 25th CPSU Congress, one that permeated the discussion of international and all other questions, was proletarian internationalism, effective Communist solidarity. The speeches of fraternal delegates stressed that unity of Marxist-Leninist parties is an inexhaustible source of their political and moral power, of their influence and prestige.

It is no accident that bourgeois propaganda is trying to hold up as a bogey the great slogan of internationalism under which the communist movement came into being and has been developing. When some parties advance and uphold this slogan, bourgeois propaganda raises a hue and cry about their alleged claim to hegemony and their

so-called attempts to subordinate the interests of some parties to those of others. And when the same slogan is upheld by other parties, bourgeois propaganda accuses them of renouncing their autonomy and independence and of forgetting the national interest.

Internationalism is not a tribute paid by some revolutionary contingents to others, but part and parcel of the Marxist-Leninists' world outlook and activity. It is a factor in their reciprocal, ideological and political enrichment. It implies mutual aid in a common struggle and readiness for joint action against imperialism, for common goals.

Internationalism implies the desire and ability to draw useful lessons from each other's experience. It implies efforts for closer unity of the communist movement and choosing such a form and tone of discussion among brother parties that preclude a sharpening of differences and, indeed, help to eliminate them.

The entire work of the Congress, its decisions and conclusions, are convincing evidence of the CPSU's invariable loyalty, as a contingent of the world communist movement, to the principle of proletarian internationalism. The Soviet Communists' keen awareness of their historic responsibility to their people and the international working class, to the whole of working mankind, found direct expression at the Congress — our Party discussed at its highest forum all its affairs in the presence and with the active participation of representatives of the revolutionary forces of the world. The Congress responded actively and with interest to the problems of the world revolutionary movement raised in the speeches of delegates and foreign guests, and unanimously supported the CPSU line on these problems formulated in the CC Report.

One of the important conclusions to be drawn from the international exchange of views that took place at the 25th Congress is that regular meetings and consultations between brother parties on problems of common interest, including complicated or controversial problems, are a fruitful method of assuring the cohesion of the communist movement.

The Havana Conference of Communists of Latin America and the Caribbean, which was also attended by the Communist parties of the United States and Canada, played a substantial role in promoting the communist movement. Preparations are continuing for a conference of Communist parties of Europe. The CPSU supports in principle the idea of convening a new world meeting of Communist and Workers' parties.

Communists throughout the world sincerely extend their hand to all who are ready to fight for peace, democracy, national freedom and social progress. They neither isolate themselves from, or counterpose themselves to, other democratic, left-wing forces, but offer them all

cooperation on a fair basis, on the principles of equality and mutual respect.

The participation of delegations from 19 revolutionary-democratic parties in the 25th CPSU Congress was evidence of the growing scope of internationalism and the increasing desire of all anti-imperialist forces for cooperation. Many revolutionary-democratic parties see in Marxism-Leninism and in a socialist orientation the key to solving vital problems of their countries, as the speeches of their representatives at the 25th Congress showed. This undoubtedly strengthens the forces of world progress.

The 25th Congress reaffirmed our Party's readiness to extend contacts with Socialist and Social-Democratic parties. Communists are well aware, of course, of the deep-rooted anti-communism and anti-Sovietism of the right-wing Social Democrats' ideology and policy. They will continue their principled struggle against views and actions that injure the working-class cause and make it easier for imperialism to interfere in the affairs of peoples fighting for freedom and independent development. But Communists also see that positive changes are taking place in the social-democratic movement over a wide range of international issues. An indication of this is that the attitude toward Communists is now a central topic of discussion among Social Democrats.

The CC Report to the Congress authoritatively reaffirmed the invariable Leninist attitude of fraternal solidarity maintained by the CPSU and the Soviet people toward all fighters for the emancipation of labor, against reaction and imperialist oppression. The Congress statement 'Freedom for the Prisoners of Imperialism and Reaction!' was wholeheartedly approved by both the delegates and our foreign guests, who welcomed it as a forceful and practical expression of genuine internationalism.

Those who are languishing in fascist prisons, those who risk their lives in fighting for the vital interests of their peoples, for the interests of all the disinherited on earth, are our brothers, the salt of the earth, sterling people, exponents of the purest and loftiest ideals. Solidarity with them is the class duty of all Communists, an imperative of conscience, evidence of their unfailing loyalty to the ideals of peace, democracy and socialism.

The 25th CPSU Congress will hold a special place in the glorious history of the Leninist Party. L.I. Brezhnev described it as 'a Congress of great accomplishments which proceeded in a realistic and businesslike spirit, a spirit of calm confidence in our strength, in new victories of our great cause, the cause of building communism, of our struggle for a durable and just peace on earth.'

For our whole Party and all Soviet people the 25th Congress is a

tremendous ideological and political stimulus. Meetings of Party activists and of working people throughout the country warmly and unanimously supported the Congress decisions. These decisions were greeted with enthusiasm and a keen sense of responsibility, with genuinely Bolshevik readiness to respond to the Party's call by real deeds, by everyone undertaking to accomplish more in his field. The nationwide emulation movement to carry out the program of the 25th Congress shows that the Party's cause is the cherished cause of all Soviet people, Communists and non-Communists alike.

The Congress had widespread international repercussions. It fully revealed the historic significance of real socialism. The world saw the greatness and dynamism of the new society, which has ended oppression and discrimination, in which the working people's living and cultural standards are steadily rising and democracy for the people is expanding, and which has made genuine equality for all and freedom for the individual a reality by abolishing all exploitation. 'The very existence of the Soviet Union, all your activities in building the first communist society on earth, and your dedicated fight for peace and security mean as much as sunlight means to our planet,' said Alvaro Cunhal, in his speech at the Congress.

The world communist movement has highly appraised the results of the 25th CPSU Congress. Decisions of the higher bodies of many brother parties, speeches and statements by their leaders, and their press express solidarity with the CPSU line. Communists throughout the world note that the vast experience of struggle and work embodied in the deliberations of the CPSU Congress will be useful and instructive to all who treasure peace and socialism.

The working class in the anti-imperialist alliance

Rodney Arismendi
First Secretary,
CP Uruguay

As reported earlier, Comrade Arismendi addressed a meeting of our Editorial Council.

His report on the political situation in Uruguay and in Latin America generally has an important bearing on the discussion on

the pages of this journal of working-class allies at the present stage of the revolutionary struggle, a problem central to Marxist theory, strategy and tactics.[1]

The following is an abridged report of his address.

For over two and a half years now our Party has been leading the working class and people in the difficult fight against the fascist regime. The Bordaberry dictatorship and the reactionary generals have destroyed all democratic institutions and freedom, have interfered in the affairs of the university, which they have placed under fascist police agents. The opposition press has been banned. There are about 5,000 political prisoners, and this in a country with a population of 2,700,000! A new wave of terror, the most ferocious since the June 27, 1973 coup, was launched in October. There have been kidnappings, raids and torture. More than 1,000 have been arrested, among them Party leaders Jose Luis Massera, Alberto Altesor and Wladimir Turiansky, former members of parliament, intellectuals, political and public personalities. Their lives, as those of Jaime Perez, General Victor Licandro, Hector Rodriguez and other political prisoners held by the dictatorship, are in danger.[2] With its unrelenting use of torture, the Uruguayan tyranny, like the regimes in Chile, Brazil and some other countries, represents one of the most outrageous examples of violation of human rights.

Our Party is working for unity of all democrats and patriots and has always been in the front ranks of the struggle. It tried to prevent the coup and after it initiated mass actions against the putschists and worked out the necessary tactics of such actions. That is why on the very first day of the coup, it was possible to retaliate with a general strike of the working class, seizure of factories, demonstrations and other means of struggle. After the memorable 15 days of continuous battles, there was an organized retreat in order to apply new forms of struggle. We were able to preserve our trade union organizations and the entire network of worker and popular associations. We used a wide variety of methods in fighting the regime and strengthening the alliance of the working class with the middle strata and other forces.

In September 1975, our Central Committee summed up the results of the struggle. Having made certain correctives, it approved the Party's line of action. It emphasized, first, the Party's role as the leading force of the organized working class, particularly in conditions in which we have to use diverse forms of struggle, from the highest type (seizure of factories, for instance) to traditional types (strikes, demonstrations, protest meetings, etc.). Workers' delegations presented the government a demand for a 50 per cent rise in wages, and the demand contained nearly 70,000 signatures collected

in the factories. With hundreds of delegations coming from many different factories, the dictatorship did not venture immediately to take repressive measures, but somewhat later there was a new wave of arrests. The signature campaign, despite all the risks it involved for its participants, was indicative of the viability of the class trade union federation, of the militant spirit of our glorious National Workers' Convent (NWC) and also of the Party's close ties with the main proletarian centers.

Second, we analyzed our work in activizing the mass movement among other sectors of the population, primarily the middle strata. It was noted that notwithstanding the conditions created by the fascist regime, and the dismissal of 700 of the 2,000 university instructors and the expulsion of thousands of students, notwithstanding also repressions in the secondary schools and the long prison sentences passed on a number of well-known professors and teachers —resistance among educational workers has been growing and assuming a wider range of forms. In particular mention should be made of the students' solidarity campaign with the people of Chile.

There is a visible trend to organize work in rural areas, activize the agrarian movements and utilize the contradictions between the ranch owners (including the big ones) and the government. Organizations of small and middle peasants are also more active. At a time when the regime is anxious to deprive all movements, no matter how innocent they may seem, of leadership, much importance attaches to work among these various organizations (residents' associations, sports clubs, etc.).

Third, we discussed the problem of political unity. Though all political activity is forbidden, the Broad Front — the people's hope — continues to operate, bringing together Communists, Socialists, Demochristians, intellectuals, left-minded servicemen and people of no party affiliation. It should be emphasized that, in conditions of fascist dictatorship, our policy of alliances cannot be confined to uniting only the more advanced anti-imperialist forces. We are working toward a broad anti-dictatorial and anti-fascist alliance based on our minimum program, i.e., overthrow of the dictatorship, a provisional military-civilian government that would pursue an independent foreign policy, find a way out of the crisis and assure the people freedom. In other words, this is a program designed for victory over the main enemy. A program moreover capable of uniting broad political forces which, though discontented with the present government are not yet prepared to fight it. These forces include the big bourgeois democratic parties, definite church circles, nationalist progressive elements in the army and other strata.

But, of course, identity of views is one thing, sharing in the struggle

against the dictatorship is quite another. We must therefore be persevering and patient, working for unity at grassroots level and at the top — there can be no unity policy based only on one of these. The U.S. Ambassador, Siracusa, a CIA agent, mindful of the dictatorship's narrow social base, is trying to unite the right wing of the traditional parties and establish a curtailed pseudo-democracy to give the regime a somewhat better image. This is evidence of the dictatorship's instability, and also of the need to bring into a common anti-dictatorial front thousands of democrats still under the influence of the above-mentioned parties.

Fourth, though the fascist generals control the army, direct the repression and take part in the torture of prisoners, we have not changed our principled political attitude toward the military who represent a factor of no small importance in the country's public life. Though the military are the main force in the military-bureaucratic structure of the state, most of them come from the middle strata. And they are not alien to the problems that have plunged our society into such a deep crisis. They cannot but be aware of the people's hatred of everyone in army uniform. Besides, the contradictions within the armed forces have by no means been resolved. They find expression in some servicemen siding with the Broad Front, participating in democratic nationalist actions that are in the interests of the people. Consequently our Party is against both vulgar anti-militarism and military paternalism. Politically, we should not tie our activity to crisis phenomena within the army, its sentiments and vacillations. Of course, these must be taken into account. But for these crisis phenomena to lead to a break between the army and the dictatorship there has to be (and this is the main factor) a higher standard of militancy of the working class and the entire people and a broader anti-dictatorial front. We must regard phenomena in their dialectical interconnection and not indulge in piecemeal solutions of parallel tasks.

Fifth, our work within the Party itself. Despite the atrocious repressions, the Party has preserved its main forces within the country. Work continues in the Central Committee and at all other levels. In these extremely difficult conditions the Party continues to lead the working class. This should not be taken to mean that its role is confined to issuing directives. Our work is made easier by the fact that workers make up 75 per cent of the Party membership and that our forces are concentrated in the main industrial centers. We have built up an underground press.[3] Here is a sample of our organizational work. Last September we planned to hold 500 Party and 200 YCL rallies to mark the 55th anniversary of the Communist Party, actually there were 900 rallies. Our 1974 financial campaign brought in 600

million old pesos, and this year we are well on the way to our goal of one billion.

Retaining the mass character of the Party is one of our most important tasks. We had to extend our contacts, making that the goal of all Party organizations, urging them to involve all Party members, not only tested cadres in achieving it. At the same time it was necessary to organize wider actions.

The main thing is patient, careful work at all levels. Party cadres run a tremendous risk. We have recently sufiered heavy blows. Hence, to isolate and defeat fascism we must combine the struggle within Uruguay and other Latin American countries with a broad international solidarity campaign.

Unity of the democratic and anti-imperialist forces is, beyond all doubt, the principal strategic aim of the Latin American revolutionary movement. What we have in mind is a front headed by the working class and based on a worker-peasant alliance, a front embracing the middle strata, intellectuals and, under certain conditions, also other forces. This would add up to the political and social forces of revolution on our continent. Such is the objective reality. It poses a very wide variety of anti-imperialist and democratic problems which have to be solved against the background of sharp class struggle. The presence in Latin America of U.S. and other imperialists means that the basic, priority task of our revolutionary process is national liberation. Some are inclined to the view that capitalist development in our countries, even if subordinate and lop-sided, tends to diminish our dependence. If this implies the growth and strengthening of the forces opposed to imperialism, then we can agree. But it would be a serious mistake to believe that such a process will automatically bring us independence. The development of dependent capitalism aggravates existing contradictions but does not per se lead to the gradual acquisition of independence.

National liberation remains the principal task. In the opinion of our Party there are two erroneous views on this question. First, there is repetition of the theoretically fallacious contention of Mao Tse-tung (which we refuted in our 1960 book, *Problems of the Latin American Revolution)* that there are two basic contradictions in dependent countries: between imperialism and the entire nation, and between the productive forces and production relations. Actually, with a few exceptions, imperialism is not only an external problem for our countries, but also a problem of the production relations under dependent capitalism. And so we say that this is both an external and internal problem. The anti-imperialist struggle in our countries is, therefore, inseparable from the struggle against the latifundist oligarchy and the big comprodor bourgeoisie. Ranged against the financial monopolies,

are the genuine revolutionary forces, and potentially, definite circles of the national bourgeoisie. Even among part of the big bourgeoisie there are forces which, while not, of course, revolutionary, are objectively in conflict with imperialism. This is something we can all see. That is why it is so important to build up a social basis of revolution, including the development of far-reaching actions, such as the struggle for anti-fascist and anti-dictatorial unity and defense of our natural resources. The scope of such actions will enable us to give them a deeper meaning and this, in turn, will extend their scope.

The second mistake — the tendency to underestimate the national factor. This is characteristic of leftist theorizing. For instance, G. Frank, an ultra-left sociologist, maintains that in Latin America we should not strive to merge the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic struggle, but promote the class struggle against the capitalists. But we would be making a mistake too, if we were to absolutize the correct proposition that there is no underestimating such a factor as capitalist development in Latin America. It has created the objective conditions for the progressive character of the Latin American revolution, which in the course of a single historical process goes through two stages. Ignoring the national factor does not allow for a correct characteristic of the continent's social systems, a distinguishing feature of most of which is development of dependent capitalism. In other words, there are countries in which capitalist production relations predominate but in which there still exist pre-capitalist relations, especially in agriculture (the latifundia) and in which capitalist exploitation is being intensified. What we have are two synchronized processes: the development of capitalism and intensification of imperialist rapacity, which aggravate all national and social contradictions. We cannot, therefore, lump together the Latin American bourgeoisie and Yankee imperialism, and we certainly cannot say that our countries should pass over directly to tasks of a socialist character. This would mean ignoring the theory and practice of the revolutionary movement in Latin America, where the urge for independence has spread to every country.

It need hardly be said that life is more complex than theoretical constructions. Latin America does not know of a single revolution that followed the classical pattern, with the proletariat in power accomplishing democratic revolutionary anti-imperialist tasks and directing the country toward socialism. The Cuban revolution passed through the democratic and anti-imperialist stage and entered the socialist stage. It was led by revolutionaries from the middle strata, primarily the students, most of them inspired by revolutionary-democratic ideals, though even in those early days they adhered to socialist ideals. Their movement led to Marxism-Leninism, to the

formation of a single Communist party which absorbed the first Marxist-Leninist party in Cuba. The role of the proletariat as the hegemon manifested itself in the political and national aspects of the revolution.

The revolutionary process in Chile followed the classical pattern to a greater degree, though here the vanguard forces came to power through elections. A revolutionary front was formed headed by the working class and with the Communists playing a leading role in alliance with the Socialists. Anti- imperialist and anti-capitalist transformations were undertaken (within the framework of the democratic process). But when the country embarked on socialist transformations, or was preparing the ground for them, there came the coup d'état.

The anti-imperialist democratic revolution in Peru, where the army finds itself in the forefront and no united front has yet been set up, is developing along different lines. There is mutual understanding between the government and the Communists and other democratic forces backing it. A sharp class struggle is going on, in particular among the military. Recently General Morales Bermudez called for the establishment of a common front by uniting the people and the armed forces in it.

At present our Party, like the Chilean Communists in their own country, is tackling the problem of broad-based unity of the anti-dictatorial and anti-fascist forces. We could also cite other examples. The main strategic task of the working class and its Party is to set up a democratic national-liberation front. But this can also be achieved through a different tactic of unity, such as that of anti-fascist unity, depending on the lines of approach to the first stage of the revolution.

Accordingly, the declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean (June 1975) states: First, we are fighting for socialism and the fight for socialism is preceded by struggle against imperialism. Secondly, the task is for the revolutionary forces to unite with all democratic forces opposed to imperialism. In doing this, a distinction must be drawn between revolutionary unity and broad democratic unity without metaphysically counterposing one to the other but combining them dialectically. Thirdly, there now exist movements of the nationalist bourgeoisie in Latin America. They are not yet anti-imperialist but they clash with imperialism. They are likely to adopt an anti-imperialist position in step with the growing scale and depth of popular action and the intensification of antagonisms between this bourgeoisie and U.S. state-monopoly capitalism. This is both a strategic and a political issue.

Resistance to imperialism is on the rise in Latin America. It is

becoming possible to form on a continental scale a broad front of peoples and governments against imperialism and fascism. A vast program prompted by reality itself is materializing; relations are established with Cuba, the movement for the protection of natural resources and in defense of democracy is gaining in scope, relations are established and promoted with socialist and developing countries, the struggle against Latin American seats of fascism is intensifying. These new trends are evidence of the crisis of the U.S. imperialists' policy of domination on the continent — a result of the crisis of the socio-economic structures of Latin American countries, changes taking place in the world and the deepening general crisis-like state of relations between imperialism and Asian, African and Latin American countries.

Questions relating to the establishment of an anti-imperialist front are approached in each country with due regard to the conditions prevailing there. To answer them, our parties must show political vision, become a real political force, put the main ideas of the front into effect with due regard to the level, pace and peculiarities of the process going on in the country concerned, search for ways of bringing revolutionary changes nearer and fulfill the main task — achieving unity and asserting the leading role of the working class, which must win allies at every stage of the political process. This is why setbacks and successes should be viewed in the light of the dialectical interconnection of revolutionary and counter-revolutionary processes on the continent. Lenin said that it is necessary always to see the connection 'between revolution and counter-revolution' and realize that this is 'an integral social movement developing in accordance with its own inner logic' *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 13, p. 115).

Ever since the 50s, a bitter struggle has been going on between the forces of revolution and those of counter-revolution (the latter are led by U.S. imperialism), a struggle that goes on intensifying. If we confine ourselves to one aspect of this struggle we come to the conclusion that the trend toward fascism is predominant in Latin America. If, on the other hand, we take an idyllic view of things we only see gains and fail to notice that the struggle is hard and generally involves bloodshed. It would therefore not be out of place to stress that, with the exception of Indonesia, the greatest number of Communist leaders have fallen in Latin America and that tens of thousands of political prisoners are still behind bars. This is a result of CIA and Pentagon policy, for U.S. policy is really aimed at putting the whole of Latin America under fascist regimes.

However, there are also great achievements, some of which are of historic significance. They include the consolidation of socialist Cuba, the First Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba, the five-year plan

of that country and Cuba's role as a member of the socialist community and a catalyst of the forces resisting imperialism on the continent. Another achievement is the disintegration of the OAS, the crisis of the legal, political and military system of Pan-Americanism while more and more countries establish relations with Cuba, whose international prestige is steadily growing. There are also the processes going on in Peru and Panama, the intensification of contradictions between imperialism and Venezuela as well as other countries, the positive foreign policy of Mexico, the upsurge in distinctive nationalist movements in Ecuador and Honduras. On the continental level there is the formation of Latin American organizations without and against the United States, and the failure of the 11th Conference of American armies called on the initiative of the CIA and Pentagon in collusion with the Brazilian, Chilean and Uruguayan fascists. A further achievement is the development of relations between many of our countries and socialist countries. What we have here is not *tercerism*, which attacks both imperialism and the Soviet Union and has nothing to do with the policy of governments that do not consider themselves socialist but take a favorable, increasingly friendly stand on the Soviet Union. These are only some of the positive aspects but they are indicative enough.

The situation on the continent is conducive to the accomplishment of the great tasks facing us. We must therefore strengthen the motive forces of the revolution, strive for new gains, build up the Party and its influence, heighten the role of the working class, pursue a more active policy of alliances and strengthen the network of popular organizations. There are ample opportunties to fulfill the important tasks relating to trade union unity, peasant organizations and the movement of peoples and governments interested in protecting natural resources, democratic freedoms and the principle of national self-determination.

Along with the numerous gains made in various countries, it is important to stress that in spite of all the atrocities committed by fascism in Chile, Uruguay, Brazil, Guatemala and other countries, it proved unable to destroy the heroic Communist parties of these countries. Resistance is mounting. The middle strata, the military and other forces are joining in political struggle and favorable changes are occurring in the church. All this is evidence of gains of tremendous political significance.

As for difficulties, it is worth listing them. The first difficulty has to do with the 'scene of action.' Latin America is one of the most sensitive nerve-centers of U.S. imperialism, which will never grant our peoples independence of its own free will. Another difficulty lies in the historical backwardness of the movement itself, in particular

the relative lag in our work in the countryside (although the rural population of the continent is diminishing, the peasants remain the chief ally of the working class in the revolutionary process). A third difficulty is the split in labor unions. The consequences of this division are all the more negative because the trade union centers of Uruguay and Chile, once the most articulate class organizations uniting almost the entire working class and other wage workers, are banned. A fourth difficulty consists in the fact that as capitalism develops a sharp class struggle interlocks with struggle for a democratic front. This makes for the radicalization of the masses, on the one hand, and frightens the bourgeoisie, on the other. Fifth difficulty: in spite of the maturity and heroism of the Communist parties, we believe it is necessary to do much for their consolidation if they are to be equal to the great historic tasks facing the continent. At the same time, it is necessary to raise unity and fraternal coordination of action between Communist and Workers' parties to a higher plane and work for the consolidation of all patriotic and democratic forces of the continent.

We Marxist-Leninists regard the working class as the vanguard of the revolutionary process in Latin America at any period of transition from captialism to socialism.

The historic role of the working class analyzed by Marx, Engels and Lenin has been confirmed by the experience of revolutions in countries having reached a definite level of capitalist development. This does not militate against the fact that in some African countries, for instance, the governments adhere to a socialist orientation and it is urged that the road of non-capitalist development be taken even though the working class is only just in the making. It is a question of distinctive problems within the framework of general rules. But there is no advancing to socialism without a developing working class. At the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said that the working class in power can contribute to the development of other countries on non-capitalist lines, leaning to a certain extent on the international alliance of the working class, the peasantry, intellectuals and revolutionary democratic forces (see Vol. 31, p. 244). But socialism can be built only if the productive forces and hence the working class have achieved a definite level of development.

The working class of Latin America is an impressive force numerically. It is estimated that 50 million people in our countries are wage workers, almost 40 million of them being workers proper. About 30 million of them are employed in industry. This is an immense social force concentrated in large industrial centers. Some Latin American countries have attained an average level of capitalist development and all the countries of the region are developing mainly on capitalist lines

although there still exist such things as latifunda, pre-capitalist survivals, dependence on imperialism or technological backwardness. There are even typically working-class cities.

Secondly, the working class of Latin America has valuable fighting traditions. In Argentina, Uruguay and other countries of the continent, trade union organizations came into being as early as the end of the last century. The past decade in Latin America has seen a relatively high rate of strikes in comparison with other regions of the capitalist world, and the highest proportion of worker participation in political strikes. In Uruguay 25 general political strikes lasting between 24 and 48 hours took place in 100 days in 1968 over the state of emergency and repressive measures. In our country there were 24-hour general strikes of solidarity with Cuba and strikes prompted by other political motives. This enabled us to react to the coup by calling a 15-day general strike during which strikers occupied the enterprises and carried out demonstrations and other militant actions.

But, of course, the role of the working class is not limited to participation in the trade union movement and social struggles. There are Communist parties in all Latin American countries. In some of them they are not only militant organizations engaged in ideological work and propaganda but a real force having a great deal of political leverage. In Uruguay, for example, the whole — and in some countries almost the whole — trade union movement is led by the Communists, and it is the Communists that have for years fought selflessly for the working people's interests. This is a factor making for the vanguard role of the working class in the revolutionary process.

I was asked a question about allegations by some 'theorists' to the effect that the Latin American working class is not yet mature enough to play the role of leader or, on the contrary, is past the stage at which it could have played it.

What is meant is perhaps two aspects. The first may be connected with Marcuse's assertions taken up by petty- bourgeois groups. According to those assertions, the working class has been 'integrated' into the system and shares in the profits of the ruling class. Some believe, for example, that the peasants and rural wage workers constitute the poorest part of the population. That is true but poverty is not an indication of being revolutionary. Integration? If we bear in mind the struggle going on, that is not so. Recent years in Latin America have seen an upturn in guerrilla action, democratic movements of the military, peasant struggles, a radicalization of students and intellectuals. These processes involve the people at large, some of whom are under the influence of bourgeois democratic forces. All this bears the imprint of the militant presence of the working class in key countries. But if it is implied that the working class has not subjectively matured

for revolution and that the Communist parties are unable to lead it into action, I disagree.

The affirmation that the working class of Latin America is ripe for the revolution is relative. Not the whole of the working class is organized as yet and, besides, the revolutionary process presupposes the existence of many components. There can be no revolution without a crisis at least heralding a revolutionary explosion. Action by the vanguard can become a component of the revolutionary process and speed it but it must lean on an objective process and, moreover, take into account subjective factors in the country's development. It may happen, and has actually happened, that non-proleterian strata find themselves leading the struggle. Life is no hard and fast pattern. Conditions for the maturing of the material basis of revolution in Latin America are such that they speed processes which the forces destined by history itself to play their inherent vanguard role cannot always lead (it is immaterial whether the reason for this is that the working-class parties are too small, that there is no unity among the main revolutionary forces or that they have been outpaced by other political forces). The task of the working class and its parties is to join in these processes, speed them, cooperate and unite with the more consistent revolutionaries, build up strength and advance, for the transition to socialism necessarily demands that the working class be in the van of the revolution. And it does become the vanguard. It is not enough to be the vanguard in the historical, theoretical and political meaning of the term, for it is necessary to play a vanguard role in daily political battles. The working class and its parties win this role through everyday struggle.

The allies of the working class are above all the peasants and the middle strata, specifically the students and intellectuals, who play a tremendous part in Latin America. They have joined actively in the revolutionary process and are, indeed, the main reserve drawn on in reinforcing guerrilla units. Given definite conditions, these forces can lead part of the national bourgeoisie or neutralize it. But this pattern alone is not enough, of course, for the choice of new allies depends on the given situation. We have already said that alliances against dictatorship are one thing and alliances of the democratic forces of national liberation as the motive power of the revolution — another. There may be very broad alliances or agreements on unity of action. In September 1975, the CC CPU examined the condition of ranch owners, including big ones, whom the disastrous effects of a severe economic crisis prompt to oppose the dictatorship and who are therefore followed by large sections of the rural population. We must not ignore these contradictions in fighting against fascism. This is why we speak of alliances and agreements, of a political alliance, meaning also

an anti-fascist one, and of a common view on the struggle against the chief enemy. It is within the framework of this problem that we also consider the problem of the military, which we have already spoken about.

The anti-imperialist democratic platform is directed primarily against imperialist monopolies and calls for their nationalization and the recovery of the country's natural resources and other riches. This platform demands a radical agrarian reform; the nationalization of large agrarian centers that cannot be partitioned without injuring the economy as a whole; nationalization of the property of the bourgeoisie opposing the revolution; respect for the property of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie as a whole with the exception of the monopolies, enemies of the revolution and imperialists; division of the land with or without compensation depending on local conditions; steps to protect and stimulate the development of the country's agriculture and industry and to expand the home market; an independent and diversified foreign trade; reform of the education system, a democratic policy toward culture and education, and so on. This is certainly an ambitious program. It is in the interest of the working class and peasantry as well as of the middle strata, the intellectuals and all else who want cultural progress, national independence and a higher standard of living for the working people. To bring this about, it is necessary to form an anti-imperialist democratic government, with the working class playing the leading role.

Naturally, the platform of a revolution being carried out according to the optimal classical model must be implemented stage by stage as a revolutionary situation approaches. This is why to overthrow the dictatorship in Uruguay, we propose seeking solutions to only the fundamental problems. Later on it will be possible to decide on the order in which other revolutionary tasks should be carried out with due regard to our ultimate goal. By accomplishing these tasks, we will be able to preserve our allies and ascertain how long they will stay with us or, in other words, establish what we call the range and mobility of alliances. It may therefore be possible to evolve, not a common program for all countries, but a program declaration for the given stage of the revolution and a specific political program not clashing with it and taking strict account of the given situation.

1. See 'The Working Class and Its Allies,' *WMR*, July 1975; E. Pastorino. 'In the Vanguard of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle,' September 1975; L. Muller, E. Macaluso, G. Panicidis, R. Kenny, 'The Peasantry in the Struggle for Democracy and Socialism,' October 1975; I. Sinha. 'The Condition and Revolutionary Possibilities of the Peasantry,' November 1975; A. Escala. 'The Socio-Political Positions of the Intelligentsia,' November 1975; H. Safari. 'Need for Scientifically Clear Concepts,' November 1975; P. Vasquez, 'Role of the Intelligentsia in the Class Struggle,' December 1975; S. Sudiman. 'The Power Structure and the Alliance Problem,'

January 1976; E. Wimmer. 'The Social Image of the Intelligentsia,' February 1976; N. Kianuri. 'Alignment of Class Forces at the Democratic Stage,' February 1976.

2. Later the terror was intensified, with more kidnappings, torture, destruction of cultural values, persecution of democrats. The President of the Broad Front, General Liber Seregni, who has been released after a long prison term, was arrested along with a number of Communist leaders.

Every day brings fresh reports of crimes by the dictatorship, which is continuing its campaign of terror against the workers' and democratic movement, and primarily the Communist Party. The number of political prisoners in March 1976 stood at more than 8,000. More and more people are being done to death by torture. There is every reason to fear for the lives of the well-known mathematician Jose L. Massera and workers' leader W. Turiansky, both of whom have been seriously injured by torture and are now in a military hospital. Among the recently arrested are Jerardo Questa, a prominent leader of the trade unions and the CPU, and Jorge Mazarovich, former secretary of the Young Communist League. More than 150 women are being held behind prison bars, suffering from terrible congestion, hunger and humiliating treatment. Also behind prison bars are prominent cultural personalities who too have been subjected to torture. The mounting international solidarity campaign and exposure of the crimes of the Bordaberry dictatorship have forced the regime to resort to provocation and vile slander. But nothing can conceal their crimes. — *Ed.*

3. For two and a half years now we have been regularly publishing our newspaper, *Carta semanal.* We also have a monthly, *Analisis y orientacion,* the theoretical journal *Ensayos,* a YCL paper, etc. We are helping to put out the weekly bulletin of the National Workers' Convent, the organ of the federation of university and secondary school students. In addition there are 120 factory papers (put out mostly by Communists). In agitation work we have started and are carrying on 'the battle for the house walls,' on which we paste big-letter posters of the Party and the YCL.

Spring will come into its own

Betty Sinclair
Member of National Executive Committee, CP Ireland, and *WMR* Editorial Council

COMMENTARY

To many in Western Europe, the icy breath of economic crisis has made this year's late and cold spring seem colder still. While press writers try to determine, each in his own way, whether or not rock bottom has been reached, and while monopoly pundits look for real or imaginary signs of an economic pickup, reality remains harsh for those who have to earn their living or exist on state benefits and allowances.

In March, the UN Economic Commission for Europe surveyed some of the results of 1975. The most charitable thing that can be said about them is that they do no credit to capitalism as a social and

economic system. In 13 West European countries industrial output declined 10 per cent (9 per cent in the U.S.); unemployment stands at twice the 1973 figure. Inflation continues to rise; consumer prices are up, on average, 11 per cent.

The early months of 1976 have brought little comfort. On the contrary, we are witnessing a new and sharp aggravation of capitalism's monetary crisis. The EEC countries are again locked in a currency war, waged on the principle 'each for himself and God take the hindmost.'

For the working class the most alarming direct consequences of the crisis in capitalist Europe is growing unemployment. This spring, there were 5.7 million jobless in the Common Market countries alone (and over 18 million in the 24 industrially developed countries). In Britain, the FRG, Italy and France the number of unemployed runs into millions. Even in our own small Ireland unemployment in both parts of the divided island is more than 170,000, according to official figures. What other evidence is needed of the bankruptcy of capitalist society, which again and again has demonstrated its inability to provide a livelihood for so many of its citizens?

Some contend that unemployment is not the terrible evil it was in the past. The unemployed, we are told, live fairly well on the dole and, indeed, are enjoying a well-paid holiday. No worker is going to fall for that. For, first, unemployment benefits are not overly generous, especially with galloping inflation and soaring prices, and, what is more, are paid over a fixed period. Second, unemployment is becoming chronic. For many blue-collar and white-collar workers it means the end of their working life, the end of all hope of ever improving their lot. Many thousands of school graduates have been unable to find any kind of employment.[1] Significantly, even the experts who predict an early rise in economic activity do not predict the end of mass unemployment. Quite the contrary, all available data indicate that this reserve army of labor, a built-in feature of capitalism, will continue to swell.

That is the outlook, and it makes nonsense of all the talk about the virtues and benefits of bourgeois democracy, civil rights and freedoms. These rights are not worth much if they do not include the most important one of all, the right to work. That was well understood even by the utopian socialists: 150 years ago, Charles Fourier declared that 'the right to work was uppermost ... without it all other rights are useless.' That is just as valid and topical today. For mass unemployment remains the scourge of the working class, a nightmare for all working people, a moral and material catastrophe for hundreds and thousands of families, though you do not find unemployed workers

selling matches on the London streets, nor the long soup lines in New York, those typical scenes of the 'Great Depression' of the 1930s.[2]

And not because the capitalists have become more kindhearted or more responsive to hardship and suffering. The simple fact is that they cannot afford a repetition of this without jeopardizing their domination. The bourgeoisie is well aware of how the class consciousness of the workers, their sense of dignity, their militancy and organization, have grown. And it has good reason to fear the conclusion the workers will draw from a comparison with the socialist part of the world, where unemployment has long been forgotten. No wonder bourgeois sociologists warn that the present growth of unemployment can become a 'social trigger.' And no wonder Mr. Edward Heath, that toriest of Tories, warns the House of Commons: 'We shall see those on the shop floor turn on free enterprise and say "as a system, you are not capable of providing employment".'[3]

Consciously or by class instinct, that conclusion has already been drawn by large sections of the working people. All the more so, that bourgeois governments are providing constant proof of their reluctance to encroach on monopoly profits and their inability to cope with consequences of the crisis, especially unemployment and inflation, from which the masses suffer first and most.

The conviction is gaining ground that, far from solving the problems of present-day society, capitalism is only exacerbating them, and this conviction inevitably tends to intensify the class struggle. Class conflicts have become more frequent, but not, of course, due to outside instigation, as reactionary propaganda, with its police-like reasoning, wants people to believe. No, this is a natural result of the sharper internal contradictions of bourgeois society, with its crying social inequality. The strike movement has always been the most visible criterion of the class struggle. Its dimensions, of course, differ from country to country, but the statistics show that in the 70s the strike level in Western Europe is *much higher than in the preceding decade*.

There is also this important characteristic: in the past economic crisis and mass unemployment meant less strikes. And the bourgeoisie exploited that — the fear of losing their job 'disciplined' the workers, forcing them to accept lower wages and worse conditions. There was even a 'scientific' formula to show the reverse ratio between the level of unemployment and that of the strike movement. One bourgeois British economist (probably using this formula) maintained that a one per cent increase in unemployment resulted in a eight per cent decrease in the number of strikes. Now, working-class militancy has substantially refuted that piece of 'expert' wisdom. For

even in the present profound crisis, the strike movement remains on a high level and in Italy, to take one example, is actually growing.

Growing, too, is the fight against mass layoffs, for guaranteed employment, against attempts to set those with jobs against those without them. Toward the end of March, the British unions held a national assembly against unemployment and for guaranteed jobs. Drawing on the experience of the 30s, an Unemployed Workers Association has been set up in Dublin. The thousands of leaflets it has circulated at the labor exchanges demand effective measures to increase employment. Mass demonstrations for job security have been held in France, Italy, Denmark, Belgium and other countries. The Japanese workers' traditional 'spring offensive' has been especially vigorous this year. Reports of mass demonstrations against unemployment and high prices have come from the United States and Canada.

Dissatisfaction with the policies of bourgeois governments is not confined to blue-collar and while-collar workers. There is unrest among the students, incensed by the cuts in expenditure for higher education. There is serious ferment among peasants in several countries, especially those in the Common Market. Ireland's membership of the Market has proved little short of a national calamity. It is having a ruinous effect on our country folk and is bringing food prices up. Potatoes, a staple for most Irish families, have for many become a luxury following the 1974 price increases. In the bigger EEC countries farmers are passing from grumbling to energetic protest against an agrarian policy fashioned to suit only the big capitalists. There have been mass protests in Denmark, Belgium and the recent violent events in the wine-producing south of France.

This widening protest movement against monopoly-dictated policy is aggravating the political instability in European capitalist countries. This is clearly expressed in the precipitous decline of the authority and influence of parliaments and bourgeois parties which had held power for decades. Another blow to West European reaction was dealt by the overthrow of the fascist regimes in Greece and Portugal, the agony of fascism in Spain where attempts to keep alive 'Francoism without Franco' are encountering more vigorous resistance from all the democratic forces. The popularity of esteemed political parties, always proud of their 'independence' and 'democracy,' has not been helped by the exposure that, virtually from their very inception, they have been kept by the CIA.

In contrast, the influence of the Communist parties and the left generally is increasing. In such countries as Italy and France the voters now see in the Communists and in the alliance of the left forces a realistic alternative to the present combination of ruling parties. The

Communist vote increases with every election: in Italy one voter in three casts his ballot for Communist candidates. In the recent French cantonal elections the left won an absolute majority for the first time since the war. What attracts the voter is the Communists' devotion to the interests of the working people, their political integrity and administrative ability, freedom from the corruption that is eroding the bourgeois parties, their clear, reasoned program that can unloose the stranglehold of state-monopoly capital, restructure society and put it on the road to socialism.

The Communists are not alone in maintaining capitalism has played out its role, has become a brake on progress and must give way to a more advanced, socialist form of society. Many political movements in the capitalist countries are coming to see the need for wide-ranging social and economic change. That, in fact, is the basis for the wide democratic alliances, long advocated by the Communists as the backbone of a common anti-monopoly front.

To this I might add that the urge for left unity is apparent not only in the citadels of West European capitalism, with their mass, influential Communist parties, which have many attractions as political allies. In our own Ireland there has been a development which only a few years ago would have seemed inconceivable. I refer to the big meeting in Dublin of representatives of the Communist Party, the left Labor Liaison Committee and the oldest republican party, Sinn Fein, to formulate a left alternative to the ruinous course of the present coalition government, for a guenine, and not merely verbal, struggle against the consequences of the crisis, for a brighter future for the Irish people. The manifesto it adopted has met with lively response throughout the country.

In tormented Northern Ireland, where the latest British attempt to resolve the protected crisis has proved a fiasco, the only ray of hope today is the mass campaign started by the trade unions under the slogan 'For a Better Life For All.' The division of the working class along religious lines, which reaction has always sought to foment and exploit, is now countered by a unity program for democratic rights for all, an end to unemployment and poverty, terror and the fratricidal civil war.

There can be no two opinions about the source of the growing popularity of Marxist ideas and Communist policy. That source is the momentous achievements of world socialism, which, against the background of the present aggravation of capitalism's general crisis, are very concretely understood and appreciated in all parts of the world. Every Communist Party, big or small, feels itself 10 times stronger because socialism has become a reality in a large part of the world and exerts a steady and growing influence on the march of

history and on everyday life. That was the strongest impression I took away from the 25th CPSU Congress, which I attended as a guest.

It is no accident that bourgeois ideologues and monopoly propaganda are at such pains to instill the entirely false idea that the present crisis involves the whole world, that it is beyond human ability to cope with it, that all social systems are powerless against it, and, consequently, that the working-class struggle stands no chance of success. A propaganda ploy meant to kill two birds with one stone: justify the convulsions of capitalism and cast aspersions on the economy of socialism, it has failed on both points.

For the world has before it a clear picture of the vast achievements of socialism revealed at the 25th CPSU Congress in Moscow and at the Communist Party congresses of other socialist countries. The facts and figures leave no doubt that socialism is a reliable dam against the raging waves of the crisis that has engulfed the capitalist part of the world. While we in the capitalist West see many factories closing down, with thousands left without jobs, with unemployment running into millions, prices increasing at cosmic speed, social services deteriorating, people losing all faith in the future — the world of socialism is witnessing developments of a very different kind. The future of capitalism is clouded by uncertainty and pessimism, the future of the socialist community is clear and optimistic, for it is based on a scientific theory.

This, of course, should not be taken to mean that there are no clouds on the communist horizon, no difficulties and obstacles. No, there are plenty of difficulties, some of them caused by objective and subjective factors, and not infrequently by direct enemy political subversion. The sharp ideological struggle is not confined to a Marxist-Leninist offensive against capitalism's ideological positions. There is also the intensified pressure of enemy ideology on the Communist parties and the working class. In this respect, the past few years have seen more active bourgeois intervention in the ideological affairs of the communist movement, even attempts to redirect its ideology.

To do that, there have been ceaseless attempts to induce 'internal dialogue' within the parties, subtly suggest problems for discussion, raise questions that have long been solved and rekindle long-resolved differences. And we cannot say that these attempts always meet with a proper rebuff from our side. Nor can we deny that they sometimes succeed in producing what Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CP-USA, described as 'new varieties of the opportunist virus.' The maladies caused by this virus are extremely dangerous, and it is our duty, our common task, to work out an antidote.

Experience has shown that there is nothing more erroneous than

opportunist concessions to pressure by the class enemy. L. I. Brezhnev justly remarked in his report to the 25th CPSU Congress that 'even if a concession to opportunism can produce some temporary advantage, in the final analysis it is bound to damage the Party.'

I think that all veteran Communists — and I am proud to be among them — can recall many examples to back up that idea. The ideological struggle follows its own laws. And one of them is that no amount of concessions will appease the anti-communists — they will only whet their appetite, prompt them to demand more far-reaching concessions. There is the old proverb about giving the devil a finger and he'll bite off the whole hand.

In a way, that applies to the speech made at the March congress of the Italian Christian-Democratic Party by its former leader, Amintore Fanfani. Referring to the possibility of Communist parties entering the government, Fanfani, an old hand at political manipulation, demanded that they renounce 'also communist international unity and the economic-political-social system that it tries to extend to all the world.'[4] In other words, renounce scientific communism. He could not have put it more brazenly, but many other professional anti-communists share this tendency to blackmail the Communist parties.

The insidious plans of the monopoly bourgeoisie find expression also in the continuing attempts to provoke quarrels within the communist movement, divide the parties according to their 'loyalty to West European traditions,' etc. There has been a concerted effort to drive a wedge between the West European Communist parties and those of the socialist community. The former are told that they must dissociate themselves from East European socialism and thereby acquire the necessary 'respectability.' The latter are told that they can no longer rely on the solidarity of certain Communist parties. One has to be totally ignorant of the relations between Communists, and have not even the remotest idea of proletarian internationalism, to believe that these attempts stand any chance of success.

It is precisely because such hopes of splitting the movement exist that Communists are so concerned to safeguard proletarian internationalism, which is an inalienable part of Marxism-Leninism. The recent Communist Party congresses in the socialist countries, and especially the historic 25th CPSU Congress, attended by a record number of delegations from Communist parties and other progressive political trends, demonstrated that power of internationalism.

No matter how winter clings on this year, spring will come into its own, and the working people will celebrate May Day in the sunshine that has prevailed over the clouds and the cold. Socialism is often described as the spring of mankind, as distinct from capitalism, now

living through its somber autumn. And we have every right to say that the spring of mankind, too, will come into its own.

There will very likely be setbacks and disappointments, even temporary defeats, on the road to victory. For imperialism is an experienced, ruthless and still strong adversary and will not give up a single position without a fight; if forced to retreat, it will use every opportunity to counter-attack. The struggle that has now developed over the future of détente and activization of the extreme right in a number of capitalist countries indicate that reaction is regrouping its forces. This imposes a special responsibility to the people on all Communists, and we will do everything to live up to it.

1. In Britain, there have been many voices from the right demanding reduction of the 'generous' unemployment benefits. Already student benefits, paid during vacation periods, are seriously threatened. The 'battle against unemployment' is very often waged by manipulating the statistics to reduce the number of people looking for work.
2. But one does find the crime rate, especially petty crime, in the capitalist countries increasing in ratio with the increase in unemployment.
3. *Morning Star*, July 30, 1975.
4. *International Herald Tribune*, March 20-21, 1976.

Party experience

The fight for land, part of the revolution

Antonio Gervasio
Member of PB,
Portuguese CP

Since the early days of the revolution Antonio Gervasio has been working in the south of Portugal. At present he heads the Party's regional leadership in Alentejo Province, conducting work among agricultural laborers and small holders there. It is their selfless struggle against the big landowners that initiated the agrarian reform — one of the historic gains of the Portuguese people.

The following is an interview he granted to a *WMR* correspondent in early March.

In building the new, democratic and socialist Portugal, the Party attaches great importance to the enforcement of the agrarian reform and to the pursuance of an agrarian policy that accords with the interests of the working people in the countryside.

The agrarian reform was a principal objective of the Communist Party's struggle long before the events of April 25, 1974, throughout the period of the fascist dictatorship, for the Party has always sided witthe the rural proleterians and the small and middle peasants who were fighting against the big landowners.

In the opinion of the Communist Party, Portugal needs at least two agrarian reforms, not one. The country was divided into two regions: that of latifundia (or big landed estates), which predominated in the south and constituted a major socio-economic support for fascism and reaction; and that of mostly small and medium-size holdings in the north.

While in the south the aim of the reform was to expropriate (without compensation) the latifundia and big capitalist farms, in the north the task was to allot land to the landless and land-hungry peasants. The agrarian reform upheld by our Party, despite what reactionary propaganda says, did not aim at depriving the small and middle peasants of their land. The Party has always favored their possession of the land.

The Party's agrarian reform program envisages state assistance to

the farms set up on expropriated land as well as to the small and middle peasants, credits to them on favorable terms, and supplying them with agricultural machinery, seeds, cattle, fertilizers and insecticides.

The program also stipulates an increase in the number of tractors and other agricultural machines, the construction of granaries, stores and dams, electrification of the countryside, the building of roads, schools and training centers for specialists in agriculture, and the organization of marketing cooperatives which would ensure, on just terms, the sale of agricultural produce and the supply of agriculture with industrial goods.

Throughout its centuries-long history, the Portuguese countryside never knew agrarian reform: even the republican revolution of 1910 failed to carry it through. It was not until the April 25 events that deep-going changes began to take place. The agrarian reform has become an historic achievement of the revolution. Its implementation is indispensable for abolishing the power of the landowners and for the democratic transformation of society.

By now nearly 1,200,000 hectares of land belonging to the latifundists and big capitalist farmers have been expropriated. More than 400 collective enterprises have been set up in that area and they unite some 100,000 farm workers who till the land together with their families. By organizing agricultural cooperatives and other collective enterprises on the land taken away from the big owners, the rural working people and the small holders made the first heroic steps toward reorganizing agriculture on a new, non-exploitive basis.

The Communist Party can take legitimate pride in all these accomplishments. It guided the working people's struggle and succeeded in securing enforcement of the agrarian reform; it has been the motive force of the reform.

Farm workers in the south, in alliance with the small peasants, were in the forefront of the struggle for the implementation of the agrarian reform. Progress in this was much more profound than in the north due to a number of factors.

Historically, the biggest latifundia in Europe were concentrated in the south of Portugal. There were (no longer now) such landholdings as the Palma estate with 17,000 hectares, the Rio Frio estate — 16,400 hectares, and the Pinheiro farm — 5,200 hectares. And the Camparhia das Lepinar had 24,000 hectares of land. In only six of the country's southern districts (Bejha, Evora, Faro, Porta-Alergro, Santarem and Setubal) there were 950 estates of 500 or more hectares each and 523 holdings of over 1,000 hectares each. More than half of all the land in the regions where the reform has been carried out used to belong to big owners. The degree of land concentration can be judged by the

fact that the 500 biggest estates had more land than 500,000 small peasants.

It should be noted that in the region of the big landed estates, vast areas were not cultivated for the last 10 to 20 years. In Alentejo province, for instance, the area of neglected iands totalled 700,000 hectares. These lands were fenced with barbed wire: sometimes they were used for grazing cattle, but more often as hunting grounds for the big national and the foreign bourgeoisie.

At the same time thousands of country dwellers were out of work and had to emigrate. The farm laborers, who made up 90 per cent of the gainfully employed population in southern Portugal, had no market gardens or cattle of their own: they had nothing except a pair of hands with which to earn their living. Latifundism was one of the causes of the unemployment, the problem of work was linked with the land question: to eradicate latifundism meant getting rid of unemployment, poverty and starvation.

The farm workers in the south have long been known for their high political consciousness and activity. During the fascist dictatorship they often fought under the Communist Party's leadership for better conditions, against unemployment and repressions. Our Party has long enjoyed great prestige in the south and it has a strong organization there. Its slogan — 'land to the tiller' — has become the banner of the rural proletarians' struggle.

After the overthrow of the dictatorship, the first thing that the rural proletarians embarked upon was the establishment of a trade union.[1] This class-based organization played an important role in the struggle that unfolded in the countryside after April 25.

The latifundists reacted to the overthrow of the dictatorship by economic sabotage — destroying their crops and refusing to give the rural proletarians jobs and provide them with fodder. When the landowners were finally compelled, under the pressure of the working people's struggle, to give them jobs, they evaded paying them under different pretexts.

The development of events confronted the working people with the alternative: either hunger and loss of democratic freedoms, or, without waiting for the adoption of the agrarian reform law, put an end to the sabotage of the latifundists by revolutionary means, occupy and begin cultivating their lands in order to feed the people as they build the new life. The working people chose the second alternative.

The first cases of wrokers occupying neglected or badly used lands of big owners took place in 1974. The workers met with tremendous difficulties: more often than not, they lacked seeds, fertilizers and tractors. Having launched on this undertaking at their own risk, they received practically no help from the government at first. It required

incredible efforts to clear high thorny thickets, lands which had not seen the plough for decades. Those who had tractors helped those who had none: people shared their seeds, and loaned cattle and fertilizers to one another. Some assistance was secured from the government. Maize, rice, beans, sunflowers, tomatoes and other crops were planted on what were once waste lands.

The movement to occupy the big landed estates gained particularly wide scope in the spring of 1975, following the abortive rightist coup of March 11. And the decree on the agrarian reform (April 1975) appeared when the reform had virtually begun, when broad masses of working people had joined the movement. By mid-1975 more than 500,000 hectares of land had already been occupied. The reform enjoyed the sympathy of the Armed Forces Movement and most of its leaders. Were it not for the working people's struggle, led by the Communist Party and the trade union, there would probably have been no agrarian reform up till now. We have every justification for saying that the reform was carried out from below by the workers themselves, who were united in their trade union and led by the Communist Party.

The enforcement of the agrarian reform involved a fierce class battle between the workers and the landowners. At first the latter and their accomplices tried to use force to provent its implementation (they have not given up their attempts even now). They and the fascists organized mass meetings to frighten people with the imaginary dangers of agrarian reform. They vainly appealed to the army for help, and tried to steal cattle and implements from the farms set up on expropriated lands. Reaction's aim was to get the small and middle peasants in the north to reject the reform: from day to day it told them that farm hands from the south would come and take away their land. It organized in the north the so-called movement of Portuguese agricultural producers. From there reaction several times tried to launch a march to the south, but its participants met with firm resistance and never dared to cross the boundary of Alentejo province. The struggle reached its peak in the middle of last year when the landowners realized that the workers would not retreat, that they were determined to defend their gains.

The right-wing Popular-Democratic and Christian-Democratic parties frequently attacked the agrarian reform. Even today they do not want to hear anything about it. The Popular Democrats, both inside and outside the government are waging an open battle against the reform and mobilizing for this purpose the reactionary forces, and also the small and middle peasants.

At first the Socialist Party, too, opposed the reform and it hampered the adoption of the law on its enforcement. Speaking on radio

and television, at meetings and rallies, its leaders claimed that the farm workers in the south were land grabbers. This stand of the Socialist Party deeply offended the working people, including its own rank and file. As a result, the party's influence in southern Portugal declined sharply.

Today the Socialist Party takes a different stand toward agrarian reform. The Minister of Agriculture in the present government, Socialist Lopes Cardoso, is a defender of the reform, although his opinion on some of its important aspects differs strongly from that of the Communist Party. But on some other aspects our views coincide.[2]

Whatever reactionary propaganda inside the country and elsewhere may say to the contrary, the agrarian reform has not affected the property of the small and middle agricultural producers. The right-wingers' assertion that the property of these producers was confiscated or stolen is a lie from beginning to end. The broad mass movement that the agrarian reform entailed caused no more than some two dozen cases in which plots with good olive groves or orchards belonging to middle peasants but abandoned by their owners were occupied. But these mistakes have been rectified.

The kind of agrarian reform accomplished in Portugal is not described in any textbooks: it is unique. It was the working class who carried it out and it did so quickly — within a few months. But the working class of Portugal is not in power. In executing the reform it faced frenzied resistance on the part of the exploiter classes, whose power, though restricted in the course of the revolution, had not been overthrown. The agrarian reform in our country was not designed to bring about a class of small holders. As a result of its accomplishments, the working people have taken possession of the land and are jointly managing it within the framework of an as yet bourgeois social system.[3]

The very names of the collective farms set up on the lands taken away from the latifundists are symbolic. The spirit and history of the revolution are reflected in such names as 'The Red Carnation,' 'In Unity We Shall Win,' 'The Left Will Be Victorious' and 'Bento Goncalves.'[4] Such names show that the working people link the establishment of these farms with the development of the revolutionary process.

It is only by tradition that we call these farms cooperatives. Their emergence was not the result of collectivization of small and medium-size landholdings or other property. The annual profit goes into the further development of collective production. Every cooperative member gets a fixed wage, established in the contract concluded by the farm workers' trade union and the Ministry of Labor. The wages of tractor drivers, machine operators and work-

ers in other trades differ. Wages are a form of remuneration the workers appreciate. As a rule, they do not seek to acquire even a tiny household plot of land. It is only a few people of the elder generation in some areas who express such a desire. Most of the collective farm members, especially the young ones, want only regular wages and normal working conditions.

The organization and management of the cooperatives are founded on a democratic basis. The management board is elected by all members of the cooperative. And then within the board specialized commissions are elected, likewise on a democratic basis, to direct the different sectors of production. The commissions regularly hold meetings, which can be attended by any member of the cooperative.

The Communist Party plays an important role in organizing the work of the collective farms, each of which is a big and closely-knit family. In view of the change in the economic and political structures in the south, Party organizations there are now founded, not according to the territorial principle, but on the basis of the farms. Party members are usually elected to the top posts, but the management boards also include quite a few non-Party people who support the Party's policy.

Our Party constitutes a sizable force in the south. There are cooperatives where more than half of the employees are Party members. More and more people are joining the Party, and the circulation of *Avante!* is increasing.

The country now has dozens of collective farms with an efficient structure and a sufficiently high level of organization of production and management. One of these advanced forms is called May Day, situated in the municipal district of Avis, Portalegro Region. It has 14,000 hectares of land and 400 employees. This cooperative has a great influence on farmers in all the neighboring areas. The members of its management board are respected people well known throughout the region; nost of them are Communists, a few are Socialists.

To promote the growth of production, the May Day cooperative is building by itself, without government assistance, a dam for irrigation purposes, and small workshops for the repair of machines, motor vehicles, etc. It has two nursery schools and a rest home for elderly members of the employees' families.[5] It also has its own shop, where the prices of foodstuffs and other goods are lower than market prices. In this, what we call consumer cooperative, the employees are shopkeepers who could hardly make a living out of their former businesses. Now they have guaranteed wages. And their knowledge of commercial affairs is useful to the farm.

The May Day farm has established cooperation with the small and

middle producers of the district. They sell their products through the cooperative, which has trade ties with the state and can do without middlemen. The cooperative buys seeds and fertilizers from the state and sells them to the small and middle peasants at cost price. It also helps them to harvest their crops.

Reaction's slanderous predictions that illiterate workers would fail to manage the lands they had occupied and that the country would face a famine have not come true. Owing to the devoted efforts of the working people, Alentejo Province, for instance, has increased agricultural output. The tendency toward increased production was noticeable already in the first year of the revolution. In that year the sown area was up seven per cent. In the 1974-75 agricultural year weather conditions were good, and wheat output rose by 24 per cent.[6]

In 1975 the crop area was further enlarged, and though there are no overall data, the selective figures are highly indicative. For example, in the municipal district of Avis 450,000 kgs. of winter wheat were sown in 1974, and 1,200,000 kgs. in 1975: the amount of winter barley sown was 5,000 kgs. and 30,000 kgs. respectively. In the municipal district of Campo Maior the sown area in 1975 was 50 per cent greater than in 1974. Last autumn the amount of wheat sown in the municipal district of Montemor Novo exceeded the previous year's figure by 500,000 kgs. And the municipal district of Mora doubled its sown area.

It is safe to say that this year's sown area has increased by 30 to 40 per cent over last year's. If weather conditions are good this year, Portugal will not have to import wheat and other grains.

The cattle population in the southern regions has increased over last year. Measures have been taken to preserve breeding cattle. Young livestock is bought in other regions of the country and sent to Alentejo.

It is significant that the workers, as experience has shown, have no intention whatsoever of adhering to the traditional, obsolete forms of production. They are already thinking in terms of quality seeds and irrigation, mechanical milking, and higher effectiveness of animal husbandry.

While opening up wide prospects for the flourishing of agriculture in Portugal, the agrarian reform is also an important instrument for defending the revolution. It is strengthening the alliance of the urban and rural proletariat. Industrial workers, too, have proved to be closely associated with the farmers. One of the forms of this association is their participation in agricultural work. Thousands and thousands of workers and members of the revolutionary youth go to the countryside on Sundays and other holidays. There they work

voluntarily in the cooperatives and organize unity festivals. So it is not only a matter of material, but also of moral and political support from the urban working class.

The reform is also consolidating the alliance of the farm workers with the small and middle producers in the countryside. The Party pays unremitting attention to this alliance. By promoting all-round cooperation between the collective farmers and the small holders, it has foiled the attempts of the fascist reactionaries and the landowners to break this alliance.

This cooperation is developing along two lines. First, there is sales cooperation, which means that the small producers sell their goods through the cooperatives, and have no need for middlemen; through the same channels used by the cooperatives and on the same terms they can obtain fertilizers, machines and other industrial wares. Second, cooperation in production. Many peasants lack equipment and manpower. The collective farms help out by sending a column of 10 or 12 machines, which can harvest all peasant holdings in one district within a day. Their interests are expressed by the League of Small Producers, which maintains close ties with the farm workers' trade union, and, through it, with the cooperatives.

Many of the small producers have no land of their own, and in some districts they are granted land by the cooperatives. Another interesting fact has been observed: small producers having been convinced of the advantages of collective farming, voluntarily join the cooperatives, which buy their cattle and implements, and accept them as equal members.

The peasants in the northern provinces too, are beginning to see the advantages of joint work. The agrarian reform enables them to cooperate and barter products with collective farms in the south. The collective farms are helping to solve an extremely urgent problem facing the peasants in the north — export of their produce, notably to socialist countries.

There has been some misunderstanding between the collective farmers and the small holders in the north, whom the reactionaries were able to mislead about the agrarian reform. However, this is gradually disappearing.

The Communist Party's efforts are directed at strengthening its organizations in the north and helping the working peasants to achieve social and economic emancipation. The difficulties confronting the Party are due to the fact that before April 25 it did not have as strong an organization there as it had in the south. Besides, the church has always had an enormous influence in the north. Party work there is also hampered by the terrorism unleashed by reaction. Supported to some extent by the military and actively backed by all

anti-revolutionary forces, reaction is pursuing a policy of repression and intimidation in the north. Any supporter of the Communist Party risks finding his car burned or his house demolished.

The Party, however, never tires of repeating that the population in the north is not reactionary. It is just that the conditions there differ from those in the south, where there is a revolutionary and well organized rural proletariat. We are convinced that the Party will find forms of organization that accord with the specific conditions of the north, that it will broaden the scope of its work to win over more and more peasants there. We believe that we will achieve a firm alliance between the working masses in Portugal's two agricultural regions and extensive cooperation will develop between them. This alliance and this cooperation are indispensable to the defence of the revolution.

We Communists are well aware that it is extremely difficult to embark upon further revolutionary reorganizations when a bourgeois government is in office. The main difficulty is to find the ways and means, in this complex and contradictory political situation, of consolidating the progressive economic and social structures established during development of the revolutionary process, of furthering this process despite the hindrances of the right-wing forces and the present government.

The agrarian reform, too, has to be extended in spite of the many technical, financial and organizational obstacles created by the government.

The cooperatives obviously have to grow a wider variety of products for sale to the state. There are other marketing difficulties which they overcome by setting up their own commercial network, with retail shops, sales cooperatives, promoting commercial ties with major enterprises where workers exercise control, using the network of department stores to market their produce, and supplying foodstuffs to such wholesale buyers as hospitals and the procurement agencies of the armed forces.

The cooperatives badly need equipment, irrigation systems and reservoirs (the south of Portugal is very dry). An agricultural infrastructure must be built: cattle yards, silage pits, forage storehouses, and fodder-producing facilities. Pedigree livestock has to be bought. Funds and credits are required for all this, but the government has refused to grant any.

The shortage of agronomists and machine operators is a serious problem. One-third of the population in Alentejo province for instance, is illiterate, and a great many specialists identify their interests with those of the bourgeoisie.

One must also bear in mind the difficulties involved in adapting

thousands of farm workers to the new conditions. They must now learn to work for themselves, not for landowners. The process of adapting to collective, democratic forms of farming is not simple and has involved many organizational difficulties.

We Communists are well aware of the nature and magnitude of the problems, and we are confident in our ability to solve them. In our daily work among the masses, we feel their vigorous strength, the fervent enthusiasm with which they are carrying forward the revolution. To the working people, defense of the agrarian reform means defense of the revolution, and vice versa. They realize that if reaction wins, it will suppress all democratic freedoms and their revolutionary gains, including the agrarian reform. A fascist dictatorship would rule the country once again. But the enemies of the revolution must know that its defeat would spell death and bloodshed. The working people do not intend to wait until the reactionaries abolish their gains. The same is true of the agrarian reform: it can now be reversed only with tanks and guns, for the rural working people are determined to defend this great gain of the revolution to the end.

The prospects for progressive changes in the countryside are inseparately linked with the prospects of the revolution itself. The revolution has not been completed, it continues despite all the difficulties. The Portuguese Communists are enriched by the experience of the revolution's sharp turns. This enables them to plan the next step toward the revolutionary reorganization of society more accurately.

1. Farm workers' trade unions were outlawed soon after the fascists came to power in 1933.

2. This issue was already being prepared for print when fresh reports were received from Portugal saying that on Lopes Cardoso's proposal, Vitor Louro, representing the Communist Party in the government and responsible for the implementation of the agrarian reform, has been relieved of his post of Secretary of State for Land Management. In a statement the Communist Party expressed concern about this decision, whose adoption was prompted merely by the attacks of the reactionary press on Vitor Louro. He was accused of 'inciting workers to riots' in Alentejo. The Communist Party regards this slanderous accusation as part of the right-wing forces' offensive on the agrarian reform — *Ed.*

3. The decree on the agrarian reform provided for the expropriation of landed estates that brought an income of 50,000 contos (1 conto = 1,000 escudos). This meant that estates with unfertile and dry lands totalling more than 500 hectares, and those with over 50 hectares of fertile and irrigated lands, were subject to expropriation. Estates of more than 50 hectares with soil of medium fertility were not subject to expropriation, unless they had orchards. These norms were twice revised afterwards. The question of the area of estates subject to expropriation is still outstanding today. For according to the prevailing system, owners are entitled to retain estates of 200 to 400 hectares because they do not yield an income of 50,000 contos. These estates are not irrigated, no capital is invested in them, and they have not undergone amelioration. Nevertheless, one who possesses such an estate remains a big land owner.

4. The first General Secretary of the Communist Party died in the fascist concentration camp of Tarrafal. — *Ed.*

5. This is a typical characteristic of advanced collective farms: they set up nurseries, schools, song-and-dance groups for their employees' children. They organize literacy and qualification improvement courses. The personnel problem is so acute that sometimes the cooperatives give allowances to their employees attending these courses.

6. Grain (wheat, oats, barley) is the traditional crop in the south, above all in the Province of Alentejo. In Ribatejo Province wine and cork are also produced, but there, too, grain is the main crop.

Socialist society's spiritual potential

Hans-Joachim Hoffmann
Minister of Culture,
German Democratic Republic

SUPG CULTURAL POLICY

The Eighth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG) held in 1971 set the Party and state the aim of further raising material and cultural standards through a high rate of socialist economic development, higher effectiveness, technological progress and higher labor productivity. The five years since than have shown, as Comrade Erich Honecker has pointed out, that this involves 'a principled and long-range orientation stemming from the basic economic law of socialism' and corresponds with the new requirements in building developed socialist society. And this society, as our draft Party Program emphasizes, will be the beginning of a gradual transition to communism.

Dual task

Culture plays anything but a secondary role in building mature socialism. As our draft program emphasizes, the building of developed socialist society is a historical process involving deep-going political, economic and social transformations, and also transformations in the cultural field. This process calls for systematic development at a higher level of all the advantages and motive forces, all aspects and spheres of public life, the productive forces and production, social and political relations, science and education, socialist ideology and culture, the entire complex of living and working conditions, as well as the country's defences.

It will thus be seen that the SUPG considers continued improvement of material conditions and the development of culture components of a whole. Improving socialist education, developing culture and the arts and their penetration of all spheres of life is just as important a task as assuring social confidence and higher prosperity standards. 'When we speak of cultural progress in a developed socialist society . . .,' Kurt Hager has remarked, 'we have in mind the entire complex of conditions of life, material and spiritual values, ideas and knowledge, all of which help people to mature and become educated convinced builders of socialism, real socialist personalities.'

The integral character of our conception of culture is expressed in the fact that culture is both an ideological and philosophical orientation and guide to practical action. From this follows the need constantly to study culture and direct its development. This is a multidimensional dynamic process based on the laws governing the building of socialist society, and closely interacting with the process of bringing together the classes and strata of socialist society, gradually obliterating the distinctions between town and country, mental and manual labor, and unfolding of the scientific and technological revolution and its organic combination with the advantages of socialism. Lastly, this process is closely associated with the changing way of life of our people.

Culture permeates every sphere of life of socialist society. But its main function remains the formation of a harmonious and comprehensively developed personality, the shaping of the conscious, educated and socially active member of society. This function is being discharged by the socialist education system, by all workers in culture and the arts, by institutions and organizations concerned with culture, by the ideological and educational activities of the Party the state, the trade unions, all other public organizations, and by economic management bodies. The fullest development of the People's creative abilities, first of all of the working class, the leading social force, is both an aim and an essential condition in the building of developed socialist and communist society.

That is precisely how the matter is treated in policy statements of the SUPG and other fraternal parties in the socialist countries. The efforts toward that goal contribute to progress in achieving the ultimate aim of the Communist parties, to assure, in the words of Lenin, '*full* well-being and free *all-round* development for *all* members of society' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 6 p. 54).

Main direction of cultural policy

Guided by this Lenin thought, our Party regards the socialist cul-

tural revolution as an inalienable part of the revolutionary refashioning of society. It is being carried out over a long period, from the establishment of working-class power right up to the building of communism. The working class is central to this all-embracing process of cultural development. Hence the effectiveness and quality of all our work in this field is determined primarily by the way it stimulates and satisfies the cultural interests of the working class. In other words, by the degree to which culture and the arts help to develop the worker's personality.

Guided by Party policy, the trade unions, Youth League and other public and government organizations are actively working in this direction, and we can say that the impact of socialist culture is now substantially greater.

The spread of the socialist emulation movement and its companion piece, the movement to 'work, learn and live in the socialist way,' play an important part in raising the educational and cultural level of the working class and stimulating and satisfying its interests in the values of socialist culture. The latter movement began in 1959 and now accounts for nearly 90 per cent of all work collectives involved in the socialist emulation drive. The creative activity of the working class in the culturál sphere is clearly discernible in fulfillment by work teams and trade union collectives of the plans of cultural and educational development. These plans are a component part of the obligations undertaken in the socialist emulation campaign. And they include such provisions as assimilating and deepening the study of Marxism-Leninism, raising work skills, a closer interest in art and literature, development of socialist forms of recreation, participation in amateur art groups, sport, public affairs, etc.

In all these plans a very prominent place belongs to our efforts to satisfy the workers' requirements in fostering a socialist work culture, the desire by workers to 'saturate' the very process of work with culture and for culture to permeate the general atmosphere in the factories. In this way socialist emulation helps to shape unity of a cultural way of life and a cultural way of work. The socialist work schools at factories play a prominent part in this. At present there are 80,000 such schools, and the 1,600,000 working people who attend them assimilate the Marxist world outlook, raise their professional skills and learn more about the economy.

The results of this cultural growth are taken into account in summing up the achievements of the emulation movement. This is done at meetings of work collectives to review the development of culture. Each collective reports on its work, on how it is raising its

cultural level. This form is designed to activize cultural work among all working people of a given factory, office or other institution.

Another important method of stimulating culture among the workers, the cooperative farmers and all sections of the working people is the art festivals held at industrial enterprises, cooperative farms and residential areas. The factory festivals were started in 1970 when about 350 were held, with about one million people participating. Last year there were 3,000 festivals involving about eight million people.

Workers' festivals with the participation of leading amateur art groups from factories, agricultural cooperatives, the National People's Army, schools, etc., are held every two years in various parts of the country. These festivals have become part and parcel of our cultural life since 1959. They are also attracting increasing international interest. Their scope is measurable in the fact that the 1974 festival involved about 18,000 amateur and professional artists and was attended by 1,650,000 people.

Still another clear indication of the cultural growth of our people is widespread amateur art activity. There are now 25,000 groups and circles with 1,400,000 active participants, 100 worker and farmer theatres, 50 'worker-writer' circles, etc. About 43 million people visit our houses of culture and clubs every year.

Developing culture in the rural areas

With the domianance of socialist production relations, the growth and strengthening of cooperative farms and the wider use of industrial methods in agriculture, we were able to pass to a new stage in developing culture in the rural areas. The possibilities and prerequisites are being created for gradually evening out cultural levels in urban and rural communities.

We can already speak of substantial progress in overcoming the sharp gap between town and country inherited from capitalism. There is a steady process of bringing town and country closer together in terms of culture. In 1960, only 4.2 per cent of cooperative farmers had received occupational training; the present figure is 80 per cent. We have introduced 10-year universal polytechnical schooling. Medical care, too, is on much the same high level in the towns and villages. Nor are there any material differences in possession of radio sets, TV sets and other durable consumer goods.

The result has been a much wider interest in culture among cooperative farmers. The 240 houses of culture and the over 6,000 village clubs staffed by volunteers are the initiators and centers of a very active cultural life.

Environmental protection, more rational and effective use of the

land, water sources, flora and fauna is still another aspect of how culture is being assimilated by the people, particularly in rural areas. Aesthetic criteria and appreciation of the beautiful play an increasing role in planning and building up communities, recreation centers, and in preserving nature, historical monuments, etc. As Comrade Honecker said in his speech at the 11th Farmers' Congress '. . .We are far from underestimating the fact that well-tilled fields and well-cared-for forests and attractive villages add to the beauty of our country and are a matter of rejoicing for every citizen.'

Notwithstanding urbanization, we are doing everything to preserve the characteristic features of our villages but not, of course, to the detriment of providing modern conditions for the rural population.

Art helps society, society helps art

The socialist revolution has wrought a qualitative change in the role of art and the artist in the life of society. The rapid growth of cultural interests and the equally rapid growth of opportunities to satisfy them naturally make new demands on cultural workers, artists and writers, stimulating perfection of their craftsmanship and bringing them into closer association with the people, also heightening their responsibility to society. In full accord with the main task formulated by the Eighth SUPG Congress, our Party is orienting development of the arts on satisfying these new requirements.

Proceeding from the understanding that 'man must cultivate his feelings, develop his ethical and aesthetic interests and his ability to appreciate art,' the Sixth CC SUPG Plenum (1972) noted that art is a vital necessity for socialism and the artist, 'the first to depict the new reality,' becomes a conscious participant in the process of building socialism. 'Socialist art,' the plenum emphasized, 'matures only in the class struggle, in the course of accomplishing its great social mission. . . .'

Our progress in literature and the arts, especially tangible following the Eighth SUPG Congress, was largely due to our Marxist-Leninist policy on culture and to the closer alliance of the working class and other sections of the working people. This policy has been persistently pursued by the Party. The high appraisal the Congress gave to the work of our artists, the major tasks it set them, necessitated by the building of developed socialist society, the close links between the artistic intelligentsia and the working class and its Party — all this created an ideological and spiritual atmosphere conducive to creative work. In all branches of art and literature works have been produced which now hold a firm place in the country's cultural life. They reflect the interests of our workers and scientists, our farmers and artists, of the men and women who are solving the complex economic, social

and cultural problems involved in building developed socialism. There is a closer link between artists and writers and the life of the people and new vistas have opened for their creative endeavor.

The voice of the young generation of artists is being heard more authoritatively and convincingly. These are men and women born in a socialist society and for them socialism is something taken for granted. They pose new, interesting problems of the past, present and future. Their understanding of capitalist reality in many ways differs from that of the generation that is today 45 years old or more. They are anxious to accumulate their own political, general and working experience against the background of multiform class battles and social movements. Consequently, operating our policy of alliance with creative intellectuals is a constant, multi-faceted and by no means one-dimensional task. We regard partisanship and unity with the people as the key features of socialist art.

There are many facts illustrative of the important place socialist literature and art holds in the life of our society. For instance, the rapid growth of subscribers to our more than 13,000 public libraries and to our 5,000 trade union and 34 scientific libraries. Or another example: we produce 120 new books a year, four times more than in the year the GDR was founded. Also this: 82 per cent of all families have television sets. There has been a very marked increase in visits to museums, picture galleries and exhibitions: the figure has risen from 17,500,000 in 1968 to 35,000,000 at the present time. There is also a big demand for musical works of all genres. Compared with 1970, output of phonograph records in 1974 was twice as big, amounting to 15 million.

All the achievements of socialist art and literature would have been inconceivable without our care and solicitude for the cultural treasures of the past and without our constantly drawing on the humanist, democratic and socialist traditions of our world culture.

Today we can be justifiably proud of the fact that the development of culture in the GDR has won international recognition. Our experience in operating our cultural policy suggests that now, as well as in the future, the question of what place the cultural heritage should hold and what our attitude to it should be is of vast political and ideological importance. Taking as our starting point the Lenin proposition that only he can be a Communist who assimilates the wealth of knowledge accumulated by mankind, our Party has over the past three decades done much to preserve and bring within the reach of the public the treasures of culture inherited from the past.

And we can safely say that the cultural wealth accumulated by mankind has now become accessible to the masses. The steady increase in the books and phonograph records we put out, the truly

popular interest, compared with the past, in Beethoven, Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Feuchtwanger, Thomas Mann, Mickiewicz, Tchaikovsky, Verdi, Shakespeare, Pushkin, Balzac, Cervantes and many other writers; mass participation in the festivities marking the 450th anniversary of the Peasant War, the 1,000th anniversary of Weimar, etc.; the staging of works by the world's great dramatists and the performance of works of the great composers of the past — all this is convincing evidence that socialism is becoming the real home of all that is valuable and progressive in the culture of mankind. We are protecting the spiritual and cultural heritage of the past against imperialism, which abuses this heritage, distorts and emasculates it.

The cultural heritage has become the subject of a sharp ideological confrontation. Our ideological adversaries in the imperialist countries, notably the FRG, have stepped up their activity. The GDR's creative attitude to the values of history and tradition effectively refutes the Western propaganda figment of a 'united German cultural nation based on the common culture and destiny of all Germans,' which, it is alleged, exists today too. The deeper we penetrate and assimilate the cultural past, the clearer becomes the correctness of Lenin's theory of two incompatible cultures. This is fully confirmed by the mutually opposed socialist culture of the GDR and the imperialist culture of the FRG ruling classes. A creative approach to the legacy of the past has always been, and will continue to be, an inalienable part of our cultural policy.

Internationalism of socialist culture

By word and deed our people are upholding the internationalist traditions of the revolutionary working-class movement also in the realm of culture. And one of the main indicators of cultural progress in the course of building developed socialism is the fact that the internationalist content of our culture is being raised to a new, higher plane. For one thing, there is closer unity of socialist patriotism and socialist internationalism, of the national and international.

Our country is a staunch member of the socialist community. The common economic basis, social and political structure of the fraternal socialist countries, their coordinated international activity, their common Marxist-Leninist world outlook and the development of socialist economic integration — these and other factors — have powerfully influenced cooperation in culture, strengthening its internationalist basis. Concretely this implies active assimilation by the GDR of artistic and cultural values of the peoples of the USSR and other fraternal countries, especially the great, world renowned, humanistic, democratic and revolutionary cultural heritage of the Russian people.

Our chief aim in this respect is to facilitate the consolidation of world socialism and the world revolutionary movement. That is the purpose of organizing 'culture days' of fraternal countries in the GDR and reciprocal measures in these countries, such as festivals, etc. This has become a regular practice. Every major event in the cultural life of any fraternal country is marked by the participation of artists from other countries of the socialist community.

Celebration of the 30th anniversary of victory over fascism was a very special event in the cultural life and cooperation of the socialist countries. For the peoples of our socialist community it was an occasion that vividly brought out their feelings of gratitude and respect for the Soviet people. Among the main events were an international art exhibition, Thirty Victorious Years, and a joint amateur art festival sponsored by Czechoslovakia, Poland and the GDR at a point where the three countries meet. Publishing houses of the socialist countries will by 1980 put out a 35-volume Victory Library, of which the first several volumes were available on the 30th anniversary of victory.

However, expanding cultural links of members of the socialist community are not confined to these undertakings. They include direct creative projects, and these have been facilitated by the long-term cultural cooperation agreements. Direct contacts between creative and cultural organizations are constantly being expanded. They make for live, direct exchange of experience and their development enjoys all-round support. Such cooperation agreements have already been concluded between many theatres, universities and schools, and museums. For instance the Dresden Gallery has such an agreement and maintains close contact with museums in Moscow and Leningrad and the national galleries in Prague, Warsaw and Budapest. In recent years this has been complemented by plan coordination and joint undertakings, primairly in publishing, the cinema and phonograph records.

The art of the USSR and of other members of the socialist community have become part of our own cultural life. Most theatres, orchestras, amateur art ensembles and concert groups visiting the GDR come from the socialist countries which also account for 65 per cent of all our translated literature, 75 per cent of visiting exhibitions and 60 per cent of feature films.

And so, the achievements of the people of each fraternal country are increasingly becoming accessible to audiences in all other fraternal countries. This process, directed by the Communist parties, is constantly expanding. Cultural development in the socialist countries is now determined by two intertwining dialectical processes: on the one hand, socialist national culture flourishes in each fraternal

country, and on the other, there is gradual coming together and mutual enrichment of national cultures. This is something entirely new in history and we make a point of supporting and promoting it.

We tie in our closer cultural contacts with other countries of the socialist community with ideological cooperation of the fraternal parties, which has assumed wider scope in recent years. In his report to the 25th CPSU Congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary, CC CPSU, emphasized that such cooperation 'helps to raise the level of ideological and educational work in each of our parties and more successfully to act in the ideological confrontation of the two social systems. In present-day conditions this is very important, for the problems of ideological struggle are more and more being brought to the fore, and the truth about socialism is a powerful weapon in this struggle.'

Battle of ideas

In reflecting on the significance of culture in building socialism and communism, we must not lose sight of the fact that socialist culture and art rise and develop against a background of sharp class confrontation with imperialism. Obviously, their attractive power and influence in the world are steadily increasing. Our culture is an effective alternative to the anti-human, by its very nature, imperialist 'mass culture' of contemporary bourgeois society, with its dehumanized way of life. Obviously, too, the decadence of art, its glorification of violence and crime, its contempt for the human being, his dignity, happiness and confidence in the future — in short, all the things that make up bourgeois 'mass culture' — are the result of culture being subordinated to the class interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The apologists for capitalism are frantically looking for a way out of the crisis of bourgeois culture. But that crisis is part of the general crisis of capitalism, which extends to all aspects of capitalist society, to its very way of life and its morality. History has clearly demonstrated that modern bourgeois society has no future and is incapable of solving the problems of cultural development in the interests of man and progress.

And this crisis is being aggravated at a time when socialism is successfully forging ahead in the cultural and all other fields. This means that our socialist culture is exerting a growing influence on cultural processes in the imperialist countries, increasingly exposing the distorted, deformed and contradictary nature of their cultural life. We refer to the basic contradiction between the dominant, reactionary, imperialist culture and the elements of a developing humanist, democratic and socialist culture, and also to the intrinsic contradictions of the dominant bourgeois culture.

These contradictions and the growth of the democratic forces present new opportunities for the socialist community countries. The Helsinki Conference recommendations provide a good basis for gradually overcoming the inadequate information or distorted notions about cultural development in the socialist countries. While taking that into account, we are fully aware that constant confrontation with the bourgeois, 'left' and right opportunist conceptions of culture, desseminated above all by definite circles in the FRG, is a component part of our own cultural policy. These concepts are meant to conceal, or even negate, the existence of antagonisms in modern bourgeois culture.

A distinguishing feature of the culture of developed socialist society, one that contributes to durable peace and closer friendship between the peoples, is our rejection of the decadent imperialist culture, of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in whatever form or shape. Our culture is advancing in struggle against imperialism and is continuously asserting its historic superiority over bourgeois culture. In the ideological battles of our time, the socialist culture and art of the GDR can rely on the genuine humanism of socialist society, its spiritual and moral values, its absorption of the great achievements of the German people's culture which continue to live in our own socialist national culture. Guided by proletarian internationalism, we shall continue, together with the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, to use every channel of international cultural exchange and cooperation to assert the ideals of humanism, democracy and socialism as part of the battle against imperialism.

The culture and art of the German Democratic Republic are the embodiment of the spiritual potential of a country that has drawn the necessary and correct lessons from history, especially from the nazi years and the Second World War. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism, humanism and peace, socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism are firmly rooted in our people. They have once and for all done away with chauvinism, nationalism and racism, which had such a ruinous effect on bourgeois German culture and are still making themselves felt among definite circles in the FRG. Culture and art have become the property of all the people, as Lenin foresaw. The deep-going changes in cultural life, in the consciousness and psychology of our people over the past three decades, the flourishing state of our socialist national culture — they are all an immense achievement of socialism, the result of the purposeful ideological and political work of the SUPG and of its Marxist-Leninist cultural policy, the logical outcome of the cultural and educational work of the state and of all the parties and mass organizations united in the National Front.

Terror cannot stop the march of history

PAGES FROM THE BOOK OF COURAGE

The contribution which Communists — members of the great international brotherhood of fighters for the happiness of all working people — make to the positive changes taking place on our planet, to the world revolutionary process, is tremendous and indisputable. The sources of the current achievements of world socialism and the gains of the international working-class and national-liberation movement trace back to the activity of the Communist League founded by Marx and Engels, to the barricades of the Paris Commune and the streets of Chicago stained with workers' blood, to the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Russian proletariat and the heroic deeds of Lenin's Party, to the *Aurora* shot which heralded the advent of a new era in man's history. These achievements and gains are a materialization of the collective wisdom, experience and energy of many generations of revolutionary heroes of all continents.

The 25th CPSU Congress supported and approved the proposal put forward in the report of L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, that a monument symbolizing the Soviet Communists' unfailing loyalty to the great cause of proletarian internationalism be erected in Moscow in memory of the heroes of the international Communist, working-class and national-liberation movement who fought selflessly for the people's happiness and fell at the hands of the class enemy. Expressing the will of all Soviet Communists and Soviet people, the Congress solemnly declared its fraternal and unbreakable solidarity with Communists and all other fighters against imperialism and reaction, with the victims of fascist repression, with those who languish in prisons and concentration camps and who are brutally tortured.

'The inhuman ordeal that has fallen to their lot,' says the statement 'Freedom for the Prisoners of Imperialism and Reaction' adopted by the Congress, 'is the class revenge for their heroic participation in the noble struggle for the interests of the working people, for the triumph of the ideals of peace and democracy, national independence and socialism.

'Despite the angry protests of broad sections of world opinion, the fascist junta in Chile continues to trample on all norms of law and to

keep in confinement that outstanding son of the Chilean people, that prominent personality of the world communist movement, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, Luis Corvalan.

'The Congress demands in all firmness: Release Luis Corvalan! Release our comrades — members of the Communist Party of Chile leadership Jose Cademartori and Jorge Montes, leaders of the Socialist Party Exequiel Ponce and Carlos Lorca, other Popular Unity leaders, and the thousands of other prisoners of the fascist regime — Communists, Socialists, all patriots and democrats!

'In Uruguay, the authorities have started another wave of repressions against the progressive forces. We demand: Release Secretaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay Jaime Perez and Jose Luis Massera, release all Uruguayan Communists, the President of the Broad Front of Uruguay Liber Seregni and other democrats!

'Antonio Maidana, Chairman of the Paraguayan Communist Party, has been languishing in prison for 18 years. A tyrannical military dictatorship holds sway over the whole country. Release Antonio Maidana! Release Miguel Angel Soler, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party, and hundreds of other Paraguayan patriots!

'In recent years, General Secretaries of the Guatemalan Party of Labor, Bernardo Alvarado Monzon and Huberto Alvarado Arellano, were brutally killed in quick succession in Guatemala. In Brazil, leading members of the Communist Party and the democratic opposition are disappearing without a trace in prisons. In Argentina, the reactionaries are subjecting the Communist Party and other progressive organizations to systematic terror. Terror does not cease in Haiti.

'The Congress declares its resolute protest against all these persecutions and demands an end to them.

'Outstanding personalities of the national-liberation movement of Africa — Amilcar Cabral, General Secretary of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, and Eduardo Mondlane, President of the National Liberation Front of Mozambique — have lost their lives at the hands of imperialist agents.

'The racist regimes' rule over the peoples of the South African Republic, Namibia and Zimbabwe is a challenge to the conscience of all mankind. Inhuman treatment from jailers caused the death of Bram Fisher, a distinguished humanist and an unbending fighter against racism and social injustice. Many leaders of the Communist Party of South Africa, the oldest Communist Party on the African continent, are kept in prison in appalling conditions. Disgrace upon

the racists and their henchmen! Release all participants in the national-liberation movement in the south of Africa!

'Thousands of Communists have been killed in Indonesia. To this day there are tens of thousands of political prisoners in jails and concentration camps. Release the Communists, all the patriots of Indonesia!

'On Palestinian territory occupied by Israel, fighters against aggression, for the sacred right of their people to have their own independent state, are arrested and kept in prison.

'In Spain the authorities still refuse to restore lawful freedom to many hundreds of political prisoners — Communists, Socialists and other democrats. The Congress supports all those who champion the just cause of the Spanish people.

'The Congress emphatically condemns the persecution and discrimination of Communists, the consistent champions of peace and the security of peoples, the most dedicated fighters for the interests of working people and for a better future for mankind.

'The Congress declares its full support for the martyrs and heroes of the revolutionary and liberation movement and sends them its fraternal greetings.'

We have repeatedly written about many of these heroes, well-known leaders of the international communist movement, such as Luis Corvalan, and rank and file members of the fraternal parties of various countries. Some of them have recalled in *WMR* memorable events of their life and struggle. The editors see their internationalist duty in continuing to carry material about heroes of the underground movement, prisoners of dictatorships, anti-fascists, courageous participants in class battles, past and present, about the inspiration and daily events of revolutionary struggle.

In this issue we would like to tell about the Communists of Paraguay, working in the harsh conditions of illegality and unceasing repression.

Reynaldo Marin, First Secretary of the Paraguayan Communist Party, speaks in an interview with *WMR* about today's struggle of the Communists of that Latin American country, including Miguel Angel Soler, Secretary of the PCP. During the 25th CPSU Congress, *WMR* correspondents asked leaders of some of the fraternal parties of the continent who know Miguel Soler, to tell our readers about him.

For obvious reasons, much of what follows is incomplete. But even this necessarily scant evidence of the selfless heroism of fighters for the Paraguayan people's freedom can, we believe, make up one of the innumerable pages of the Book of Communist Courage.*

*See *WMR*, August 1975, p. 142. The proposal to create this book, put forward in the journal, is also supported by our readers.

THE PARTY HAS COME BACK

Reynaldo Marin
First Secretary, Paraguayan Communist Party

The class struggle has lately been intensifying in Paraguay and so has anti-dictatorial activity. The Stroessner dictatorship and its policy of renouncing national sovereignty are a source of widespread discontent. The working class has stepped up the fight for its rights. In Pilar and other towns, workers took action against government policies. Not so long ago, the church severed relations with the Stroessner clique. Even smaller manufacturers and members of the traditional bourgeois parties have begun to resist the government.

The regime's reaction to growing anti-dictatorial trends is more repression. Troops and police carried out a punitive operation against Jejui, a Catholic community, where they jailed peasants and priests. In 1975 official violence turned against the peasants in the Misiones, Yho and Acaray districts. Last November and December, a new wave of violence struck the working-class and democratic movement. The homes of workers, students, intellectuals, shopkeepers and public figures were raided.

Communists are the hardest hit as usual. At the end of last year, the authorities arrested Miguel Angel Soler, Secretary of our Central Committee. They refuse all information on his fate, as well as that of other comrades. This makes political and democratic circles fear for the prisoners' lives. Many of them are tortured. A special section of the CIA operating in the Paraguayan police force has a hand in this.*

There is no doubt, however, that like his comrades, Soler, that indefatigable fighter for the Party, has borne up courageously under the trials in store for every revolutionary, for anyone carrying on underground work.

Stroessner would like to destroy Communist organizations. But his regime's repressive measures fail to produce the results he seeks. The dictatorship can no longer do as it pleases. It can no longer intimidate the people by hounding those who want to fight it in alliance with the Communists. Moreover, the Party has considerably improved its

*Word came late in March that the Paraguayan authorities were compelled to transfer PCP Chairman Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta, CC PCP members, and Ananias Maidana Palacios, a veteran, to the prison hospital after a four months' hunger strike called by them in protest against the dictatorship's repressive measures against a number of noted politicians. It also became known that CC PCP Secretary Miguel Angel Soler, Derliz Villagra, CC PCP member and leader of the Communist Youth Federation, and other imprisoned activists had 'disappeared.' The hunger strikers — Maidana, Rojas, Alcorta and Maidana Palacios — also protested against barbarous conditions of detention. They were backed by other political prisoners, who went on a hunger strike in solidarity. — *Ed.*

structure and functioning since its latest congress, the Third (April 1971). It has come back and its activity is on the rise.

The Stroessner dictatorship's terror against Communists was coupled with a blow which Oscar Creydt, a Maoist agent-provocateur, struck the Party and its unity from within, seriously weakening the Communists' positions in the fight against the dictatorship. Many comrades were killed or jailed. Many more had to emigrate. Incidentally, it was Soler who, at the head of a small group of comrades, exposed in a most difficult situation Creydt's hostile activity and cleared the way for his expulsion from the Party. Not until it had got rid of Creydt and his followers was the Party in a position to go back to organizing work inside the country.

Soler was one of the initiators and organizers of committees for the defense and reorganization of the Party and of the convocation of a national conference in April 1967 and then of the Third Party Congress. He made an invaluable contribution to the drafting of theses, program and rules adopted by the congress.

One of Soler's main concerns was to organize the Party inside the country. In 1968 and 1970, he tried twice to make his way into the country — clandestinely, of-course. He failed and only thanks to his experience of underground work managed to evade the police. The third time he succeeded in by-passing all police cordons. He was the first Central Committee member to return to the country after the Third Congress.

Soler worked in the Paraguayan underground for nearly four years. Stroessner's underlings caught him just as he was working on material for the coming Fourth Party Congress.

Miguel Angel Soler's arrest is a major loss to the Paraguayan Communist Party and the world communist movement.

The Party knows Soler as a staunch and uncompromising fighter against 'left' and right-wing deviations, an ardent champion of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. A hard-working man, he carefully studies the classical works of Marxism-Leninism and documents of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Soler is a staunch defender of the standards of Party life; he is also attentive to the opinions of cadre members of branch organizations.

Soler is also a remarkably unassuming man with an ability to adapt to difficult circumstances. I recall a Central Committee meeting that was held in a severe winter, in the absence of elementary facilities, and lasted all day long. It was deep night when Miguel and I arranged to get together before daybreak to discuss certain matters. At the appointed hour, I found him by the glow of his cigarette. He was in the kitchen, lying on two boards near a cold oven. I asked him if he

had slept. 'Very little,'' he replied, 'there are so many ants crawling all over the place.'

Soler rightly enjoys the affection of his fellow Communists as a man who has done so much to strengthen the Party.

Party leaders are now operating clandestinely in Paraguay. The Party publishes and distributes illegally the periodical *Adelante,* the theoretical journal *Bases* and a Communist Youth newspaper. Communists put out leaflets on current events and write slogans on walls. The Party has organized the circulation of Marxist-Leninist literature.

We have restored Party branches and formed new ones, especially in factories. The Party is growing. All our cadre members, old and young alike, have passed the severe test of underground work. This is important since in the conditions of brutal terror the replacement rate of cadre members is much greater than in normal conditions.

We have organized Party education for the members, which is very important to a party that has for decades been operating amid the most savage terror. Theoretical and political studies inspire Communists with confidence in the ultimate victory and impart to them moral qualities enabling them to stand the test of torture, death threats and slander and, moveover, to strengthen the Party and win friends and supporters for it.

In spite of repression, the Party is gaining strength, sparing no effort to be a strong, organized vanguard of the working class, a vanguard which as part of a united anti-dictatorship front could sweep away the Stroessner tyranny and fight for a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

Our Party has fine traditions that we are all proud of. It would be hard to list all the Communist heroes who fell fighting against the dictatorship, for the future of their country. The people cherish the memory of the fallen, both the known and the unknown. Nor is it easy to name all whom the fascist regime has put behind bars.

The Communist Party calls on all democratic and anti-dictatorship forces of the country, all contingents of the international working-class, communist and national-liberation movement and all progressive national and international alignments and organizations to demand an end to tortures and the release of Party Chairman Antonio Maidana and Central Committee members Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta, arrested almost 18 years ago, Miguel Angel Soler, Darliz Villagra and other political prisoners.

Supported by international solidarity, the Paraguayan people's struggle can put an end to tortures, preserve the lives of all political prisoners and secure their release.

TRUE SON OF HIS PEOPLE

Rodney Arismendi
First Secretary, Communist Party of Uruguay

The news of the arrest of Miguel Angel Soler who, true to his duty as a Communist and undaunted by the dangers in store for him, had returned to Paraguay, deeply disturbed me.

Today many leadinig Latin American Communists resolutely challenge fascism, exposing themselves to deadly risk. Some have lost their lives at the hands of torturers. By returning to his country as a leader of its Communists, at a time when the situation in Paraguay is so oppressive, Soler set an example of the personal courage distinguishing Communists.

Miguel Angel Soler came to the communist movement from the revolutionary wing of students; from the front of anti-imperialist struggle against dictatorships of tyrants, as a result of a quest for a solution that would enable the country to end its appalling backwardness and almost century-long stagnation. He chose the communist path. It was on this path that we met. I recall his alert mind, his lack of pose, his concern about the destiny of his Party when it found itself in a crisis and, later, his determination to create a revolutionary center in the country, which is ultimately of decisive importance to the destiny of every revolutionary party and to the struggle of every people.

I wonder if Soler will live through the horrors of the most refined tortures practised by a brutal regime subservient to U.S. imperialism. On behalf of a party fighting under a fascist regime, on behalf of the thousands of those imprisoned, killed or tortured to death by the Stroessner tryanny, we raise our voice in defense of Miguel Angel Soler. We call on the world public to save the life of a man, one of the Latin American leaders who are raising the banner of struggle against imperialism on a continent of revolution. Their fight is a fight for the future of our peoples and of world peace, for social progress and the development of revolutionary movements of our epoch, because today the fascist dictatorships of Latin America, including the bestial Paraguayan dictatorship, are a center of provocations directed by U.S. imperialism against world peace and the progress of peoples.

Jorge Colle
First Secretary, Communist Party of Bolivia

The extremely difficult revolutionary struggle in Paraguay, a country ruled by the tyrannical Stroessner regime, is marked by many sacrifices, made daily by the sons and daughters of that country in their

fight for freedom and human rights. The greatest losses have been suffered by Communists. Communists jailed by Stroessner have beaten all 'records' for length of detention.

Antonio Maidana has become a symbol of Communist resistance to reactionary repression on our continent. Recently a new name was added to the list of the Paraguayan Gestapo's victims, the name of Miguel Angel Soler, zealous and staunch leader of the Communists of Paraguay.

A serious young man who never parts with his pipe — that is how I have remembered him ever since we met. I have a vivid memory of his lean face marked by the hardships he went through after escaping once again from the Chaco concentration camp and trudging hundreds of kilometres across desert with his comrades.

Having joined the Communist Party as a mature person, after a persevering quest for ways of liberating his people, Soler gave all his energy to organizing the brain of the revolution in our country, the Communist Party, to the cause of national and social liberation, which history has assigned to the peoples of our continent as the paramount task. My most vivid recollections of Soler, like those of my comrades, are associated with his role in building up the Party, or in reorganizing it, to be exact, in perfecting that most important instrument of social revolution.

We Bolivian Communists join the revolutionaries and democrats of the world, the patriots of Paraguay demanding the release of that remarkable man, that indomitable fighter for democracy and socialism.

Volodia Teitelboim
Political Commission member, Communist Party of Chile

The statement of the 25th Congress of the CPSU demanding the release of all prisoners of fascism and reaction is a stirring document of proletarian solidarity. Significantly, most of the victims of repression mentioned in the statement are in the clutches of Latin American tyrants.

There is no forgetting for a single moment the 18 years spent by Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta in Stroessner's prisons. We are now concerned about the fate of a new captive of the dictatorship, Miguel Angel Soler, Secretary of the Party Central Committee.

This outstanding fighter, a lawyer by profession, has always lived a full life as a public figure, politician and intellectual. He was first arrested almost 30 years ago. A student leader, he was not 25. He escaped from jail and joined in the fighting that was going on near the capital. The first arrest was followed by others. He escaped again and

again to go back into action. No amount of torture could break his will.

The whole world must raise its voice in defense of Miguel Angel Soler's life, to secure his release. In a country which has been in a state of civil war for more than 20 years and where many patriots have grown old after spending almost two decades in detention, any crime is possible. That is why it is so important for all progressive forces to rally to save the life of Soler and secure the release of all fighters imprisoned by the dictatorships.

Eduardo Gallegos Mancera
Political Bureau member and Secretary,
Communist Party of Venezuela

I have the warmest recollections of my fraternal contacts with Miguel Angel Soler — of his generous smile, his warm handshake, his open heart. It is easy to talk to him and his speech is full of humor and optimism. We soon became friends, which made our talks on the most diverse subjects even more agreeable. We discussed problems facing the countries of the continent, international solidarity, the Paraguayan people's struggle, Soler's resolve to return to his country as soon as possible so as to join personally in the formation of a broad front against the Stroessner dictatorship and build up Party unity.

He considered that work to strengthen Party unity is most effective when carried on inside the country. He knew that it would be no easy task. He was well aware of the dangers involved but he also knew that the risk would be justified by the main goal, which was to unite the Paraguayan people around their undisputed vanguard, the Communist Party.

A consistent internationalist, he has always worked for the closest possible contacts between fraternal parties, for rallying all embattled peoples around the country of Lenin, the main bulwark in the fight against imperialism. A genuine representative of the finest traditions of his country, he devoted himself completely to his Party and his people.

A warmhearted man with a ready smile, he is a genuine Marxist, a staunch Communist, a fearless fighter who will not hesitate to give his life for his revolutionary ideals. To him, life means struggle, and he says a Communist must carry it on without undue haste but unrelentingly.

We still hope that our comrade is alive, and that it will be possible in the end to bring him out of the dictatorship's prison.

Miguel Angel Soler's whereabouts is still unknown. The authorities refuse all information concerning his fate or the fate of other detainees.

The lives of Miguel Angel Soler and his comrades are in danger!

viewpoints

The goal: a society without exploitation

The interviews printed below were granted to our correspondents by statesmen and political leaders of a number of revolutionary democratic states in Africa — the Somali Democratic Republic, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, the People's Republic of the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania, and the Malagasy Democratic Republic.

These states are at different stages of development — some have been independent for more than a decade, others for just a few years, and each has been on the road to progress for varying periods of time. That is why many of the problems facing them have certain peculiarities, whether it is a matter of the motive forces of the revolutionary process, the nature of the ruling parties or the place of religion in the life of society. But, as the following interviews show, the states concerned have a common goal — to build a society free of exploitation of man by man.

REVOLUTIONARY RESOLVE

Mohamed Siad Barre, President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council, Somali Democratic Republic.

The Somali Democratic Republic set out to build a socialist society in a complex situation, when the prerequisites for this were lacking. For one, capitalism in the true sense of the word never existed in Somalia. Though the capitalist ideology had penetrated our society, there was no capital proper, no industry or big enterprises that could form the basis of capitalism. So there was practically no working class either.

The bulk of the country's population are nomads. Our society is backward in all respects, from cultural to technological. This is not because it is lacking in human qualities of development. Our backwardness is a result of traditional imperialist policy. To promote their selfish interests, the imperialists used every means at their disposal to

keep our country poor and suppress its will for free development. And this has left an imprint on the entire social and economic life.

The leaders of the Somali revolution were aware of the profound difference between capitalism and socialism. But before moving toward socialism, they had to ascertain the ways of materializing their aspiration for socialism.

First of all, we analyzed the alignment of forces in the country. This enabled us to understand the nature of our society and its basis, and thus to determine the possibility of its accepting the new concept of social development.

The analysis showed the armed forces to be the only organized 'work force' in the country. But they had to be prepared ideologically. They would not have understood us if we began by talking about socialism and capitalism. The leaders of the Somalian revolution had to find a different vocabulary to make their point clear. It is with this 'sprirtual training' that we began paving the way for the revolution.

The revolution of October 21, 1969, indicated that the time had come to make a practical move toward the materialization of socialism; it was the first stage of our revolution. The second, present, stage aims at creating what our country lacked, namely, the prerequisites for building socialism — a working class and a peasantry (I mean industrial workers and cooperative peasants working on a collective basis). At the same time it is necessary to mobilize the masses by organizing broad campaigns and explaining the meaning of socialism and its fundamental differences from the capitalist system.[1]

In carrying out this work we must not lose sight of the psychological, cultural, religious and economic peculiarities of the nation. We must also create all the basic prerequisites for building the new society, and overcome all obstacles and render harmless the enemies of the social system we want to build.

Let us take religion. When the representative of the Supreme Revolutionary Council, Ali Mattan Hashi, addressed the conference organized by your journal in 1972, he spoke about removing the contradictions between religion and socialism.[2] How is the question approached in our country today?

To attain our strategic goal — building a socialist society — we must take account of the realities. This accords with Lenin's idea that one who disregards the historical specifics of the situation does not know the ABC of Marxism. That is why we reckon with the peculiarities of Somali society. One of them is the population's devotion to Islam. In our country religion is not just a matter of faith; it is inherent in our culture and has its own social structure. We have begun to analyze the contradictions arising from such a situation, and draw lessons from it.

The world has many religions, each with a theology and philosophy of its own. I can only speak about Islam. Its theological aspect consists in recognizing the existence of God, which is rejected by communist ideology.[3] Its philosophical aspect consists in the establishment of economic and social equality. There are also other peculiarities of Islam.

Our analysis led us to the conclusion that the religious structure that has long existed in the country could be exploited by our enemies to hinder the building of socialist society. We know that imperialism has always tried to use religion as an instrument against communist ideas. That is why we decided that in our country there should be no struggle between religion and socialism. We made it clear that religion was the private affair of every person, while socialism — the economic, social and political doctrine of building a socialist society — is the cause of all patriots. And patriotically-minded believers cooperate in implementing this policy. Of course, problems do arise, but they are not insuperable.

We are already building the economic and social base of socialism.[4] We are combating ignorance, disease and poverty, which hamper progress in all spheres.[5] Various, difficulties have confronted us during the six and a half years of the revolution. Some of them were caused by natural diasters, others — by imperialist subversion. But although the imperialists and other reactionary, mostly external, forces are trying to stop us, we are confident that we shall overcome these difficulties and build a society based on socialist principles.

For this we need a political organization, its name is immaterial. We mobilized the masses and have already created the necessary organizational structure. People's committees have been formed in villages, districts and under the central administration, and also in urban neighborhoods, factories and offices. In addition, there are local organizations for workers, women, the youth (similar to the YCL), and for Young Pioneers. All this provides a basis for future political organizations.

We have local national orientation centers where people meet to discuss important issues, thereby participating in the administration of the affairs of society. Here many draft laws and decisions are worked out. The centers have legal rights to settle disputes among citizens, resolve problems of marriage and the family, settle labor conflicts, and so on. In short, we to all intents and purposes have a party, although we do not call it as such. But this organization enables us to guide society.

We want to educate our people first, and set up a party afterwards. In our view, this will prevent the rise of opportunism and inner-party struggle. Political education for the masses is being organized, and

politically reliable people[6] are appointed to positions of leadership. The formation of a party is a long process. An appropriate decision can be passed only by the Supreme Revolutionary Council, although in principle it was decided as early as 1972 that a party of socialism will be formed.

Immediately after the revolution, we defined our policy in a document entitled The First Charter of the Revolution. The Second Charter, published on January 1, 1971, declared scientific socialism the ideological basis of our society. There is only one socialism namely scientific socialism. Anyone who gives it other names is only deceiving himself and others.[7]

Humane principles are inherent in socialism. We consider it the duty and responsibility of everyone who believes in them to strengthen the class cooperation of the international proletariat and all progressive forces. This cooperation is directed against imperialism, colonialism, all forms of oppression and exploitation, against fascism wherever it may manifest itself.

We are against war, against everything that is harmful to the world. It is our deep conviction that world peace and détente are one of the principles of socialism and must be advocated by every sincere socialist. This does not mean concord between capitalism and socialism. The ideological struggle between them must go on, but it does not and cannot prevent peaceful coexistence and world peace.

A happy society can be built only in peaceful conditions. War destroys society and kills workers. It is not the exploiters who die in battle. The capitalists send workers to the front to fight for interests alien to them. All who believe in working-class unity must oppose war. We highly value the noble steps taken in this direction by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Political Bureau, and by Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev personally. The whole world applauds them. I mentioned this in the speech I made at the 15th Congress of the CPSU. We are promoting all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union and receive economic and political aid from it. I conveyed the Somali people's profound gratitude for this to the Soviet people at the Congress. We also cooperate with other socialist countries and maintain good relations with them. This cooperation may not have yet reached the level we would like, but this is understandable, for our revolution is still young and the socialist countries have to be convinced of our consistency in pursuing our chosen line.

Participation in the work of the 25th Congress of the CPSU enabled us to make new friends and exchange opinions. We are confident that this will help to further extend cooperation with the socialist countries for the good of our people, who are determined to fight for full

national and social emancipation, for their ultimate goal — the triumph of socialism.

1. In 1972-73 a special Campaign for the Implementation of Scientific Socialism was conducted. Its aim was to explain to the masses the political, social and economic foundations of the course taken by the country, and to inspire them to labor efforts. — *Ed.*

2. See *WMR*, November 1972.

3. In one of his speeches President Siad Barre said:The founders of scientific socialism were not against religion in particular but they exposed and disproved the reactionary elements that dominate sound reasoning of mankind and hence hinder progress of society' (Quoted from *Why We Chose Scientific Socialism*. Mogadishu, 1975, p. 12. — *Ed.*)

4. Some of the basic measures taken in that direction are: nationalization of foreign banks, factories and other enterprises (1970); adoption of a program for the intensification of agriculture (1970); implementation of a three-year (1971-73) and a five-year (1974-78) development plan; literacy campaigns (1972-73 and 1974-75); decisions, passed by the December (1975) national conference on economic and social problems providing for the building of a firm industrial base. —*Ed.*

5. Great successes in that effort were scored during the Campaign for Rural Development, conducted in 1974-75. — *Ed.*

6. Leading personnel are trained at the Lahane Institute of Political Sciences. The national orientation centers sponsor political education courses, which were attended by nearly 10,000 working people in 1975. — *Ed.*

7. 'Our socialism,' President Siad Barre emphasized, 'cannot be called Somali socialism, African socialism or Islamic socialism ... Our socialism is scientific socialism, founded by the great Marx and Engels, i.e., Marxism-Leninism' (Quoted from *Why We Chose Scientific Socialism*, pp. 12, 14).

NEW STAGE IN THE STRUGGLE

Francisco Mendes, Member of of the Permanent Secretariat, Executive Committee, African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC); Head of Government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Soon it will be three years since the proclamation of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau. This culminated the people's long years of political and armed struggles under the leadership of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC). The persevering and purposeful work conducted by the sons of our people headed by Amilcar Cabral had at long last triumphed.

The Republic was born on September 24, 1973. It has since been recognized by nearly all states and it has become a member of the United Nations and all its agencies. Its birth and international recognition accelerated the revolutionary process in Portugal, and this paved the way to national independence for the peoples of other Portuguese colonies.

During the first few months after we established full control over the country,[1] our chief task was to assess the new situation which was very complex. The war which had lasted 11 years was over. The country's already weak economic framework was totally destroyed. The demagogic policy of the last Portuguese colonial governor widened the gap between the major social groups; those who lived in the towns controlled by the colonialists, those who were driven into 'strategic hamlets' (veritable concentration camps), and those who lived in the liberated areas of the country.

It should be noted that the withdrawal of Portuguese troops (after the proclamation of the Republic they were no longer colonial, but occuption forces) the dismantling of the colonial administration proceeded without a single incident. Our primary task, apart from setting up a new administration, was to bring the people back from the 'strategic hamlets' to their homes. This we did. We also managed to persuade former villagers who during the war had fled to the towns, especially Bissau, to return to the countryside. And, finally, people who had emigrated to neighboring countries came home in response to our call.

We dismantled the colonial administrative structure. Its former employees, who have administrative experience, are employed in the new apparatus, but not in top positions.

We based the new administrative structure on the one already established in the liberated areas, and adapted it to the new situation. But the tasks of the administration that operated in the liberated areas during the anti-colonial war differed from those of the administration in today's independent Guinea-Bissau.

The country if governed by the Council of State Commissars, accountable to the National People's Assembly. There are eight administrative districts with local legislative powers vested in the District Councils. One of the functions of these Councils is to control the fulfillment of decisions passed by the National People's Assembly. Executive power in a district is exercised by the State Committee headed by its Chairman, who is subordinate to the government and accountable to the Party leadership. Each district is divided into sectors with a similar administrative structure.

During the years of the liberation struggle each district was virtually autonomous, but abided by the Party's general line. We are now granting every district wider autonomy and conferring upon its leaders greater responsibility in matters relating to the development of the economy, the public services, etc., provided they comply with the general line of the Party and the government.

Our economy is in a poor state. The country's small economic potential, especially in Bissau, was used by the Portuguese solely for

waging the colonial war and for the most part was directly geared to war. Admittedly, the repairing of warships and weapons, the building of strategic roads and concentration camps provided jobs for many people. Now all this is no longer necessary, as is everything involved in the servicing of colonial troops. As a result, their withdrawal caused a share growth of unemployment, though it was partly reduced by the return to the villages of many who had resettled in Bissau during the war. To make it easier for these people to return to the land, the government has been giving them rice and ground-nut seeds, and other assistance free of charge.

Agrigulture is the country's key economic branch. We have practically no industry. Today's economic task is to reach the prewar level of agricultural production, meet the population's requirements for food, and get rid of the need for imports, especially that of rice — our staple food. We are conducting a campaign to intensify agricultural production by introducing progressive methods of farming. Measures are being taken to organize the processing of agricultural produce in the localities — for domestic consumption as well as for export as finished products. In this sphere, too, our aim is maximum decentralization (in the colonial period the economy was concentrated mainly in the towns).

Our present policy is a continuation of the line formulated during the anti-colonial war. Then our slogan was: start liberation from the countryside; now it is: promote development beginning with the countryside.

Thus our policy is one of decentralization and harmonious development. Aimed at preventing a big gap between town and country and forestalling migration from the countryside to the towns, it is designed to recompense the peasantry — the worst exploited stratum in the colonial period and the main force in the war of liberation.

One of the urgent measures taken by our government was to establish state monopoly over the import of prime necessities (rice, vegetable oil, etc.) and organize their distribution through a system of people's shops. Immediately after the advent of people's power private traders started open sabotage. They hoarded rice and to provoke discontent, they told the people: 'Eat the freedom you wanted so much.'

Today the association of people's shops is a centralized body in charge of all imports. It trades mainly through people's shops in the localities, but a certain proportion of imported products is allotted to private traders so as to maintain a balance between state and private trading.

In the colonial period, the Gouvea firm, a branch of the giant Portuguese CUF monopoly, was virtually the master of the country.

This is no longer so: the firm's trading businesses and its enterprises for the production of vegetable oil, soap and other goods were recently nationalized and will be run by mixed companies. Apart from these, there is in Bissau a brewery producing beer and non-alcoholic drinks. It used to cater for the colonial army; now, working at one-third of capacity, it turns out five million litres a year. The brewery is the country's only modern manufacturing enterprise. It will have a mixed management, too.

The government is planning quite a few projects, including a brick and tile plant, a parquetry factory, and enterprises for the production of fruit juices and cane sugar (60,000 tons a year). It has decided to set up a mining development fund. In mining, too, the principal task should be decentralization to avoid concentrating the industry in one place, especially in Bissau. In addition, we are taking measures to develop fishing and have assigned this work to the *Estrela do Mar* Company, set up jointly with the Soviet Union.

Finally, the situation in the social sphere. Here the Portuguese colonialists were even more demagogic than in politics in an attempt to counter the international campaign conducted by the PAIGC. They claimed that the country was flourishing under their rule. True, they built schools and medical centers. But these were very inferior. At the secondary school in Bissau the teachers were mostly former officers of the colonial army or their wives. They had neither the ability nor the desire to teach; money was what they were after. They did not care whether the pupils gained any knowledge. In the hospitals, found only in Bissau, the doctors, too, were military men.

In the context of independence, our task is to raise the level of education and public health and distribute the respective institutions evenly throughout the country.

We already have secondary schools in three districts, and we plan to have them everywhere.[2] There are retraining courses for teachers — for those who taught in liberated areas as well as for those who worked in Portuguese schools. In the educational sphere close cooperation has been promoted with Cuba.

After the withdrawal of the Portuguese army, only two doctors were left in Bissau (the only two civilian doctors there in the colonial period). But in the liberated areas we had more doctors than the Portuguese had. They were trained either in the socialist countries or locally with the assistance of specialists from Cuba, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. We also had courses for training medium-level medical personnel. What we need now are hospitals and medical centers in every district.

The greatest difficulty facing the Republic as regards education and public health is shortage of money.

We should like to emphasize that the policy of the Party and the government is based on the principles devised in the years of the anti-colonial war and verified by the experience of the liberated areas. The first principle, I repeat, is decentralization of the administration and even distribution of the economy between town and country. Another one is active participation of the people in fulfilling the tasks set by the Party and the government. They should understand our policy and execute it energetically and efficiently. There is yet another principle that the liberation war has taught us — never to hide difficulties from the people. (For example, the government once failed to pay its civil servants for three or four months because it had no money, and we told them so at meetings.)

A new and still greater responsibility now rests on the PAIGC. Although it has become the ruling party, it retains the structure of a mass national-liberation movement. This is so mainly becuase the Party leadership seeks to preserve the dynamism of the masses in the new phase of the struggle, and to extend the close ties between the government and the people. Our Party is a nationwide movement, and the people identify themselves with it. During the liberation war people reasoned: The Party is fighting against colonialism, therefore we are all in the Party; anyone who is not is an agent of colonialism. The people are not yet ready to accept the idea of a smaller party, a vanguard party, an advanced detachment. But they will come to understand what a party really means as the revolution proceeds.

Our Constitution says: 'The state is built up by the Party.' Before the proclamation of the Republic, the Party conducted the anti-colonial war and at the same time governed the liberated areas. Later on it began to give the administration greater autonomy. That is how our state gradually took shape. It is now an important instrument of the Party in building the new life.

Today there is a clear-cut division of functions between the Party and the state. But the Party has the decisive say and is the highest authority in our society. This year we plan to enhance its role, strengthen the existing Party committees and set up new ones in all districts.

We must not fail to mention that the PAIGC is the ruling party of two independent states — the Republic of Guinea-bissau and the Republic of the Cape Verde Islands, and constitutes the connecting link between them. The two states are governed by their respective National People's Assemblies. It is intended to set up a Supreme People's Assembly of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands as the legislative body of a union of the two republics. Certain spheres of economic managment and social administration are well coordinated through consultations. In particular, we want the economy of each

Republic to complement one another, to avoid duplication of industries; that is, we are striving to lay the foundations for truly fruitful cooperation, which is indispensable for the future union of the two states.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize the role of international solidarity and cooperation at the present stage of our country's development by repeating what I said on behalf of our Party and our people at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: 'During the grim war against Portuguese colonalism, we valued the Soviet people's lofty feelings of internationalism. And today the solidarity of the Soviet people and their Communist Party — our true allies — is more important than ever in building the new life in our country and promoting peace and progress on our planet.'

We shall build a new society, one in which, as Chairman of the State Council Luiz Cabral has said, our people will not be exploited by either whites or blacks. Exploitation has no regard for color: we know that there are some blacks who would like to take the place of the Portuguese. We want to build a strong and progressive state and a flourishing national economy. We want our poeple to become the masters of their country.

1. The official ceremony of the handing of power to the government of the Republic took place on September 10, 1974, in the capital Bissau. By that time the withdrawal of Portuguese troops had been completed. — *Ed.*
2. There are nearly 85,000 pupils attending primary and secondary schools.

RADICALIZING THE REVOLUTION

Jean-Pierre Gombe, Member of the Special Revolutionary Staff, Central Committee, Congolese Party of Labor.

Our country is going through a radicalization period, i.e., through a process of deepening the revolution in every sphere. To properly understand why this was necessary, we have to look back at bit.

The August 1963 popular demonstrations resulted not merely in a change of government — they started a concerted struggle to build a socialist society. Our Marxist-Leninist Party, the CPL, was formed in the course of this struggle.

Subsequent events, however, revealed a wide gap between Party theory and practice. There was a decleration of the revolution, the revolutionary machine was not working at top speed; more, it was being braked.

The situation was little short of alarming, and it was critically, and

self-critically, examined in the Central Committee statement of December 12, 1975. The CC formulated a program of energetic measures fundamentally to improve the position and speed up the revolutionary process. That, essentially, is the purpose of our radicalization policy, and it is being pursued in the name of the revolution, for the triumph of socialism in the People's Republic of the Congo.

Begun by decision of the emergency CC plenum of December 5-12, 1975 the radicalization movement should accelerate implementation of the directives of the Second CPL Congress (December 1974) on effectuating the National-Liberation Program, in particular the three-year social and economic development plan. The main goal, the CC statement said, is 'to secure a qualitative change in the situation, link theory to practice, mobilize the Congolese people for a vigorous struggle for socialist-oriented national liberation.' We are now preparing for the third, special Party congress and the problems it will examine are being discussed throughout the country.

The radicalization process extends to politics, the economy, culture and social relations. We consider it especially important to introduce revolutionary order in the political structure, the national economy and on the ideological front.

There can be no united action without ideological unity, but until recently the Party leadership lacked cohesion and dynamism and the lower Party organizations action ability.

In many cases contact between the Party leadership and membership, between the Party and the masses, was disrupted. As a result, the trade unions, youth, women's and other mass organizations did not always correctly understand their tasks, notably the need to educate and mobilize the masses to carry out the National-Liberation Program.

Hence, our priority political aim is to restore the Party's dynamism. It must be closer to the masses, or more correctly, closer to real life. Of course it is important to issue directives, but the main thing is concrete, practical work.

Discrediting the Party's fundamental principles by one's conduct is inadmissible. We must therefore apply more strict criteria in admitting new members and pay more attention to their ideological training.

As for the economy, we shall continue to concentrate on building up the state sector. Made up basically of enterprises nationalized after August 1963, it now extends to every aspect of economic life, but has not been properly managed. The situation was abnormal: instead of playing a vanguard role in the battle for economic liberation and higher output, many state-owned enterprises were a drag on the national exchequer. Their grossly inflated staffs lacked adequate

political and professional competence. That is why the Party decided to take concrete measures fundamentally to improve operation of the state sector, boost proudction, put its enterprises on a paying basis with no government subsidies. Then they will really be helping to solve our main problems and the state sector will become the basis in our fight against imperialism and for economic liberation.

In the cultural field, we have long been working for spiritual decolonization and to bring our nationaal cultural heritage within the reach of the people. But here too not everything was done correctly, purposefully and with the necessary speed. The Party leadership has cast aside all doubt and hesitation in pursuing its revolutionary policy on culture. Its decisions in this field must fully coincide with our socialist orientation.

How have the people reacted to the radicalization program? The workers, peasants, all working people are convinced that 1963 revolution was performed in their interests. And inasmuch as the radicalization program carried the revolution further, strengthens its positions, gives it a new impulse, it is only natural that the people should support the measures we have introduced. Evidence of this are the numerous letters of support the Central Committee has received since its December statement.

However, ours is a heterogeneous society, with widely different levels of consciousness. Obviously, these measures are bound to affect the interests of definite groups and will encounter their resistance. But the revolution must continue. Revolution is not 'made' in drawing rooms. Inevitably there come periods of abrupt change and sharp upheavals that affect the egoistic interests of some groups, first of all bourgeois elements who fear losing their privileges, or do not stand to gain from the new policy.

For example, if some trade union leader comes out against radicalization, that does not mean that he has the support of the working class. In many cases such a leader is simply an 'office-holding bourgeois,' and for him radicalization might mean loss of the privileges he now enjoys. Consequently, his attitude to the new policy differs from that of the worker in the factory or the peasant in the field. When you explain to them what the radicalization is all about, you can be sure of a positive response.

There are not many who reject radicalization or do not appreciate the need for it. But we should not overlook the fact that there are such people. Nor should we overlook the designs and plots of foreign reaction, the imperialist-engineered economic sabotage.

Though the people as a whole enthusiastically accept radicalization, not everyone understands it in the same way. The Party knows that not all groups of the population — workers, peasants, intellectu-

als, students, soldiers — have an equal share in the radicalization movement. That is why the Party is doing so much to explain the new policy and show the masses that it is being carried out in their interests. We are going straight to the masses, frankly discussing and clearly explaining the true meaning of one or another measure and of the radicalization movement as a whole. In Congolese conditons this is a much more important and effective method than relying entirely on the mass media.

The radicalization movement is still young, but we have already come up against certain difficulties.

First, the Party's propaganda of the new policy has to reckon with the counter-propaganda of its opponents. And their tactic is to distort the very meaning of radicalization and sow doubt and confusion among the people. In surmounting this difficulty, the Party is helped by its direct contacts with the people, by its work in the factories and offices, in the fields and on the streets. And the people understand us and support us.

There are also difficulties of a psychological character. The removal of one or another shortcoming in the economy often entails sacrificing something. And it is not easy to convince people voluntarily to give up what they already have. Not everyone realizes that the present state of the economy calls for restrictive measures.

The radicalization movement is, in a way, a test of the people's political understanding. Naturally, there are difficulties, but these cannot deter a revolutionary.

We are inspired by the knowledge that the Congolese Party of Labor has embarked on a course hitherto unknown in Africa, and we know that other African countries will judge our experiment by its results.

Our radicalization movement is a clear example of self-criticism, that inalienable feature of the Marxist-Leninist party. Those who attended the 25th Congress of Lenin's Party or followed its proceedings, could convince themselves of this. The Congolese Party of Labor does not confine itself to acknowledging its mistakes, but calls on the masses actively to participate in correcting them. That, we feel, is the earnest of the movement's success.

A POLICY GEARED TO MAN

Joint Delegation of Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) and Afro-Shirazi Party (Tanzania) to 25th CPSU Congress.

Q. How are Tanzania's main lines of development as defined by the Arusha Declaration[1] being implemented?

A. The Arusha Declaration, adopted nine years ago, was a statement of intent. It formulated a correct policy line for Tanzania as a whole. Its implementation will require considerable time. It is too early, therefore, to sum up results although we can tell about some achievements even now.

To begin with, the Declaration stresses concern for man and his development as the Party's central goal. It is man's all-round development that all our achievements are meant to promote.

The Declaration binds the Party membership and the whole nation to rely primarily on their own, internal forces[2] in building socialism. Accordingly, the basic means of production have been nationalized. The state has assumed control of the banks, insurance companies, big farms, transport, export and import firms, a substantial number of factories. The land has been declared national property and none but the state can grant anyone a title to land tenure.

To ensure continuous economic growth, speical state (or parastate) organizations are set up to carry out new projects. They make up the public sector, which comprises factories and state farms and controls some commercial enterprises.

We would like to stress the people's participation in economic activity. Many an economic project is put into effect by the people themselves — outside the framework of the organizations we have mentioned — and is a fruit of their initiative and effort. This participation is effected in various forms, specifically through cooperative societies and district development corporations.

The Declaration assures ample democracy and gives the people the power to end exploitation, oppression and humiliation. Most important of all, a new man is coming into being as the Declaration is put into practice.

The Party's general line approved in 1971 supports and spells out the principles of the Arusha Declaration. Its significance is determined by the propositions 'Politics equal agriculture,' and 'Agriculture equals politics.'[3] This is indicative of a line entirely in keeping with the distinctive conditions of our country.

Q. Some time ago a document called '*Ujamaa Vijijini*, or Rural Development' was adopted in Tanzania. How is the construction of *ujamaa* villages progressing? What real results do they achieve?

A. In Swahili, *ujamaa* means roughly 'a common concern of people.' In building such villages, the authorities consult the population and persuade it of the need to live and work collectively. They teach it the difficult science of living together[4] and respecting the common interest, and do all this before people move to one new big village. The peasants are free to choose the site. Of course, in deciding to build an *ujamaa* village, account is taken of numerous factors,

such as the size of cultivable lands and pastures, soil fertility, water resources, the state of communications if any or the distance from the nearest public services. The government and the party give future villagers all the aid they need to change residence.

At present over half the population of the country lives in *ujamaa* villages, or what we call 'planned villages.' There the government sets up schools, out-patient hospitals and medical centers, provides water supply, and so on. All these public services are thus becoming accessible to more people than before. In particular, work has been made easier for women, if only because *ujamaa* villages now have piped water supply.

It has been decided to introduce universal free elementary education throughout the country by the end of 1977. We are now carrying out this task. It would clearly have been impossible to do this without *ujamaa* villages. The advancement of rural areas is also promoted by the revival of small-scale industry, formerly neglected.

In carrying out these measures, we set up numerous new Party cells and branches. This enables people to participate in politics more effectively. As for the economy, they manage it on cooperative principles.

A law passed last year grants *ujamaa* villages greater powers and autonomy. Indeed, it is called '*Desh Madaraka Vijijini,*' or 'More Powers for Villages of Socialism.'

Imperialist propaganda alleges that peasants are 'forced' to move to *ujamaa* villages. In the past, it claimed that Africans did not want to manage their affairs and were willing to live eternally under colonial rule. This turned out to be a lie. We can say as much about allegations regarding *ujamaa* villages. No sensible person would ever protest against measures improving his life and enabling him to shape his destiny as he sees fit.

Q. What processes are going on in the Party? What is its structure? What is the basis of relations between TANU and Afro-Shirazi?

A. First of all, we must stress that the Tanzanian power system applies the principle of full priority of the Party. Nor is this principle disputed by anyone.[5]

Our Party — both TANU and Afro-Shirazi[6] (when we say 'our Party' we mean either of the two) has deep roots in the country.

It is important to emphasize that both TANU and Afro-Shirazi are broad-based mass organizations. Many ask why we do not form a narrower party of the vanguard type. We don't think that in our conditions a vanguard party is an indispensable guarantee of effective politics. We have resolved to build a socialist society in Tanzania under the leadership of our two parties. To bring about revolutionary changes, the masses buidling socialism must be able, as we see it, to

participate directly in politics. We don't believe this opportunity should be a privilege of the few.

On the other hand, while the party is open to all, joining its ranks is a long and difficult process. An applicant must submit his application and other papers to the Party branch concerned. In taking action on his application, an assessment is made of his achievements as an individual, his party beliefs and his attitude to socialism. After he has been admitted, he must receive two or three months' political education to become a full-fledged member.

For the time being, the system of a mass party fits into our conditions and social context. We don't want to establish rigid organizational forms for the people. The people are builders of the Party and defenders of its policy and they realize that this policy is made by their own Party. Our goal is to build socialism. We intend to achieve this goal through a mass party.

As for merging the two parties or founding a new organization, both parties are discussing the problem. It will take time to arrive at a common view and adopt the right decision.

The basic Party unit is the '10-cell' or a cell made up of tenants of 10 houses. Cell members discuss in it all their social, economic and political problems. In villages, towns, circles, factories,[7] government departments, administrative offices and on farms, we have Party branches, whose activity is coordinated by party district officers and committees and their executives. The next echelon is regional working committees of the Party and regional executive committees elected at annual regional conferences. The Party is headed by a Central Committee elected by the National Conference for a term of five years. The CC comprises seven subcommittees working under the Secretariat. A National Executive Committee is elected to direct everyday work. It is accountable to the National Conference, the highest Party authority. Elections at all levels are entirely democratic and votes are cast by secret ballot.

We would also like to point out the role of the youth movement, which we think is stronger and more active than anywhere else on the continent. It is through it that we school our cadre members, future leaders of the country.

To train leading Party cadres. TANU has set up the Kiwukoni ideological college in Dar Es Salaam (term of study, nine months). We plan to open four zonal colleges — in Murutunguru, Hombolo, Mahiva and Lushoto — to educate workers of lower echelons (term of study, three months). The Afro-Shirazi Party will soon set up its own ideological college in Zanzibar. Besides, the Party holds seminars, discussions and political rallies. These are all part of our political activities.

Q. What conclusions have progressive African countries and the Organization of African Unity drawn from the events in Angola?

A. The events in Angola are a lesson which means, first of all, that a united and determined people following a definite policy is bound to win a liberation war. Africans know this well although imperialist maneuvers and intrigues may occasionally mislead some of them. We reckon with the sovereignty of every independent African state. There is a wide range of factors that may prevent this or that country from adopting a position it is expected to adopt. We know why that is so.

We wish to specify that the Organization of African Unity has never split or disintegrated over the Angola issue. At the extraordinary session of heads of state and government in January 1976, the organization resolved to refrain from taking specific action so as to head off still greater bloodshed in Angola. However, in spite of differences voiced at the session, the participants were unanimous in describing imperialism as the main threat to Africa. And the fact that the overwhelming majority of OAU members has since recognized the People's Republic of Angola is indicative of the political maturity of African states. They are determined to build up OAU unity in order to accomplish the historic task of liberating that part of Africa still under colonial rule.

The OAU has asked the socialist countries to help free Africa in achieving this noble goal. We can affirm that by cooperating with the newly-free countries the socialist states honorably fulfill their duty.

'Our delegation,' said Abdulnuru Suleiman, its leader, member of the TANU National Executive Committee, in his speech during the 25th CPSU Congress, 'regards it as its duty to express its appreciation and gratitude to the Soviet Union for its aid to the People's Republic of Angola and the MPLA party in defending that country's independence and national interests.' Elsewhere in his address, he said: 'Our parties think highly of the Soviet peace policy being implemented under the leadership of the CPSU. Peace is a most important condition for progress.'

Imperialism is inseparable from colonialism. By fighting against colonialism, we are also fighting against imperialism. This fight will go on until imperialism is completely defeated. Our common goal is to build a strong socialist world in which the exploitation of man by man will be eliminated for all time.

1. Approved by the TANU National Executive Committee at Arusha, 1967. — *Ed.*
2. So interpreted by Tanzania's leaders, this formulation has an explicitly anti-imperialist connotation. — *Ed.*
3. Late in January 1976, the TANU National Executive Committee resolved to set about fulfilling the third five-year development plan of Tanzania, which puts the

emphasis on a long-term program of setting up an industrial sector of the economy. *Mzalendo*, the TANU weekly, stressed in this connection that while agriculture is the basis on which Tanzania is developing, setting up an industry is the key to the country's rapid progress. It is the lack of industry, the weekly says, that prevents Tanzania from achieving its goal, the socialist transformation of society. *Mzalendo* points to the need to educate a new type of worker who will live and work in an atmosphere of collective effort, equality and social justice. — *Ed.*

4. The rural population was scattered over a wide area in the past, at least in the continental part of Tanzania, with families living far apart. — *Ed.*

5. The secretaries and charimen of local Party organizations carry out the bulk of the effort to put the policy of Tanzania into effect, says Rashidi Kawawa, Prime Minister of the Republic. He stresses, however, that the Party will unhesitatingly remove leaders who misinterpret the provision regarding the Party's leading role in government. — *Ed.*

6. TANU is operating in the continental part of the country and Afro-Shirazi, on the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. — *Ed.*

7. In June 1975, the CC TANU decided to have in industrial enterprises Party secretaries vested with considerable powers. — *Ed.*

THE MALAGASY PEOPLE HAVE CHOSEN THE SOCIALIST PATH

Gisele Rabesahala, Independence Congress Party of Madagascar.

Sharp changes have taken place in the Malagasy Democratic Republic within a relatively short period. After national independence, the people continued the struggle, this time against the neo-colonialist regime, and are now well on the way to complete liberation from imperialism. This transition was of course not easy. Both in the colonial period and under the neo-colonialist regime, the struggle did not stop for even a day; it involved much sacrifice and suffering and required dedicated and energetic effort.

Led by the progressive forces, the Malagasy people have achieved imposing successes. The neo-colonialist government[1] set up by the imperialists was overthrown in 1972. This was followed up by important foreign policy advances: revision of agreements on 'cooperation' with France, evacuation of French troops, closure of military bases on the island and withdrawal from the 'franc zone.' These measures consolidated our sovereignty. The new regime has broken off all contacts with the racist government of South Africa, established diplomatic relations with the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all, and adopted the principles of non-alignment. It supports the anti-imperialist movement on the African continent.

Home and foreign policy was given a more progressive accent after Didier Ratsiraka became head of government in June 1975. Within a few months all the natural wealth and energy resources, the banks

and insurance companies were nationalized. The transfer to the state of one of the pillars of France's former colonial domination — la Compagnie Marseillaise de Madagascar, the oldest export-import firm on the island — dealt a telling blow to the positions of imperialism and neo-colonialism. So did the dismantling of the U.S. satellite tracking station, which was actually used for spying.

Agrarian reform has been speeded up. Progress in the countryside (accounting for 85 per cent of the population) has made for a more democratic administration and greater involvement of the peasants in public life through the reorganized *fokonolona*.[2] We owe all these progressive changes to the people's heroic struggle. Their determination to advance further toward socialism was demonstrated anew at the referendum of December 21, 1975.

Voters were asked to say 'Yes' or 'No' to the Charter of the Malagasy Socialist Revolution, to the draft Constitution of the Malagasy Democratic Republic based on the Charter, and to support or reject the candidature of Chairman of the Supreme Revolutionary Council, Didier Ratsiraka, for the post of President. Nearly 95 per cent of the voters said 'Yes,' thereby declaring for social progress. From then on the socialist choice, has determined the entire state policy and it is enshrined in the Constitution.[3]

The referendum was an important landmark in our country's life. The Charter says that only through socialist revolution can we promote swift, independent and harmonious development in the economic, social and cultural spheres, that the struggle to strengthen national independence is inseparably linked with the struggle for the triumph of the socialist choice. The Charter sets these objectives and principles as the prelude to the building of socialism: genuine democracy that rules out exploitation of man by man, just distribution of the national wealth, equal access for all Malagasies to cultural values, transfer of the basic means of production to the state and the people, and abolition of all forms of discrimination.

The referendum was followed by the structure of government. The President urged bringing into the administration representatives of all political trends supporting the Charter of the Socialist Revolution. For the first time the Supreme Revolutionary Council and the National Unity government included two members of the National Bureau of the Independence Congress Party of Madagascar (AKFM). In response to Didier Ratsiraka's call, the progressive forces formed a National Front for the Defense of the the Revolution. Its members support the socialist path and are determined to repulse internal and international reaction. The Front will help mobilize the masses to fight for genuine economic independence and build the new society.

We are aware that only clear-cut objectives based on socialist principles can promote national unity.

Our tasks are tremendous and require dedicated, sustained effort by our people. For they simultaneously have to eradicate the legacy of colonialism and neo-colonialism, defend the revolution against the attacks of imperialism and internal reaction, and lay the foundations for the new society.

The progressive forces of Madagascar are confronted with many difficulties. The 80 years of the colonialist and neo-colonialist yoke even today affect economic life and have left an imprint on the mentality and behavior of certain social groups. The social strata which had always served as a support for the colonialist and neo-colonialist regimes are now opposing the socialist course.[4] True, these allies of imperialism constitute an insignificant minority and have little political influence, as the referendum showed. But they have the backing of the foreign companies still operating in our country. For them the implementation of the Charter of the Socialist Revolution is tantamount to losing all their privileges.

The experience of the countries now on the non-capitalist road shows how important it is to guard against the intrigues of internal reaction and imperialism. The latter never lays down arms, never ceases fighting to regain what it has lost. The intervention in Angola, the use of the existing military bases and the building of new ones, including the Diego Garcia base, gambling on economic difficulties — these are but a few of imperialism's subversive and aggressive acts against the liberation movement of the African and other peoples.

But we are optimistic, and our optimism is based on the decisive change in the world balance of forces. The historical initiative is now in the hands of the fighters for peace, freedom and progress. We are living at a time when the spirit of détente is increasingly pervading international relations, when the socialist community is steadily advancing, while the capitalist world is bogged down in its worst ever crisis.

The national-liberation movement has scored new successes. The historic victory of the peoples of Indochina, the victory of the peoples in the former Portuguese colonies, and the success of the African peoples' fight against neo-colonialism are an inspiration for the revolutionaries. The changing world situation helps the peoples of the newly-free countries to consolidate their political and economic independence, and, what is most important, to choose a social system that truly accords with their interests.

We are grateful to the socialist countries and all progressive and revolutionary forces in the world for supporting our struggle. We are glad that the progressive changes in Madagascar are having a positive

impact on other countries in the Indian Ocean area and inspiring the patriotic forces to fresh victories in the battle for freedom and justice, peace and progress.

1. See Gisele Rabesahala's articles in *WMR:* 'Madagascar Revolutionary Democrats' (September 1972), and 'Madagascar Looks Ahead' (July 1974).

2. The traditional community in Madagascar. The Constitution approved by the December 1975 referendum declares that the Malagasy state is founded on the *fokonolona*. The general meeting and elected executive committee of the *fokonolona* decided on economic, social and other matters. — *Ed.*

3. It says that the socialist choice, like the republican form of government, is not subject to revision. — *Ed.*

4. The leadership of the 'Tsiranana fund' (Tsiranana was head of the neo-colonialist regime) — a camouflage for leaders of the Malagasy Socialist Party — instigated the people to vote against the progressive program proposed in the December 1975 referendum.

Whither U.S. foreign policy at the Bicentenary?

Helen A. Winter
International Affairs
Secretary, CP USA

The crisis of U.S. imperialist foreign policy is acknowledged on all sides. In the USA it is manifested in a sharp struggle to determine the future course of U.S. international relations. The struggle has entered a period of great intensity during the bicentennial observances of the American War of Independence, which Lenin called 'one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars.'[1] The bicentennial observances coincide with electoral contests preparatory to the national elections November 6, and foreign policy is a central issue of these contests.

From the revolutionary war — to the export of counter-revolution

U.S. governing circles and their candidates for the contested governmental offices try to exploit the democratic traditions of the 18th century American Revolution. They invoke the old promises, neglecting to note how they were betrayed, and either repeat the old promises or claim that nothing has changed in 200 years. One of the aims of all this is to justify the imperialist foundations of the foreign policy of the ruling classes.

The people's democratic and progressive movements condemn U.S. imperialist policy as a betrayal not only of the ideals of the American Revolution, but also of the interests of the nation and the U.S. masses today. U.S. working people require a foreign policy conducive to peaceful, friendly relations with other countries. They demand a radical change of U.S. foreign policy to a policy which implements the principles of peaceful coexistence.

A glance at certain features in the evolution of U.S. foreign policy helps to make a class assessment of these contending positions.

It is true that U.S. capitalism was predominantly anti-feudal and anti-colonialist during the Revolution and for a short period afterwards. The American Revolution gave further impetus to anti-feudal struggles in Europe, notably in France, which removed barriers to capitalist development.

However, even then it was flawed by a policy of deliberately exterminating the indigenous native American Indian peoples, the enslavement of forcibly imported Africans, and ruthless exploitation of immigrant European working people. From the outset of U.S. capitalist development, class oppression, racism and aggression against other peoples were incorporated in capitalism's 'American way of life.'

Owing to many favorable conditions, capitalism developed rapidly in the USA, especially after slavery was ended. But by the end of the 19th century, U.S. capitalism entered its imperialist stage. Under the pretext of the ideas of 'manifest destiny' the U.S. grabbed colonies of Spain in some areas of the Americas and launched expansionist forays in the Pacific and Asia. Earlier aggressions against Mexico and Canada had whetted the appetite of U.S. monopoly capital.

U.S. imperialism emerged stronger from World War I in consequence of the defeat of German imperialism and at the expense of Great Britain, France and other European countries which were weakened by the war. It joined other capitalist states in the attempt to crush the young Soviet state, an attempt repelled at great cost and sacrifice by the peoples of that state, led by Lenin and their Communist vanguard.

Subsequently, U.S. imperialism's implacable hostility to the first workers' and peasants' state was manifested in its complicity with other imperialist powers in financing and promoting the restoration of German imperialism, in proclaiming 'neutrality' when Hitler and Mussolini invaded Spain, which amounted to support of the fascist forces. This foreshadowed its attitude at the outbreak of World War II, when the U.S. did nothing to curb the aggressions of fascism in Europe and of Japanese militarism in Asia.

With the developing anti-fascist character of the war, popular progressive forces in the United States and throughout the world began to

demand that a second front be opened against Hitler's armies. It was this vast and powerful movement of democratic, popular forces that pushed the United States into an anti-fascist policy. This movement, together with the tremendous show of strength by the Soviet Union and partisan forces in many countries of Europe, forced the allies to open the second front and sign the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. Without such a movement, of which the Communist parties were an integral and often leading force, the then Senator Harry Truman's earlier 'advice' to let Germany and Russia bleed each other white, may have prevailed.

Very soon after Potsdam it was apparent that U.S. imperialism was swinging away from the agreement and embarking on global aggressive policies. It moved into positions previously occupied by other imperialist powers in the Pacific. Military U.S. bases were established in many countries. Support was given to reactionary regimes in Latin America. Progressive governments were threatened or defeated (as, for instance, in Guatemala) by massive U.S. aid to reaction.

Non-white nations especially have been the targets of U.S. imperialist adventures and the policies of its multi-national corporations. Racism is supported and cultivated to divide the peoples and to carry through a system of economic super-exploitation. The aggressive wars in Korea and Vietnam were attempts to crush the independent progressive regimes of these countries, and those attempts had racial overtones as well. All this was a part of a grand design to establish an 'American Century' through cold war, professed 'liberation,' massive deterrence and brink-of-war policies.

Step by step, U.S. foreign policy evolved into a strategy manifested by its attitude to the Popular Unity government in Chile. Using the CIA, the U.S. authorities aimed their policy at overthrowing Allende by a coup. For this they generated maximum pressure.

Thus, the original objectively progressive role of U.S. capitalism of the 18th century was abandoned long ago. As a result, its foreign policy became an instrument of the support of ultra-reactionary fascist regimes and of the export of counter-revolution.

The new trends and their opponents

But if Chile represented a bloody, fascist, temporary victory for U.S. imperialist counter-revolution, the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam marked the long-term trend of the bankruptcy and crisis of its foreign policy.

Even before the collapse of the Pentagon's Vietnam adventure the developments in the world, including the loss of the monopoly over atomic weaponry, forced U.S. imperialism to face the new reality. The consolidation of the world community of socialist nations and the

rise of newly liberated countries, joining together in the anti-imperialist struggle, together with new economic difficulties and the growing working-class militancy in the capitalist world, resulted in a shift in the world relation of forces. In the U.S. there began a rise in the strength of the popular democratic and working-class forces. The defeat of U.S. imperialist forces in Vietnam clinched this process. The anti-war struggle in the United States mobilized the broadest mass democratic pressures and exposed the real motives and essence of U.S. imperialist aggressive foreign policy.

In these conditions, the initiative of the USSR for détente met a response from the U.S. masses. And the more realistic section of the ruling class began to see the futility of pursuing the desparate aggressive course which had met with drastic defeat. The process of détente, which had already been expanding in Europe and elsewhere, was given an impetus in the United States.

The necessity for a change and a more realistic view of the new international relationship of forces is recognized by almost all circles of big business, ideologues of capitalism, liberals, and other 'moulders of public opinion.' When Richard M. Nixon was seeking the presidency in 1968, he proclaimed he would bring about a 'new American revolution.' It was a demagogic slogan, but its proclamation signified the existence of a public desire for a turn of events, including foreign policy.

This was reflected in the positive support of an overwhelming majority of the U.S. people to the agreements reached by then-President Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in Moscow in 1972, including agreement on détente between the USA and the Soviet Union, contained in the document — 'The Basic Principles of the Relations between USSR and USA.' At one of his press conferences last year President Ford said that his administration will continue the policy of easing tensions between the Soviet Union and the USA, and declared it was a policy based on 'a two-way street' concept.

The strength of popular support for détente is so strong that even opponents of détente have to hide their opposition. Recently Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), who is closely connected with the military-industrial complex and has consistently striven by deeds to undermine and eliminate détente, was asked: 'In your view, what is wrong with the policy of détente with the Soviet Union that the Ford Administration is pursuing?' Jackson answered: 'It's not the concept of détente that is at fault; it's the way the Nixon and Ford administrations have managed it.'[2]

This is more than an electoral tactic; it underlines a fundamental conflict in U.S. political life which is now becoming acute as rightist

attempts in both main bourgeois parties — Republican and Democratic — are made to keep U.S. foreign policy from further developing détente politically and progressing to the stage of military détente.

The Jacksons and their like, for example, former Republican Governor of California Ronald Reagan, are alarmed not only by foreign policy changes favoring détente and its irreversibility, but by the concomitant domestic changes which are both cause and effect of détente. For détente enhances the power of the people to struggle for their vital interests. The struggle for social and economic demands and the struggle for détente and peace are two sides of one struggle — the struggle against the most reactionary monopoly influence.

Of late détente has been subjected to strong attacks by the more aggressive circles of state-monopoly capital,[3] who stubbornly resist acknowledging the new correlation of world forces and cling instead to the bankrupt positions of the cold war. Seizing the opportunity afforded by the electoral campaigns, these circles and their political representatives and ideologists have increased the pressure on the Ford Administration to repudiate its commitments at Vladivostok and Helsinki.

They deny that détente and peaceful coexistence relate solely to inter-state relations, and claim that détente is incompatible with proletarian internationalism, with the solidarity of the socialist community with peoples struggling for national liberation. Those distortions of the essence of détente have found expression in attacks on the assistance given by the Soviet Union and Cuba to the beleaguered patriotic forces of Angola in their struggle against South African and imperialist intervention in that country.

Certain reactionary circles, on the other hand, repeat demagogically the Maoist slander that détente signifies an agreement to 'forbid' the class struggle and the struggles of less developed peoples for national liberation and independence. This does not prevent some representatives of these circles from attempting to dictate policies of excluding Communists from the governments of Western Europe, a gross interference in the internal affairs of those countries. Or making charges that efforts of the less developed countries to safeguard their national resources and correct unequal terms of trade are 'extortion' that must be resisted by the developed capitalist countries.

Such deliberate misinterpretations of détente form premises for the demands of U.S. right-wing circles to return to policies of 'peace through strength,' to adopt retaliatory measures against Cuba and the socialist community, and to step up interventionist activities in Africa in support of the racist minority regimes. They also underline the demands for continuous increases of the 112 thousand million dollar military budget.

Working-class stake in détente

In the fall issue of the ostensibly 'liberal' *Foreign Policy,* the editors opened an examination of U.S. foreign policy in the 'Third Century.' The editors stated: 'Our bicentennial coincides with a by-now nearly universal awareness that our role in the world has changed. But there is little agreement on the meaning of the change, of the proper American policy for our Third Century.'[4]

The main issue the editors pose is, in brief, the conflict they believe exists between the principles upon which the United States was founded and the conduct of its foreign policy 'in a world of competitive nation-states.' This problem leads to the dilemma of 'morality and expediency, principle and power, idealism and realism,' which 'can never be fully resolved; it can simply be redefined and reformulated in the terms of each age.' And this leads them to the pessimism about détente. They are seeking ways to 'interpret' détente to give it a negative content under the guise of promoting the national security and welfare of the United States. Thus by a devious 'liberal' route they reach the views held by the right-wing politicians.

To proceed with the way of polemics chosen by *Foreign Policy,* it is evident that 'in a world of competitive nation-states' the real dilemma arises from the historic struggle of two social systems. And the triumph of socialism over capitalism will resolve it. This is the view of Communists, and it is true with regard to the way of changing the class foundations of U.S. foreign policy.

But here we also deal with another problem. The 'liberals' are in one camp with the right-wing politicians in their rejection of détente and peaceful coexistence with creates the possibility for realism to gain ascendancy over illusion and morality over expediency, as well as principle over power.

Notwithstanding these efforts by the foes of détente, the concept of détente is almost universally accepted as the main trend of the times. Support for détente is rooted deeply in the consciousness of the U.S working class and masses, who see its importance for the destiny of the world.

Long before the U.S. ruling class accepted peaceful coexistence and détente as an official state policy, solidarity with the Soviet Union had been a powerful, sometimes decisive, trend in the U.S. working class and the democratic-minded masses. This trend has at times risen to heroic heights in the contest with imperialist foreign policy.[5]

Nationwide relief movements in the 1920s and 1930s to help the socialist land were organized. Basic in this trend was a flowering of proletarian internationalism. It reached a new peak in the period of economic crisis in the 1930s. All this carried the seeds of the future —

U.S.-Soviet cooperation in the anti-fascist war and now in the developing struggle for détente.

And today the U.S. Communists believe that the role of the working class and masses of people can be decisive in maintaining a consistent policy of détente, developing it to the stage of military détente, and making it irreversible.

The Communist Party has been in the midst of this struggle from its birth. It was a leader in the 'Hands off Russia!' movement of the 1920s, as it was in the campaign for normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. It has consistently fought for this policy, and for a shift in U.S. foreign policy to achieve improvement of relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as with all peoples of the world as the only guarantee of peace.

U.S. foreign policy is today still formulated and carried out by the administration in office in accord with the aims of the dominant section of monopoly capitalism. With the development of an anti-monopoly coalition in domestic affairs, a change will be speeded also in foreign relations, strengthening and expanding détente relations and thus contributing to guaranteeing peace.

Our Party's role in this work has been defined in its constitution, which declares: 'In the struggle against U.S. imperialism, the world's most powerful imperialism, our Party works to build the solidarity of the U.S. working class with developing countries, the national liberation movements and especially with the victims of U.S. imperialist aggression, explitiation and domination. Only through world working-class solidarity and anti-imperialist unity can peaceful coexistence be assured and the world saved from nuclear war.'[6]

Continued mobilization of the mas movement of democratic-popular forces can guarantee strengthening of international détente, adherence to the Helsinki agreements, reaching an understanding with Soviet Union on limitation of strategic arms and other bilateral problems.

The Soviet Union's willingness and readiness to reach such an understanding was reiterated on February 25 at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by its General Secretary, Leonid I. Brezhnev who said: 'The Soviet Union is firmly determined to follow the line of further improving Soviet-U.S. relations in strict accordance with the letter and spirit of the agreements reached and commitments taken, in the interests of both peoples and peace on earth.'

The task of our people is to give internationalist support and aid to the fighters for independence and freedom, against imperialist interference in Africa, Latin America and Asia, and in every situation where reactionary forces impose their will on peoples' movements. U.S.

imperialism must be compelled to relinquish its colonial grasp over the Puerto Rican nation and to end the economic boycott against Cuba. Our people must insist that the government carry out the Paris Agreement and meet the reparations agreed to in Vietnam.

In this bicentennial year the fulfillment of these tasks looms as the greatest need for our people's attention.

1. Letter to American Workers,' in *Lenin on the United States*, International Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 334.

2. *U.S. News & World Report*, December 8, 1975.

3. The forces associated with AFL-CIO president George Meany are also outspoken in their rejection of détente and in their anti-Sovietism. The right-wing social democrats are fighting against improvement of U.S. relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist states. In view of the stand taken by this politically corrupt gang, the AFL-CIO bosses and social democrats of the USA, it is not surprising that they honored Daniel P. Moynihan, the former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, with a silver cup for his attacks, including racist attacks, on the socialist and less developed countries.

4. *Foreign Policy*, No. 20, Fall 1975, p. 97.

5. At the very time of an official, rabidly anti-Soviet campaign (in 1918), when the Wilson Administration had involved the United States in a shameful armed intervention in Siberia to help imperialists strangle the new-born Soviet Republic, Seattle workers asserted an independent class position by undertaking a general strike to end the intervention.

6. Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America, N.Y., 1975, p. 7.

Against the interests of the Arab peoples

President Anwar Sadat's decision to abrogate the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and Egypt has aroused another wave of anti-Sovietism in the imperialist press and in reactionary papers in the Arab East, with Maoist propaganda keeping step with them. Rating the decision as 'good news,' the enemies of the Arab national-liberation movement encouraged by international imperialism are trying to denigrate the long history of Soviet-Arab relations, cast aspersions on their fruitfulness, and even blame the Soviet Union for the collapse of Egypt's recently adopted policy. In so doing they do not hesitate to falsify historical facts.

The truth is that the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community laid the foundation stone of national industry in many Arab countries and helped them build its key branches according to modern standards, organize the training of national personnel,

and develop their national culture and science. To this should be added the USSR's tremendous military aid to the Arab peoples, which enabled them to repulse imperialist and Zionist agression. Let us look at some statistics.

The Soviet Union assisted Egypt in building 137 economic, public and cultural projects. Syria — about 50 projects, Iraq — 72, Algeria — more than 80, The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen — 40.

The building of the Aswan hydroelectrical power complex is a striking example of Soviet assistance to Arab countries. The Aswan High Dam is the world's biggest. It enabled Egypt to increase its area of arable land by one-third and begin extensive electrification of the countryside, providing power for industry. Soviet specialists helped discover oil, gas, iron, coal, lead, zinc and phosphate deposits in Egypt. Thanks to cooperation with the USSR, Egypt was able to build a modern industry, including the huge metallurgical works in Helwan and plants for the production of aluminum, radio equipment, antibiotics and fertilizers.

With Soviet assistance Syria is building a huge power station on the Euphrates. After its completion the output of electricity will treble and the area of farmland will double.

A major irrigation project is under construction with the assistance of the USSR on the Tigris River, in Iraq. It will be of key importance for extending cultivated areas, increasing the capacity of reservoirs, and combating droughts and floods. The Soviet Union helped Iraq to repulse the onslaught of the international monopolies when it nationalized the oil industry. For our people the national oil fields in Rumaila have become a symbol of Soviet-Iraqi friendship. The Soviet Union also helped in prospecting large deposits of sulphur in Mosul and phosphates in western Iraq, and in building plants for the production of agricultural machinery, electrical instruments, medicines, fabrics and glass.

Algeria received Soviet assistance in developing its oil industry, finding mercury, lead and zinc deposits, building a metallurgical plant at Annaba and factories for the production of tractors, machinery, metal-cutting lathes, and steel pipes for the oil and gas industry.

The Soviet Union gives the Arab countries all-round assistance in training skilled personnel and sets up vocational training centers. In Egypt alone, more than 50,000 skilled workers were trained in 140 trades with Soviet assistance before 1972. During the construction of the Aswan hydroelectric power station, Soviet specialists trained 19,000 Egyptian workers. Thousands of Arab students have graduated or are studying in the Soviet Union.

The Arab peoples appreciate the effectiveness of Soviet aid. During the dark days of the aggressive wars unleashed against them by the

Zionist-imperialist alliance, they unmistakably realized who their real friends were. It was the Soviet Union that created an air bridge to deliver combat equipment to the Arab armies, enabling them to inflict telling blows against the Israeli aggressors. It is the Soviet Union that has been invariably supporting the Arab peoples' just cause at international forums. Realization of this truth by the working people grows as the stand of the imperialist powers is exposed. At least two facts could be mentioned to give an idea of that stand: the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956, when President Nasser decided to nationalize the Suez Canal, and the vetoing by the United States of all UN Security Council resolutions on the restoration of the Palestinian people's national rights.

Beyond doubt the anti-Soviet campaign plays into the hands of those who oppose the Arab peoples' independence and desire to build a new life. As our Party's newspaper, *Tarik al-Shaab*, has written, the speech President Sadat made at the National Assembly when it revoked the Soviet-Egyptian treaty reflected the strengthening of the right-wing forces in Egypt and the consolidation of American influence.

The entire recent history of the Arab East shows that hostile policies toward the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community can only harm the Arabs. An inglorious end on the dust-heap of history awaits those who would like to deprive the Arab liberation movement of its tested weapon — Soviet-Arab friendship.

Adel Haba, Representative of the Iraqi Communist Party on the journal.

Trade as a factor for peace and social progress

Andrej Barcak
Minister of Foreign Trade,
Czechoslovakia

New serious changes are taking place in world trade and in areas of foreign economic relations closely linked with it. Foreign trade on the democratic principles of equality, respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual benefit is winning increasing recognition. These principles are becoming standards of

international economic relations due primarily to the efforts of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

Imperialism has always resisted new, progressive principles of world trade. The exploiting classes have always regarded trade as a source of high profits, a means of bringing other countries under their control and carrying on a colonial policy, succeeded by its neo-colonial variant. And greed has led to stronger trade rivalries, a source of war.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the imperialist principles dominating the world market lost their universal character. Their operation was further restricted by the rise of the world socialist market and the disintegration of the colonial system. Against the background of a radical change in the balance of forces in favor of socialism and peace, it is becoming ever more evident that the old approach to world trade is historically doomed. Eliminating it is no easy task, however. Reactionary imperialist quarters still try to use trade as a means of undermining the economic independence of various countries, applying political pressure and diktat and interfering in other countries' affairs, and as a vehicle of bourgeois ideology.

As a result, discrimination against socialist countries persists, capitalist countries still impose unfair terms of trade on developing countries and trade wars break out between capitalist countries or alignments, hitting the working people's interests first of all. Some politicians still believe that discrimination in trade is an effective weapon against socialist countries. They include certain U.S. Senators, who serve the military industrial complex by raising obstacles to normal trade with socialist countries. They make most favored nation treatment conditional to meeting demands that verge on gross interference in the domestic affairs of socialist countries.

These tendencies are added evidence of the invariably reactionary nature of imperialism. However, the imperialists' selfish designs clash more and more with new world realities, first among which is, from the point of view of revolutionary struggle, the growing power of the socialist community.

In a historically short time, socialism has achieved outstanding successes in the economic competition with capitalism. The CMEA countries increased their share of world industrial output from 17.5 per cent in 1950 to 37.5 per cent in 1974. In th same period, the United States' share in world industrial output dropped from 43.6 to 25.4 per cent, and the Common Market's from 21.8 to 16 per cent.

The planned and crisis-free economic development of socialist countries ensures dynamically growing trade between them. Trade expands in step with closer economic relations between socialist countries and benefits them. In 1960-74 trade between CMEA coun-

tries grew by almost 280 per cent, the 1971-74 period showing a 56 per cent increase. In 1974, their mutual trade accounted for nearly 53 per cent of their foreign trade. It plays an important part in equalizing their economic development levels and guaranteeing a steady rise in the standard of living. Mutual trade enables the CMEA countries to meet most of their import requirements: in 1974, for example, rolled ferrous metals 54 per cent, rolled non-ferrous metals 71, machinery and plant 67, iron ore 76, oil 80, cast iron 96, and coal almost 100 per cent.

The socialist countries, especially CMEA members, base their mutual trade and economic cooperation on the principles of proletarian internationalism, respect for state sovereignty, independence and national interests, and non-interference in internal affairs. They take maximum account of the requirements of each country and the need to coordinate national economic plans. Recent Communist Party congresses in the socialist community have shown that the parties attach primary importance to fulfilling these plans and to drafting and carrying out joint long-term programs.

Expanding all-round economic cooperation among the CMEA countries on these lines enables them to solve difficult problems. In the area of the CMEA countries, energy sources are distributed most unevenly. Most of these countries lack oil and gas, that is, the most effective fuels. In 1961-74, Soviet oil deliveries to other CMEA countries increased from 6.3 to 59 million tons and gas deliveries from 200 million to 8,600 million cubic metres. This makes, in particular, for the stability of Czechoslovakia's power resources. The Soviet Union supplies 92 per cent of our oil imports and 100 per cent of our natural gas imports. It has become Czechoslovakia's main trade partner and accounts for more than 30 per cent of our foreign trade.

Before World War II, Czechoslovakia's trade was mostly with West European countries. The bulk of its exports was made up of textiles, glassware, leather and some food products. The share of machinery and plant in exports did not exceed six per cent.

Due to the rapid growth of Czecholslovakia's economy and industrial potential in postwar years and the reorientation of its foreign trade to countries of the socialist community, the share of machinery and plant in our exports now makes up almost 50 per cent. While the national income of the CSSR in 1948-74 showed a 380 per cent increase, foreign trade had grown 8.3-fold by 1974 and was worth 85,200m. korunas. Progressive changes in the Czechoslovak economy are also seen in the pattern of our foreign trade. Electronic equipment, transistors and chemical products lately have a more prominent place in it.

Last year the CMEA countries completed the bilateral and mul-

tilateral coordination of their economic plans for 1976-80. Under agreements and specialization programs they will meet on a reciprocal basis a substantial proportion of the demand for fuel and power, metals, machinery and plant, chemical products and consumer goods. The emphasis is on integrating production in the key industries. The qualitatively new tasks set by the Comprehensive Program of socialist economic integration also find reflection in trade agreements between CMEA countries, including Czechoslovakia.

Trade with socialist countries will be an important factor in advancing the Czechoslovak economy and raising our people's standard of living. In 1976-80, its volume will increase by roughly 40 to 42 per cent.

The socialist community considers that its rapid economic progress can and should play an important part in the steady and dynamic growth of world trade and help effectively in reshaping international economic relations on democratic lines.

Closer economic links between socialist and newly independent countries make for progressive trends in world trade. The process of nationalizing foreign trade as a whole or its key fields that took place in numerous Asian and African countries after they won political independence was greatly influenced by the experience of state monopoly of foreign trade in socialist countries, an experience which has fully proved its effectiveness.

Needless to say, the emergence of the peoples of one-time colonies as politically independent nations does not automatically free them from the shackles of the world capitalist economy. Imperialism uses new, disguised methods to continue exploiting these countries as markets and suppliers of raw materials. It also resorts to discrimination in trade for the same purpose.

Capitalist countries pursue a harsh policy toward all commodities coming from new independent states, raw materials included. They impose tariffs twice as high as on imports from developed capitalist countries. Furthermore, price formation on the capitalist world market is extremely unfavorable to developing countries, with high prices on machinery and low prices on raw materials. Another discrimination factor is the quota system, prompted mainly by purely political considerations and intended to cause sharp rivalries between developing countries.

The developing countries see one of their primary tasks in achieving economic independence and equal trade. They are fully supported in this by the socialist community. Due to the solidarity of socialist countries, the legitimate demands of developing countries gain recognition in the UN and at various international conferences.

Between 1950 and 1973, the CMEA countries increased their trade

with the new independent countries roughly 22-fold. A special fund of 1,000 million transferable rubles has been set up in the CMEA International Investment Bank to grant economic and technological credits to developing countries. To ensure payment for plant and other facilities, the CMEA countries grant developing countries government and commerical credits unfetted by any political or economic demands. The long-term credits granted by the CMEA countries to date total 11,000 million rubles. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have abolished tariffs on imports from developing countries. To promote the growth of their economies, they increase imports of manufactured goods from these countries.

The Comprehensive Program provides for the possibility of developing countries participating in CMEA activities and its international economic organizations, which affords many of these countries valuable opportunities, as exemplified by the CMEA agreements with Iraq and Mexico.

International relations today are characterized by the fast-growing economic cooperation between countries with different social systems. Trends in the development of international relations have their effect on foreign trade. 'There is a force more powerful that the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments or classes that are hositle to us,' Lenin said. 'That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 33, p. 155). International détente, now becoming the dominant aspect of world politics, has made for favorable changes in trade between socialist and capitalist countries and helps use opportunities to normalize and perfect the machinery of world economic relations.

Conversely, beneficial changes in economic relations between countries with different social systems carry the process of détente deeper and extend and strengthen the material basis of peaceful coexistence. This is a gain for all the poeples fighting for peace and security. 'Mutually beneficial economic cooperation is becoming an increasingly important factor in stabilizing peaceful relations between countries,' said Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the CPCz and President of Czechoslovakia, in his Helsinki speech.

Foreign trade monopoly continues to serve as a dependable safeguard against imperialist attempts to capture positions on the socialist market, exploit the raw material resources of socialist countries and undermine the socialist economic system. Imperialist plans for every manner of 'commercial blockade' and 'economic embargo,' designed to isolate the Soviet Union and subsequently other socialist countries as well, have miscarried.

The policy of encouraging mutually beneficial trade between

countries with different social and economic systems is objectively necessitated by the internationalization of economic activity, the international division of labor, and the scientific and technological revolution. Yet the socialist countries' adherence to this policy was for a long time misrepresented by imperialist politicians as a Communist 'tactical maneuver' prompted by 'weakness.' Many a would-be theorist still uses these shop-worn arguments against the foreign economic policy of socialist countries. History has taught them nothing.

No sensible person is now likely to argue that the socialist community is 'weak.' Now as in the past, socialist countries demonstrate by deeds their resolve to expand mutually beneficial economic exchanges with capitalist countries, which they regard as an important means of promoting international security and cooperation. 'In line with their policy of peaceful coexistence, in the interest of social progress and in view of the fact that the international socialist division of labor is effected with due regard to the world division of labor, the CMEA countries will continue to develop economic, scientific and technological relations with other countries irrespective of their social and political systems, on the principles of equality, mutual benefit and respect for sovereignty' (Comprehensive Program).

The socialist countries are against autarky, each country producing everything it needs. Disregard of the economic advantages provided by the international division of labor is alien to them. In this age of powerful growth of the productive forces and rapid technological progress, no country can afford economic isolation. The very scale of contemporary production and scientific research requires tremendous resources which even countries having a major economic potential do not always command.

Economic relations between countries belonging to different systems are now based on important agreements at government level. There are inter-governmental agencies to promote cooperation in industry, agriculture, science and technology. Long-term and wide-ranging agreements are of special importance. They are supplemented by agreements on economic cooperation on a compensatory basis. This means that capitalist firms taking part in the construction of industrial complexes in socialist countries will be compensated with part of the output. Agreements of this nature have already been concluded by the Soviet Union, Poland and other socialist countries. Joint research and development on a growing scale also benefit from expanding trade in patents and licenses and from mutually beneficial exchanges of knowhow.

The CMEA countries' trade with capitalist countries is today worth over $40,000 million, much more than during the imperialist cold war.

Trade played an important part in breaking down the political and psychological barriers raised by the cold-war strategists. Agreements normalizing trade often preceded treaties settling political problems.

The capitalist countries' growing interest in economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community is heightened by the undeniable fact that the socialist economy is crisis-free. It is an open secret that the serious economic crisis in the capitalist world has prompted many businessmen to reconsider their attitude and search for ways and means of expanding trade with socialist countries.

It would be simplistic to imagine that growing trade between socialist and capitalist countries will cure a crisis rooted in the evils of a system based on private ownership of the means of production. On the other hand, it is plain that orders placed by socialist countries contribute, sometimes substantially, to the reduction of unemployment, that scourge of the people in capitalist countries.

According to data released by the UN Economic Commission for Europe, the economic crisis has adversely affected West European trade over the past 18 months. By contrast, trade between socialist and capitalist countries in 1974 was up 42-44 per cent on the previous year and a further growth was registered in 1975. And while trade with socialist countries still has a modest share (roughly five per cent) in West European trade, it should not be underestimated. Even according to some economists, trade between the CMEA countries and developed capitalist countries of Europe provides jobs for at least two million people in those countries.

The working class of capitalist countries, which is led by Communist parties and many big trade unions, demand that their governments take more effective steps to expand trade with socialist countries and rid it of survivals of the cold war. Efforts in this direction are part of the general struggle against imperialism and monopoly that is intensifying in capitalist countries.

The socialist countries highly appreciate the solidarity of the international working class. This solidarity helps their effort for the establishment of democratic principles in international relations, including the economic sphere. Much has yet to be done to this end.

The facts show that the economic doors of the socialist countries are open more widely, so to speak, than those of their capitalist partners. What we mean is that our doors are open for trade, not for the inflationary processes typical of the 'free market.'

Imbalances in reciprocal deliveries make it necessary for capitalist countries to place their trade with socialist countries on a balanced basis. The solution of a number of fundamental problems will depend on the willingness of West European countries to import from

socialist countries more machinery, plant and manufactured goods.

An equally important problem is that of tariff discrimination against imports from socialist countries. Some capitalist countries are liberalizing their trade policies in order to boost exports. According to the UN *Economic Bulletin* tariffs have been reduced on 99 per cent of the 1,097 commodities imported from capitalist countries and only on 42 per cent of the goods imported from socialist countries. Many other capitalist countries have taken a similar stand. Discrimination also expresses itself in more rigid import regulations and more exacting technological and sanitary standards in regard to imports from socialist countries. The customs unions of capitalist countries provide for duty-free movement of goods within the group and impediments against outsiders. This applies to the Common Market and EFTA.

The capitalist countries' liberalization of trade policy has been sharply curbed in recent years owing to the economic crisis. Indeed, new protectionist hurdles have been raised to trade. This prevents progress in mutually beneficial economic relations between Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries, on the one hand, and capitalist countries, on the other. Were some obstacles removed, as was done under the Czechoslovak-Finnish agreement, new inducements could be found for mutually beneficial commercial relations.

Due to the effort of socialist countries, the Helsinki Conference called for the restriction and gradual removal of all trade barriers. Its Final Act, signed on August 1, 1975, contains important recommendations for greater cooperation in the economic, scientific and technological fields, as well as in environmental protection.

The adoption of these recommendations does not at all imply, as ultra-leftists contend, a class reconciliation or class truce undermining the basis of the class struggle on a world scale. It would be just as wrong to expect these recommendations could bring about a rapprochement or convergence of countries with different social systems. Their cooperation does not, nor can, eliminate class contradictions between the socialist and capitalist systems.

The growing economic, scientific and technological cooperation of countries with different social systems and opposed ideologies by no means tends to end the objecitve phenomenon of class struggle. However, this increases the responsibility of states and all social forces, which must see to it that this struggle does not take a course threatening mankind with a devastating military conflict. 'We Communists,' said L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU, 'will continue to do all in our power for the earth never to be engulfed in the flames of a nuclear conflagration.'

Like other countries of the socialist community, Czechoslovakia, with its experience in foreign trade, looks ahead with optimism, now

fortified by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, whose Final Act stresses that world trade can and should be one of the most important factors in economic growth and social progress and that advances in this sphere promote peace and security in Europe and throughout the world.

A pressing task now is to seek the removal of discrimination and other artificial obstacles to international trade and the elimination of all inequality, imposition and exploitation in international economic relations. This is urged by the program of continued struggle for peace and international cooperation, for the freedom and independence of peoples, advanced by the 25th Congress of the CPSU. The socialist community, hailing it as a program of joint action, will work for its steadfast implementation. In common with the Communist parties of capitalist countries, with all the forces of peace, democracy and progress, it resists imperialist reaction, which tries to thwart or hold back the process of détente.

communist viewpoint

Subscribe now . . .

6 issues a year $4.
(NEWSSTAND VALUE: $4.50)

COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT is a Marxist theoretical-political journal dealing with Canadian and world affairs from the standpoint of scientific socialism.

In Canada: Single Copy 75c; One Year $4.00; 2 Years $7.00 (Save $1.00). U.S. and Foreign: $5.00 1 Year; $8.50 2 Years. Half-price for students and unemployed. Enclose 15c with U.S. cheques.

Send to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....ZONE .....PROV. or STATE .....

Enc. $ ..... Bill me .....

Progress Subscription Service, 487 Adelaide St. W., Toronto M5V 1T4 Canada

comment

The problem of power in the transition period

Zahi Karkabi
Secretary of CC, CP of Israel

Never before has the prospect of socialism been so near to reality than in our time, in this era of the ever growing superiority of the socialist world system, the deepening crisis of capitalism and the rise of the mass revolutionary movement for social and national liberation. The growing intensity of the class battles naturally rivets the attention of Communists on the aspects of Marxism-Leninism that have a direct bearing on the conquest and consolidation of working-class power. In this context it is important to discuss the objective laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism, a discussion begun in the columns of this journal with the article, 'The Image of Our Own Future,' by Ib Nørlund, member of the Executive and Secretariat of the Communist Party of Denmark.*

It gives an argumented rebuff to our ideological opponents, the bourgeois ideologists and advocates of opportunism and revision, who are doing their best to discredit the experience accumulated by the socialist countries, undermine the unity and cooperation of fraternal parties and justify every retreat from Marxism-Leninism. They inflate out of all measure the importance of 'specifics,' 'exclusiveness,' 'inimitability' in the development of one or another country. Their idea of our struggle is everyone going his own way, with communism, our aim, replaced by all manner of voguish recipes and home-grown 'models' of socialism, whether Danish or Zionist, as preached by Ben-Gurion, Katsnelson and their followers. The criterion of truth, as Ib Nørlund rightly reminds us, is life, practice. We do not know of a single case of socialism being built by these recipes, though the parties that advocate them, the Social Democrats, for instance, were and are in power in many countries. At the same time we see the rich experience of existing socialism, and the fraternal parties attribute their achievements primarily to stringent adherence to the objective laws of development.

In reading Nørlund's article, I found that I shared many of his thoughts and much of what he says about the feelings of a Communist

* *World Marxist Review*, January 1976, page 44.

in a capitalist country who has closely followed life in the Soviet Union and other socialist states. And like Nørlund I ask myself: 'How will all this work out in my own country? These thoughts, I believe, are near and dear to may comrades in various other countries, for every real Communist is bound to appreciate the value of Lenin's statement: 'We now possess quite considerable international experience, which shows very definitely that certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but international.... It is the Russian model that reveals to *all* countries something — and something highly significant — of their near and inevitable future' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, pp. 21-22). Nor does this in any way contradict another tenet of Marxism, concerning which Lenin said: 'The revolution proceeds in its own way in every country.... World revolution is not so smooth as to proceed in the same way everywhere, in all countries' (Vol. 28, p. 123). The complex and creative character of our work resides in the fact that we have to devise a realistic strategy and tactics that take into account local conditions. However, this does not repeal the common laws of history, and, what is more, national conditions cannot be deeply understood without a scientific understanding of these common laws.

But we would be underestimating the complexity of our work if we were to reduce everything to the correlation between the common and the 'particular,' for this would be no more than a snapshot of our times, showing current differences in the position and conditions of one country in relation to others. This is necessary, but certainly not enough. We must find the key also to the peculiarities that are part of reality and distinguish it from the reality of 'yesterday,' from the historic past, even if only the recent past. It is on these points that I wish to dwell in my contribution.

Capitalism has undergone fundamental changes in the first three quarters of the century. Communists do not disregard these changes; they consider it their duty to subject them to objective analysis. The results of such analysis by the fraternal parties are discussed and verified collectively in order to further enrich Marxism-Leninism. In our time, its theoretical basis has been augmented by a number of new conclusions about the deepening general crisis of capitalism and the changing balance of forces in favor of socialism, about the possibilities of improving the international situation, forecasting the future of the young states that have broken out of the colonialist yoke, etc. Without repeating the comprehensive analysis contained, for instance, in the documents of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, I propose to deal in some detail on one feature of the present world situation.

We know that from the standpoint of building up the productive forces, the material prerequisities for transition to socialism, state-monopoly capitalism can, to use Lenin's expression, climb 'a rung of the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism *there are no intermediate rungs*' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 25, p. 359). In some of the more developed capitalist countries the Communist parties have drawn the conclusion that the objective material prerequisites for socialism already exist. On the other hand, in these same countries, they have had to admit that the transition to socialism as the next step is hardly likely. For it encounters a non-material barrier, the need to achieve general democratic aims, the scope of which is substantially greater than in the past. Why? An historic analysis will disclose the origins also of this new sharp contradiction.

The transition from the free enterprise capitalism of the past, with its *laissez faire* motto, to present-day, monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism, was accompanied by the unprecedented concentration of power in the financial oligarchy, a tight elite opposed to the interests not only of the working class, but also of all social strata, including the peasantry and working intellectuals, small businessmen and the middle strata generally. In countries like ours, dependent on imperialist powers, this also involves a definite section of the progressively-minded national bourgeoisie. Attempts by the monopoly power to shift on to the taxpayer the entire burden of the present sharp crisis, inflation and unemployment, economic militarization, squandering of national resources by the military-industrial complexes, the results of scientific and technological progress used by the monopolies to maximize profits with no regard whatever to deterioration of working conditions, the quality of life and the environment — all this has come as a telling blow to the broad non-monopoly mass of the population. And to keep that mass in submission imperialism is more frequently falling back on political reaction, curtailing traditional bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms, extending the prerogatives of the executive branch to the detriment of elected representative bodies, resorting to repression against the progressive forces, is increasingly leaning toward an authoritarian regime, and when the situation becomes especially acute, directly relies on neo-fascism and dictatorial regimes. 'The recent experience of the revolutionary movement,' L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress, 'provides graphic evidence that imperialism will stop at nothing, ending all pretence at any kind of democracy, if a serious threat arises to the domination of monopoly capital and its political agents.'

That being the situation, the Communist parties of many non-socialist countries give priority in their revolutionary strategy to the formation of broad popular fronts and alliances, and unity of the left,

democratic and all anti-imperialist forces. The aim is to carry out profound democratic transformations of the social and political system of capitalist countries through a series of transitionary measures, phases and states. Thus, policy statements of the German Communist Party speak of 'anti-monopoly democracy,' in Canada the Communist Party aims at a 'democratic anti-monopoly government.' 'It can be presumed,' the international symposium on the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Comintern Congress pointed out, 'that in many capitalist countries the socialist revolution will be preceded by one or several stages or phases of democratic revolution of the new type (as distinct from the anti-feudal, bourgeois-democratic revolution). And this, in turn, will make it possible, indeed necessary, in a number of cases, for the existence over a more or less long period of a transition government, or more accurately, a popular, democratic, revolutionary government with a higher or lower degree of working-class hegemony.'

And I would repeat: the details will not be the same everywhere, there will be (and should be) distinctions in the levels achieved by a group of countries, or even by a single country. For example, the policy documents of a number of Latin American countries speak of a revolutionary-democratic popular government, of national governments of a progressive, anti-imperialist orientation. The program of our own Party, adopted at tis 17th Congress, takes into account all the specifics of the situation in Israel and sets general democratic, anti-imperialist tasks, in particular the formation of a united peace front, wide unity in the struggle for a fundamental change of Israeli policy, freeing Israel from dependence on imperialism, and a just and durable peace with the Arab countries.

All of these, even the most minute peculiarities are of not little importance. For they are closely linked with a profound analysis of the present situation, which our ideological opponents use for renewed attempts to 'refute' Marxism-Leninism, to prove that its foundations, laid a hundred years ago, have become 'obsolete' and that the Communists themselves are 'abandoning' them. Confusion is being induced on the all-important question of the character and class substance of political power in the transition period. The common aim of all these fabrications is to counterpose to the 'Leninist' and 'democratic' road to socialism, ferret out non-existing contradictions, though the present revolutionary strategy of the Communists is based on creative application and development of Marxism-Leninism.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism always regarded the struggle for democracy as a component and inalienable part of the struggle for socialism. Lenin wrote: 'It would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat

from the socialist revolution or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc. On the contrary, in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 144).

The ideas of genuine democracy running through Marxist-Leninist teachings, and the principle of encouraging the activity of the masses are a forceful refutation of yet another stock calumny of bourgeois and opportunist ideology to the effect that in seeking power, the Communists are ready to ignore the will of the 'majority of the people.' Marxists should not be mistaken for extremists or putschists of a Blanquist type who pin their hopes on 'resolute action' by a 'resolute minority.' Lenin described this approach as 'not merely foolish but criminal (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 93). He stressed that establishing the political power of the working class depends on support from the masses that have gained experience and attained political maturity at previous stages of the struggle.

The issue of the transition to socialism through a number of intermediate phases was first dealt with from the standpoint of principle in fundamental writings of Marx and Engels. Subsequently, Lenin elaborated it carefully and Communists have every reason to be proud of the vitality of their theory, which is as valid now as ever. Speaking of the events in Portugal, for example, the press reported the growing popularity of Lenin's writings, banned in the years of fascist dictatorship. It pointed out the special interest taken in the article 'The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It,' which says that in developed capitalist countries the way for the victory of the working class can be paved by first effecting far-reaching general democratic, anti-monopoly changes under the leadership of revolutionary-democratic organs or power. It 'will *still not* be socialism,' Lenin wrote, 'but it will *no longer* be capitalism. It will be a tremendous *step toward* socialism' (Vol. 25, p. 360).

A tremendous step. A tremendous step but not the concluding one — these are two truths of equal significance which Communists always bear in mind. Carrying out the Party program for the formation of a democratic anti-imperialist front,' says the resolution of our 17th Congress, '. . .will create conditions for a transition to a higher revolutionary stage of the Israeli society — to socialism.' Just as we define our primary task on a strictly scientific basis, so the successful transition to socialism makes it necessary to take into account the objective laws of this process established by Marxism-Leninism.

One of the most important of these laws is undoubtedly the history-tested truth that there can be no question of real socialism

until state power is assumed by the working class and the people led by it. What does this mean?

There was an interesting episode in British history — an early attempt to introduce socialism by 'parliamentary' methods. In 1920, the following motion was tabled in parliament on behalf of the British Labour Party: 'In view of the inability of the capitalist system to judiciously use and organize natural resources and industrial forces and to ensure the mass of the population the requisite standard of living, and considering that the cause of this inability lies in private property and in private control of the means of production and distribution, Parliament declares the need to make legislative efforts for the gradual replacement of the capitalist system by a socio-economic order based on public property and democratic control of the implements of production and distribution' (R. Palme Dutt, 'Socialism in the British Parliament.' *Kommunistichesky Internatsional,* 1923, No. 28-29, p. 7,659 retranslated). Needless to say, parliament rejected the motion, which was absolutely inevitable at a time when the working people were very far from achieving the goals of even the democratic stage of struggle. It seems to me, however, that this fact of history is of some interest and gives food for thought in new conditions.

Let us presume that sustained struggle in a capitalist country today has enabled us to undermine the domination of monopoly forces and achieve a degree of worker participation in the management of enterprises even though production is still based on private property, and that we have at last brought about a broad government coalition in which a fitting place is held by the Communist Party and its partners of the Left alliance, representatives of the working people and, along with them, spokesmen of the bourgeoise. What would be the outcome? There can hardly be any doubt that those who owned the means of production would not give them up of their own free will. But let us assume that in this hypothetical case the parliamentary majority would be against them. It is safe to say that the bourgeois 'opposition' would do all in its power to slow down, check and, in the end, foil the implementation of progressive solutions. One cannot but recall at this point the brutal reality of the events in Chile, where the situation was much 'less dangerous' to the bourgeoisie and not identical with but only partly similar to the situation under discussion, and yet imperialism pitted all the forces of reaction against the Popular Unity government without giving a moment's thought to the need to respect the laws. This is a fresh reminder of the necessity for democracy and socialism always to be prepared to defend their gains and never to rest on their laurels. Indeed, this is the conclusion that Chile's Communists drew on analyzing the tragic lessons of those events. 'As a party,' Rene Castillo wrote, 'we committed one of our

most serious errors in overestimating the democratic nature of the government system and not taking timely steps to reorganize it' (*WMR*, July 1974, p. 30).

The accomplishment of general democratic tasks, however consistent and successful, does not at all imply that mere 'evolution' is enough for subsequent transition to solcialism, for this transition has always been, and always will be, a socialist revolution. The invariable essence of this transition to a new system is due at least to three groups of factors. To put it in brief (Ib Nørlund's article deals with the problem in greater detail), it is a question, first of the need to eliminate the capitalist mode of production, which is based on private property and the exploitation of wage labor, no matter how it is 'modified'; secondly, of doing away in the course of struggle for democracy with the system of class oppression in order to establish genuine working people's rule; thirdly, of creating a society opposed to capitalism and based on a broad alliance between the working class as the most consistent revolutionary force and all those who seek emanicipation from capitalist power.

Communists approach the issue of the nature of political power in the period of transition in specific terms by ascertaining what are the motive forces of revolutionary changes and who has an objective interest in them and is capable of carrying them through to the end. They do not do this on the basis of any dogmas or biased concepts but through scientific analysis of the class composition of society in contemproary conditions. Analysis reveals that this force is the working class led by its Marxist -Leninist party and leaning on alliance with other working people. The progressive social role of the working class in contemporary capitalist society does not diminish but increases in spite of changes coming about in its social, professional and educational composition under the impact of the technological revolution. It also helps to widen the range of potential allies of the working class in the fight for the new system and in the process of establishing it. These forces play a decisive part in effecting socialist changes. It is for this reason and in this sense that Communists speak of the transfer of power to the working class and of its leading role. It is this and nothing else — no special characteristics, shadings or qualities — that is indispensable for the essence of the law of transition to socialism which founders of Marxism-Leninism called the dictatorship of the proletariat. What is indisputable is the law not its forms. 'Bourgeois states,' Lenin wrote, 'are most varied in form, but their essence is the same: all these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*. The transition from capitalism to communism is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevita-

bly be the same: the *dictatorship of the proletariat*' (Vol. 25, p. 413).

Of course, in being translated into reality, every law acquires this or that set of special features imparted to it by life itself. Establishing working-class power can be a single act or a result of development over a certain period. This power may vary in structure, organization or method. Experience shows that characteristics can vary in the most diverse combinations. While the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and Bulgaria was a direct result of a socialist revolution, in Hungary and the GDR it was a result of a democratic, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist type of revolution developing into a socialist revolution. And whereas the fight for working-class power in the Soviet Union necessitated a protracted civil war, its establishment in a number of other countries proceeded in a relatively peaceful manner.

There is no point in trying to forecast the exact turn which the struggle for socialism in this or that capitalist country will take subsequently, and it is still more absurd to make 'universally valid' prophecies. The details will be furnished by time and the effort of the masses. We may well look forward to seeing much that will be new in the methods and approach to establishing people's rule, in the relationship between democracy and parliamentarism, variants of participation in socialist construction by non-communist parties remaining loyal to the people's interests and enjoying their confidence, the practice of using certain elements of the bourgeois state, and so on. There is every reason to believe that the growing influence of the socialist world system and of the appeal of the ideals of scientific communism and the extensive development of the democratic movement, in which Leninism has always seen 'the best stimulant for the revolution' (Vol. 29, p. 90), all improve the chances of the revolution taking a peaceful course and having a peaceful outcome in many countries, which Marxism has always preferred. Be that as it may, Communists will always be the last to object to the abolition of private property by peaceful means, as Engels wrote in 1847, shortly before the appearance of the first edition of the *Communist Manifesto*. Furthermore, nothing can make us abandon the conviction that real socialism can only be achieved by respecting the main laws of history discovered by Marxist-Leninist theory and confirmed by practice.

A correct answer to the question of the relationship between the general historical and the concereteley distinctive is particularly important today. Some believe that this is what complicates things and that the general 'gets lost' in too much multiformity. We have an entirely different opinion. The more facts there are, the more reliably they

pave the way for any serious and conscientious analyst to grasp the meaning of the given phenomenon.

So long as the practical experience of socialist construction was confined to the Soviet example, the laws of the transitional period could only be observed in one concrete form and fused with it, so to speak. Besides, in any specific experience taken by itself, laws may stand out with a differing degree of clarity. This has always been an object of speculation for bourgeois 'Sovietologists' and occasionally — why not admit it? — a source of mistakes for some of our comrades, who yielded to the temptation to thoughtlessly copy the experience of other countries. Communists firmly reject such an approach, as everyone knows. They show up past blunders and draw conclusions to prevent repetition of mistakes.

In our time, the main laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism express themselves in a wide range of examples and in multiformity of the concrete. The manifestation of these laws in this or that country is complemented by the experience of all fraternal parties. This makes us confident that the outlines of our future can be seen by the representatives of any country even today if they analyze the nature of real socialism.

On the ideological evolution of Maoism

Girgin Girginov
Deputy Director, Institute of Modern Social Theories, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

The theoretical views of Mao Tse-tung and his followers on the main problems of the revolution, proletarian dictatorship, war and peace, and national liberation, are deeply hostile to Marxism-Leninism and revolutionary practice. The evolution of Maoism concerns not only its content, but also its forms of ideological and political mimicry, designed to camouflage its essence by a welter of anti-imperialist phraseology. This evolution can only be described as progressing ideological and political degradation.

Maoism is in a state of permanent crisis which is becoming more aggravated and profound. On all cardinal issues, experience is increasingly exposing Maoism as a trend opposed to Marxism-Leninism

and fundamentally contrary to the vital interests of the peoples, the cause of peace and socialism. The new, 1975 constitution made Maoist policy of law of the land. Maoism's degradation has thus entered a new state. From playing up to imperialism the present Peking leaders have gone over to joint action with it and other reactionary forces; from an accomplice of anti-communism, Maoism has become one of its varieties. The facts demonstrate more and more convincingly that the Maoists are intensifying and extending their anti-communist activity in all the currents of the world revolutionary process. And this activity is conducted by state and Party organs, and also through Peking-supported pro-Maoist splinter groups in various countries. The ideological and political confrontation with the socialist community and the international communist and workers' movement on all the central problems of contemporary world development and the building of socialist society, is complemented by subversion of third world national-liberation movements and attempts to direct them against the existing socialism. 'The degradation of Maoism,' Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of CC BCP, told the 11th Party Congress, 'has reached a new stage. Maoism is in alliance with the most aggressive forces of imperialism, fascism and revanchism, with the enemies of peaceful coexistence and social progress. Its actions are becoming increasingly dangerous to international peace and security. The policy and ideology of the present Chinese leadership are deeply hostile to Marxism-Leninism and the communist ideals. Our Party deems it its duty actively to participate in the fight against Maoism, for its political and ideological defeat.'

As an ideology, Maoism is a conglomerate mainly of petty-bourgeois views, permeated moreover with nationalism and Great Han chauvinism, demagogically veiled by ultra-revolutionary phrases and professions of 'loyalty' to Marxism-Leninism and communism. This is not a comprehensive, integral doctrine, but an eclectic hodgepodge of various, often contradictory, ideological positions. Its most general philosophical and theoretical basis is subjectivism, curiously combined with metaphysics and sophistry. In practice this unscientific philosophy boils down to ignoring the requirements of the objective laws of social development, or to acting in defiance of them.

The Maoists resort to the most incredible manipulations of the laws and categories of dialectics. They have no compunction in using one and the same philosophical proposition to substantiate contradictory political slogans and actions, or reject these propositions altogether if they do not suit their purpose. Highly characteristic in this respect, for instance, is the evolution of the Maoists' understanding of the main (including the basic) contradictions of our epoch.[1] Their opportunistic treatment of the problem of contradictions is based on

subjectivist criteria, arbitrary division of these contradictions into external and internal, antagonistic and non-antagonistic, basic and non-basic, etc.

Maoism borrows its ideas from the most diverse ideological-political trends and schools. And as its ideological degradation progresses, it draws more on incompatible ideas.

In the 1920s Mao began by formal, declarative acceptance of Marxism-Leninism which he reinterpreted to fit nationalistic prejudices. The facts show that even the Comintern Executive was concerned over this vulgar attitude to Marxism-Leninism. In the early years after the victory of the people's revolution in China, Mao and his closest associates, though many of their views were far removed from the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism, vowed fidelity to it. But even in those days they dogmatically used the correct tenets of scientific communism to vulgarize them, thereby robbing them of their effectiveness.

As the differences between the CPC leadership and the international communist movement deepened, there were revealed in Maoism components that are incompatible with Marxism. The list included anarchism, with its preaching of violence, the Trotskyist thesis of permanent revolution, which was linked to world war, the Bonapartist faith in the omnipotence of the army, Bakunin's cavalier treatment of economics as a secondary factor, great power or Great Han chauvinism, etc.

Maoism borrows views and concepts from the arsenal of imperialist ideology (e.g. the 'superpower' concept), and anti-communist propaganda draws on Maoist theory. In fact it is often difficult to say who borrows more from whom. But there is an undoubted similarity between, for instance, the Maoist concept of 'Sinoisation of Marxism' and the bourgeois concept of 'national communism.' As for anti-Sovietism, here the position of the Maoists and of the most reactionary imperialist forces coincide.

An essential factor in Maoism's ideological evolution is the active attempts of its leaders, headed by Mao himself, to emasculate the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism through their 'Sinoisation.' On the pretext of taking into account Chinese specifics, they have sought to replace scientific communism by unscientific Maoism and impart to Chinese nationalism and Great Han chauvinism some semblance of scientific validity. Peking persists in imposing 'the ideas of Mao,' 'a Sinoised Marxism'[2] on the international communist movement as the 'ultimate' in the development of Marxism-Leninism in the contemporary epoch.

An essential place in 'Sinoised Marxism' belongs to the Maoist conception of the characteristic features and criteria of socialism.

That conception is the ideological basis of the attacks on the existing socialism and the strategy of the Communist parties fighting imperialism and for the transition to socialist society. Speculating on the Marxist propositions that the principles of socialism should be creatively applied in each country, Mao deliberately exaggerated China's national specifics and produced the so-called 'Chinese model of socialism.' With time it became clear that behind this sham adaptation to Chinese conditions was a campaign against the fundamental principles of socialist construction. More, the Maoists do not consider that their 'model' is applicable only to the specific conditions of China: they try to present it as a model of 'true socialism.'

This Chinese 'model' is premised on negation of the leading role of the working class in socialist construction: the Maoists regard the village as the main base of socialism. The Chinese 'model' is characterized also by factual negation of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard.

The Maoist understanding of socialism precludes proletarian internationalism. Furthermore, the Maoists link their 'model' to the traditions of bourgeois chauvinism, with its ideas of extremist nationalism, Sinocentrism, hegemonism and the effort to make China 'the world's first state' which would rule over the 'five continents.' Indicative in this respect is Mao's statement at a meeting of the CC CPC Military Commission on September 11, 1959: 'We must conquer the world... We will build a powerful state.'

To somehow justify their break with proletarian internationalism, the Maoists have invented the conception of building socialism, even communism, without creating the necessary material and technical basis. Their voluntarist plans envisaged passing whole stages of building communist society, a forced leap from unfinished socialism to communism. But having realized the absurdity of this policy, they went to the other extreme, claiming that the building of socialism was a long, immeasurable process. Such concepts discredit the principles of scientific socialism.

Latterly the Maoist mass media have turned their attention to 'barrack communism.' Everyone who favors use of the socialist principle of material incentives is denounced as part of the 'new bourgeoisie,' a defender of the 'remnants of the old society' and 'survivals of bourgeois law.' And this, as we shall later see, is used for far-reaching slanderous conclusions with regard to the socialist community.

Proclamation of the 'Chinese model' of socialism was merely the prelude to continued betrayal of socialism and to alliance with the enemies of existing socialism. The record of the past few years will show that the Peking ideologists have borrowed the methods of

imperialist anti-communism for ideological subversion against the socialist world system. In this too they have exposed their kinship with the class enemies of socialism — they ape them in finding all manner of pretexts for stepping up the struggle against the real gains of socialism, the communist and workers' movement.

Experience has proved that the 'ideas of Mao Tse-tung' and his 'socialist model' are groundless, for they run counter to the objective laws of historical development and the theory and practice of the world revolutionary movement. This is at the core of the permanent crisis of 'Mao Tse-tung's ideas' and their practical application.

This crisis logically led to the final discrediting of Maoism when the Peking leader began to present as Marxism-Leninism reactionary views and conclusions borrowed from the arsenal of imperialism. Hence, Maoism has placed itself not only outside Marxism-Leninism, but has entered into an irreconcilable confrontation and conflict with it. Maoism's regressive ideological evolution confirms Lenin's thought that 'evasiveness or lack of principle in theoretical questions is tantamount to utter ideological bankruptcy' (*Coll. Works,* Vol 8, p. 316). Hence, a light-hearted, and moreover conciliatory, attitude to the Maoists' ideological speculations is tantamount to support to their anti-Marxist and anti-communist positions.

Anti-Sovietism is the main orientation of Maoist foreign policy. And here we are dealing with a long-range policy sanctioned by the Ninth and 10th CPC congresses and new constitution. Though disguised by professions of 'fidelity to proletarian internationalism,' this policy implies not only refusal to join with the socialist countries against imperialism, but also an outright shift to the positions of imperialism and reaction.

The Peking leaders' anti-Soviet policy has undergone a definite evolution; it has its stages and culminating points. Without going into an examination of the anti-Soviet sentiments of Mao and his entourage before the 1949 revolution, it should be noted that these sentiments came to the surface after about 10 years of normal relations with the USSR which, on the whole, were based on proletarian internationalism. When the differences came to light, the Maoist leaders at first argued that there were ideological differences with the USSR and other socialist countries and the international communist movement only on certain questions of the strategy and tactics of anti-imperialist struggle. After that the Peking leadership proclaimed the Soviet Union 'enemy number one' of the workers' and communist movement, indeed of all the peoples of the world. There were monstrous slanders and insinuations directed at the CPSU and the Soviet Union and Jesuit-like attempts to provide a theoretical 'justification' for this rabid anti-Sovietism.

The main 'argument' was the totally fabricated charge of 'degeneration' of Soviet society — a refurbished variant of Trotsky's old thesis. The Maoists allege that the Soviet Union has ceased to be a socialist state and has restored the 'capitalist economy' and 'dictatorship of the bourgeoisie' (*Peking Review*, No. 14, 1975, p. 6). The Maoists seized on the false thesis invented by the revisionists and their anti-communist accomplices about the 'new bourgeois elements reared within socialist society trying to usurp power,' the emergence of a 'new class,' etc. In 1968 Mao stated: 'the Soviet Union of our day is a dictatorship of the German fascist type, a dictatorship of the Hitler type.' In the CC report to the 10th CPC Congress (August 1973) this piece of slander was repeated: 'The Soviet revisionist ruling clique . . . has restored capitalism, enforced a fascist dictatorship and enslaved the people of all nationalities. . .' (*Peking Review*, No. 35-36, 1973, p. 23).

Whatever the Peking leaders have done to normalize relations with some socialist countries (exchange of ambassadors, negotiations, agreements and treaties, etc.) have in no way altered their anti-socialist policy. On the contrary, the real motives behind these moves were to set each socialist country, and all of them, against the Soviet Union. And here, too, the Maoist leadership is at one with the reactionary imperialist forces and centers.

In the first decade after the victory of the people's revolution, thanks to fraternal cooperation with the USSR and its disinterested and all-round assistance, China made considerable headway in economic and cultural development. As a result of expanding Chinese-Soviet cooperation there were established industries never before known in China: aircraft, automobiles, tractors, radio equipment, etc. The present Chinese leaders at that time spoke in a different language. In particular Mao Tse-tung stated: 'To transform China into an industrial country, we must seriously study the advanced experience of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been building socialism for 40 years now and its experience is of immense value to us. Let us consider who designed and built so many important factories for us? Was it the U.S., or England? No. It was not they. Only the Soviet Union did this because it is a socialist country and is our ally.'[3] Now this is being kept from the Chinese people, and the malicious lie is being spread that the vital interests of the peoples of the socialist community are 'inimical' to the interests of the Chinese people.

Addressing the jubilee session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in November 1957, Mao Tse-tung declared: 'After the October Revolution, any government that refuses to live in friendship with the Soviet Union is only impairing the genuine interests of its people.' Compar-

ing these words with the present anti-Soviet outbursts of the Peking leaders, we can see what lack of political principle can lead to on so cardinal an issue as the attitude toward the Soviet Union.

The Maoist slogan of 'relying on one's own forces,' which is meant to justify isolation from the socialist world, factually determines the political orientation of China's economy on the international capitalist market, with all the consequences following therefrom. In pursuance of their nationalist policy, the ruling Mao group has, beginning with the 60s, deprived the Chinese economy of assistance from the USSR and other socialist countries. In 1973 the share of China's foreign trade with capitalist countries was 79 per cent, compared with only 21 per cent with socialist countries.

The chief obstacle to the achievement of Peking's strategic aims is the agreed policy of the socialist community countries, a policy of decisively rebuffing the Maoists' chauvinistic plans and splitting activities. That is why the Maoists are stepping up the fight against the countries of the socialist community, seeking to undermine their unity and discredit socialist economic integration. Posing as 'patrons' of the socialist countries and 'champions' of their national sovereignty, the Peking leaders aim their attacks primarily at the collective bodies of the socialist community, CMEA and the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

At the same time they are taking a benevolent attitude toward NATO and showing touching solicitude for its future. Some bourgeois writers had good reason last year to describe China as an honorable member of NATO. The Maoists support political, economic and military unity of Europe's imperialist forces. Now that their dream of leadership of the socialist system has not materialized, they deny its very existence. At the Sixth Special UN Assembly in April 1974 the Chinese delegation made this statement: 'The socialist camp which existed for a time after World War II is no longer in existence' (*Peking Review*, No. 16, 1974, p. 6).

One can readily appreciate why imperialism and its reactionary forces are more actively using the Maoist leadership as allies in their attempt to discredit the momentous achievements of the socialist community. The West German neo-fascist *Nation Europa* (No. 10, 1973) was very outspoken on this score: 'Capitalist Eruope breathed a sigh of relief after the last party congress in Peking: the continued existence of Maoism is assured. In other words, we need not fear that the Chinese and Russians will fall into each other's arms under the banner of world communism.'

History knows very rare cases of men professing to be Marxists and socialists surpassing the most reactionary ideologists in attacking the citadel of Marxism and socialism. Nor is there any precedent for

the fact that the Maoist constitution institutionalizes hostility toward another state: anti-Sovietism has been elevated by the Maoists into the civic duty of every Chinese!

Eulogy of war as a means of resolving international conflicts is still another characteristic of Maoism. Mao has long been theorizing about the revolutionary role of armed violence. He is trying to lull the vigilance of the peoples, faced with the menace of a thermonuclear war: the nuclear weapon is discounted as a 'paper-tiger.' Then there is Mao's poem published in the Chinese press on New Year's day 1976. It extolls war and the flames that would engulf the heavens and earth. Indicative too is Mao's statement on March 10, 1973 at a meeting with journalists and publishers: 'Our trump card is war and dictatorship.'

Now that the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems are taking hold in international relations, the Peking leaders are coming out more openly and cynically as inveterate enemies of détente. They are frenziedly preparing the Chinese people for war, assiduously instilling the idea that a new world war is a fatal inevitability. For a long time they tried to conceal their Great Han militarist propensities. Now, however, militarization has beome official policy. China continues to test nuclear and thermonuclear weapons not only underground, but also in the atmsophere. A Reuters report from Peking says China already has medium-range missiles.

The trend in the world is toward a healthier international climate, but the Peking leaders persist in their cold-war policy against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They are doing everything to prevent durable peace and good-neighbor relations and openly support the reactionary forces working to cancel out the results of the Helsinki Conference.

China has rejected the Soviet proposal to normalize relations, notably the proposal to assume mutual obligations not to employ any type of weapon, conventional, missile or nuclear, against each other. At the 30th UN Assembly (1975) the Peking delegates did not support a single one of the 25 disarmament resolutions which were adopted by an overwhelming majority. Contrary to the objective trend in international affairs, the Chinese leaders are trying to instill in the world public the idea that the threat of war is growing, that the 'two superpowers' are both 'seats of a new world war' (*Peking Review*, No. 4, 1975, p. 24).

Maoism's ideological and political degradation is thus clearly demonstrated also on the issue of war and peace, the most pressing issue of our time. The Peking leaders ar more closely working with imperialism and reaction against international peace and security, in

attempts to undermine détente, in intensive psychological preparation of war. If it depended only on them, the Moaists would be prepared, through provocation and risky adventures, to plunge other countries into a thermonuclear catastrophe. That is why the promotion of peace and security is inconceivable without struggle against Maoist ideology and policies.

The evolution of Maoism as an ideological and political trend reaffirms anew that retreat from the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, its distortion, damage revolutionary practice.

The interests of world socialism and of the international communist movement call for a principled struggle against Maoist ideology and policy, which are not only incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, but frankly hostile to it. While repelling Maoism, Marxist-Leninists do not interfere in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China, and have no intention of doing so. In fact, the countries of the socialist community have consistently emphasized their readiness to normalize relations with China on the principles of peaceful coexistence. More, Marxist-Leninists are far from the thought of 'excommunicating' any party from the communist movement or any country from the socialist world system. They maintain that if Peking returns to a policy really based on Marxism-Leninism, that will allow for development of relations with the PRC and CPC on the principles of socialist internationalism.

1. In 1960 the Maoists formulated the main contradictions of the epoch as follows: 'Between the working class and monopoly capital; between the imperialist countries; between the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies and imperialism; between the socialist and imperialist countries' *(Long Live Leninism,* Peking, 1960, p. 16).

In 1969 the Ninth CPC Congress produced a new formulation: 'There are four major contradictions in the world today. The contradiction between the oppressed nations on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other; the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries; the contradiction between imperialist and social-imperialist countries and among the imperialist countries; and the contradiction between socialist countries on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other' *(Peking Review,* Special issue, No. 16, 1969, p. 26).

In 1973, the 10th Congress reduced all the contradictions to two: between the 'superpowers,' and the rest of the world and between the 'superpowers' themselves *(Peking Review,* No. 35-36, 1973, p. 26). Or more precisely, the main contradiction was formulated as between the 'superpowers,' and especially the Soviet Union, on the one hand and all the other countries and peoples on the other.

The Maoists are at pains to conceal the real basic contradiction of this era of transition from capitalism to socialism — the contradiction between world capitalism and world socialism.

2. It will be recalled that on August 21, 1973, the *Jiefang Jihpao* wrote: 'The ideas of the Communist Party of China are the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, Sinoised Marxism.'

3. Mao Tse-tung, *Concerning the Correct Resolution of Contradictions Among the People*. Moscow, 1957, p. 48.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF A CLASS

The International Working-Class Movement, Problems of History and Theory. In seven volumes (in Russian); Chairman of chief editorial commission — B.N. Ponomaryov. Volume One: *The Rise of the Proletariat and Its Formation as a Revolutionary Class,* Editor — A. S. Chernyaev, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1976, 668 pp.

The international working-class movement and its vanguard, the Communist parties, constitute the most powerful social force of our time, the mainspring of world development. Yet until recently there have been no major attempts to make a Marxist-Leninist generalization of the *entire* history of the emergence and formation of that force, to write what might be called a 'collective biography of the international working class.' Now a beginning has been made: the first volume of such a 'biography,' written by a group of Soviet historians, philosophers and economists, has come out in Moscow.

Explaining the aims and intention of the new multi-volume work, Academician B.N. Ponomaryov writes: 'Our purpose is to present a sufficiently comprehensive picture of the socio-economic and ideological-political development of the working class, of its maturing as the leading force in the revolutionary transformation of society. This should not be just a history of 'civilian society,' with some emphasis on the role and activity of the working class... but a coherent exposition of the events and problems directly relating to the development of the working class, presenting them against the background of the development of society as a whole. The task is to show, on the basis of factual material, its growing role in ensuring the social progress of mankind' (p. 6).

The contents of this initial volume show that this difficult task is being successfully tackled by the authors. Not only have they avoided repeating the usual material contained in works on modern history, but have conducted an original research into the history of the work-

ing class. They have masterly applied an interesting method of comprehensive coverage: they highlight, against the background of the historical events of the epoch, the major economic and social problems, the philosophical views and ideological clashes involved in the development and struggle of the proletariat.

The first volume covers a particularly long historical period. This is understandable, for to trace the emergence of the proletariat as an independent social force distinct from the other unpropertied classes entails dealing not only with the 'infancy of contemporary bourgeois society,' as Marx called it, but also with the decay of feudalism. It is this period, from the disintegration of feudalism to the 1860s that the first volume examines.

The main subjects of research are: the proto-proletariat, the proletariat of early manufature, the factory proletariat, and the embryo of the modern working class — a product of the industrial revolution.

The first part of the volume deals mostly with the period when the proletariat was only being formed into a class. It was still incapable of independent political action and, as a result, often had to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for its class enemy — the bourgeoisie. We are presented with, so to speak, the childhood of the working-class movement. But it was the childhood of a giant. As it matured, the working class began to dissociate itself, in the social, political and ideological respect, from the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and from the lumpen-proletariat, on the other. As early as the June 1848 uprising in Paris, it came out with its own slogans, mortally frightening the bourgeoisie, which hastened to betray the revolution and helped to down it in blood. The second volume will tell us how the working class rose to its full stature in the days of the Paris Commune, when the first proletarian revolution established the first government of proletarian dictatorship in history.

In the volume under review we often come across the word 'first:' the appearance of the *first* workers' association (mid-18th century) and the *first* organized stoppage of work in machine-using industry in England (1758). And also the *first* rigorous anti-labor law, the *first* ban on trade unions and strikes in France (1791) and England (1799-1800); the *first* cyclical crisis of capitalism (1825); the *first* appearance of the concepts of 'socialism' and 'communism' in the political vocabulary; the *first* red banner raised over workers' barricades; the establishment of the Communist League and the *first* anti-communist trials.

Since Europe was the cradle of capitalism and since it was there that the working-class and socialist movement made its first steps, the events on that continent occupy much space in the book. But because it deals with the history of the working-class movement in the whole world, it pays due attention to the United States, Latin America,

Australia and some countries of Asia. As we come nearer to modern times, we shall meet, in subsequent volumes, with the young proletariat of Africa, which began to form into a class much later, but which is making swift progress along this path in a number of countries.

It is to the credit of the book under review that it does not try to erase the differences existing between individual countries and regions. On the other hand, analysis of the methods of the proletarian struggle in the 1840s brings the authors to this important conclusion: 'Class conflicts between the workers and the bourgeoisie in various countries manifest certain common features' (p, 303).

Forming an integral part of the first volume are the chapters on the history of the spiritual and ideological development of the proletariat, of how it elaborated its class ideals and the methods for implementing them.

The second part of the volume, headed 'Scientific Communism and the Working-Class Movement,' is devoted to the history of the rise and consolidation of Marxism, and to the emergence of the revolutionary party of the proletariat. The chapters elucidating the theoretical and revolutionary-organizational activity of Marx and Engels alternate with those illuminating the role of the working class in the European revolutions of 1848-49. The generalization, by the founders of Marxism, of the experience of these revolutions contributed to the development of the theory of scientific communism. The formation of the First International and the struggle conducted by Marx and Engels to establish the principles of proletarian internationalism in the working-class movement, which was experiencing a fresh upswing at the time, were a historic landmark.

'Scientific socialism,' the book says, 'is the acme of centuries of human culture. . . . Marxism gave the working class an important instrument for understanding reality' (p. 645).

Two features of the book under review are highly significant. First, the authors' desire to explain historical facts from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. For example, the historical account of the factory proletariat's strike movement is accompanied by a comprehensive theoretical commentary about Marxist-Leninist views on strikes, their potentialities and their place in the arsenal of the proletariat's class struggle (see p. 210). The book includes a chapter on a burning issue, namely, the ideological battle over the proletariat's historical role — a controversy that began in the days of Marx and Engels and continues in our days.

The second feature is the extensive use of the latest data provided by historical science in the Soviet Union and abroad. Among the reference works used in preparing the first volume, more than 310

were published in the last 20-25 years (including some 120 by Soviet and over 190 by foreign authors). These figures speak for themselves.

The book is of great political and scientific interest to the reading public both in the Soviet Union and abroad.

L. Din

U.S. PROFESSOR VS. ACADEMICIAN SAKHAROV

The democratic journal *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, put out in Cologne, has published an open letter written by the American economist Hans Apel to Andrei Sakharov.[1] Professor Apel, who for a long time taught at the University of Bridgeport in the USA, has for more than 10 years carried on comparative studies on socio-economic development in socialist and capitalist states. From 1962 on, he made a number of trips to the European socialist countries (German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria), and recently continued his research work in the Soviet Union. On his return he read in *Der Spiegel* extracts from Andrei Sakharov's book *My Country and I*, printed in West Germany (in other capitalist countries it is known as *My Country and the World*).

The gloomy picture of life in the Soviet Union as presented by Sakharov contrasted sharply with Apel's findings resulting from many years of research and with what he had seen for himself. In an open letter entitled 'Twenty Questions to Andrei Sakharov,' he warned the addressee that his writing would be used in the West 'for the cheapest anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda,' that 'can only multiply the worst prejudices' of readers of the bourgeois press, who for decades had been told of the Soviet Union being 'backward' and in 'dire straits.'

Apel's careful study of the data used by Sakharov to compare living standards in the Soviet Union and in capitalist countries led him to the conclusion that 'all of them without exception are either false or unproved.'

'How can you substantiate your emphatic assertion,' Prof. Apel asks A. Sakharov, 'that Soviet living standards have been rising "too slowly"? As a matter of fact, the tremendous lag in the living standard of the mass of the Russian people in 1913 was significantly reduced despite the ruins caused by the Civil War following the revolution and by the two world wars. Does this not mean that in the periods of peaceful construction living standards in the USSR rose at a far higher rate than in, say, the USA, which experienced neither re-

volutionary upheavals nor war destruction?' He cites concrete examples showing that between 1960 and 1973 the real wages of the Soviet industrial worker rose by approximately 60 per cent, while the wage increase of American workers in the same category, considering inflation, was several times lower.

Apel describes as 'totally groundless' the data Sakharov uses in comparing the wages of Soviet and American working people. Sakharov, he says, has understated real wages in the Soviet Union by no less than 38 per cent, and overstated American wages by more than 12 per cent.[2] He totally disregards, among other things, the high taxes American workers have to pay and the fact that, the enormous salaries of corporate managers, many of whom 'earn' several hundred times more than the 'average American,' are also included in the average wage in the USA.

Apel further notes that the American workers must pay for many things which in the Soviet Union are granted by the state or the enterprise free of charge. This applies, first and foremost, to medical care and education. Apart from this, the Soviet state subsidizes two-thirds of the actual cost of housing and allocates funds to keep the prices of nearly all types of social services low. Employees at Soviet enterprises buy their meals at considerably reduced prices; many of them pay minimal prices for accommodation in holiday homes and sanatoria. Enterprises also contribute large sums for the maintenance of nurseries and kindergartens, paid maternity leave, etc.

The yardstick of living standards, Apel explains, is the size of the family income rather than individual earnings. And this income depends largely on the extent to which women are drawn into production. In this connection Apel rebukes Sakharov for his advocacy of the 'traditional role of woman as mother and housewife who should have no professional interests of her own.' Nowadays, he notes, this view is rejected everywhere as reactionary and incompatible with the aspiration of women for genuine equality. Unlike Sakharov, Apel expresses a high opinion of the status of women in Soviet society. The broad participation of Soviet women in labor activities, being a key factor promoting their equality with men, naturally has a positive effect on living standards in the USSR.

According to Apel's calculations, the average real income per member of a Soviet family is 67 per cent of the American level, and this percentage shows public prosperity in the USSR to be quite different from the picture Sakharov has presented.

Apel wonders at Sakharov's assertion that U.S. citizens officially registered as poor receive state benefits which 'the Soviet citizen can only dream of.' 'I do not know of anything that could confirm this

contention,' he says. True, the 'food program' centrally financed by Washington helps many of those whose incomes are so low that after paying their rent and electricity bills, the doctor's or other fees, they have no money left for food toward the end of the month. But a large percentage of the poorest do not get this help: they cannot afford even to buy food coupons.

As to other allowances for the needy, they differ in various cities and states, but as a rule cannot provide even a minimum income. In 1973, 25 million Americans, or every eighth, were officially classified as poor. But only about half of them received some kind of allowance. Hence Apel concludes that the number of destitute people in the United States runs to many millions, and in all probability doubled in the crisis year of 1974. 'I believe,' he writes, 'that it is the American poor who can only dream of some of the major benefits to which even the poorest Soviet citizen is entitled: job opportunities, free medical care, a truly comprehensive system of social security, and a high level of occupational training.'

Point by point, Apel refutes Sakharov's allegations that the working people are in a worse position in the USSR than in highly developed capitalist countries. Sakharov writes, for instance, that in the USSR 'annual leave is very short — two weeks for most people,' and that the time of leave is 'fixed by the management.' But in what countries, Apel asks, do the majority of employees get longer paid leave and can take it at any time they choose?

The American economist knows no such countries. And since there are no conclusive statistics on this issue, he wonders what comparative data Sakharov could use to back up his conclusion. Apel himself has conducted research in four countries which were at a comparable level of socio-economic development before the war. Two of them — Bulgaria and Rumania — took the socialist path after the war; the other two — Greece and Turkey — remained capitalist. The average annual leave of the professor's respondents in Bulgaria and Rumania was 22 and 21 days respectively, in Greece and Turkey — 12 and 14 days. As to the Soviet citizens questioned, most of them had a month's leave, and the inhabitants of northern USSR had a 45-day leave.

The American scholar cannot agree with Sakharov's assertion that the working week in the Soviet Union is 'longer than in most Western countries.' According to statistics, he writes, the average working week in the period from 1963 to 1972 ranged between 40.1 abd 40.6 hours in the USSR, as against 39.8 to 41.4 hours in the USA, and 42 to 44.3 hours in West Germany.

He disagrees with what Sakharov says about pensioners' condition in the USSR. He points out that in the Soviet Union women can go on

pension at 55, and men at 60, whereas in the USA retirement age for both sexes is 65. Moreover, the American pensioner cannot have an additional income, otherwise a corresponding sum would be deducted from his pension, which, as a rule, is not more than one-quarter of his former income. In the Soviet Union, where the retirement age is much lower and pensioners are still able-bodied, a great many of them can maintain their incomes at the same or nearly the same level by working part of the day or part of the year. But even if he does not work, the average Soviet pensioner can lead quite a well-to-do, though modest, life owing to low rent and low prices of public services. In the USA, Apel notes, a considerable number of elderly people get no pension at all.

To Sakharov's claim that housing conditions in the USSR 'are as bad as in the past for the majority of the people, although intensive housing construction is under way in many cities,' Apel says: 'Having declined to make a concrete comparison with the situation in the West, did you pay attention at least to the fact that in most Western countries — the United States, Britain, France, Italy, Austria or Belgium — the housing conditions of the greater part of the population remain "as bad as in the past"? Did you consider the fact that in the two world wars none of these countries suffered anything like the losses in housing incurred by the Soviet Union? And the fact that housing construction in these countries has up till now not surpassed the level achieved in the 1950s — 15 flats a year per 1,000 inhabitants?'

Sakharov's point of view, Apel says, conflicts with what the majority of Soviet people think about their own housing conditions. Thirty-four per cent of the Soviet citizens interviewed by the American researcher described these conditions as 'very good,' 37 per cent as 'good,' 16 per cent as 'satisfactory,' 10 per cent as 'unsatisfactory' and only 3 per cent as 'bad.' The results of the survey he conducted in the USSR give the lie to this passage from Sakharov's writing: 'If a family receives a flat to itself, this is a happy chance that many others wait for throughout their lives.' Out of the 194 Soviet citizens interviewed, 179 (134 with and 45 without families) had flats to themselves.

But what baffled him most is this contention of the academician: 'It is not true that we have the lowest rent in the world.' By simple arithmetic Apel shows that the Soviet Union does have the lowest rent. In the West, he writes, rent takes up 20 to 25 per cent or more of the family income and amounts to less than 15 per cent in exceptional cases only; whereas in the USSR, a tenant having a flat with 36 sq. metres of living space (excluding area of kitchen, bathroom, lavatory, hall, passages, etc.) i.e., about 50 sq. metres of total housing space, pays about 10 rubles a month for rent (only living space has to be paid

for). This is roughly one-sixth or one-seventh of the amount paid in capitalist countries for a similar flat.

Sakharov presents literally all aspects of Soviet life only in dark colors. 'Drinking water is not pure,' he complains. But without any fear I drank water from the tap in the Soviet Union, Apel objects, and I found it much better than in Western countries. As to the state of the rivers, he says that he saw thousands of people bathing in the Dnieper, the Moskva River, the Volga and the Neva, but not in the Hudson or the Rhine.

Sakharov tells his readers that 'public service shops are almost non-existent' in the USSR. 'Could you specify the kind of service shops?' asks Apel, who visited different Soviet cities and saw numerous dressmaking establishments, shoemakers' shops, laundries, hairdressers' and even wig-making shops.

Apel describes as 'surprising' Sakharov's argument that in the USSR 'the level of education is low,' and 'medical service for the majority of the population is of poor quality.' Apel reminds him that in the Soviet Union there are 117 hospital beds for every 1,000 inhabitants, which exceeds the level in the USA by 50 per cent, and that in the USSR there was one doctor for every 370 persons in 1970,[3] as compared to one for every 645 and 572 in the United States and West Germany respectively. The general opinion in the West, says Apel, is that the situation in education and public health is much better in the USSR than in capitalist countries.

These are some of the remarks of a bourgeois economist on Sakharov's slanderous fabrications.

Apel's open letter was prompted not by sympathy for the socialist system or the communist ideology but by elementary objectivity. He points to the striking contrast between life in the Soviet Union and the pciture of it presented by bourgeois propaganda capitalizing on Sakharov's writings.

Apel had probably expected his letter to find a response in the 'big' press. But it was mentioned by none of the newspapers and magazines which so willingly print Sakharov's most absurd fabrications. So Apel, who now lives in Vienna, came to Bonn and called a press conference to break through the wall of silence. At the conference he rated the materials about the Soviet Union published in the leading West German newspapers and magazines as 'one-sided and misleading journalism' detrimental to détente.

But even after the press conference the major dailies and periodicals continued to maintain a dead silence over his letter. *A. Toll*

1. See *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik,* No. 2 1976, pp. 173-191.
2. For details on the growth of the Soviet people's prosperity see our next article.
3. In 1974 the USSR had one doctor for every 317 inhabitants.

facts and figures

What the five-year plan gave the Soviet citizen

The Soviet Union's Ninth Five-Year development plan (1971-75) attained its main goal: more than 80 per cent of the national income went into raising living standards; average monthly wages and salaries increased 20 per cent, and collective farmer earnings 25 per cent.

Table 1
Percentage growth of per capita real incomes

	1965	1970	1975
Percentage of 1965	100	133	165
Percentage of 1970		100	124

Social services expenditure equalled the total for the previous two five-year periods. 'Never before,' the CC Report to the 25th CPSU Congress said, 'has our country known such a comprehensive social program as the one carried out in the period under review.'

Sources of growing prosperity

In 1975, the minimum wage was raised to 70 rubles a month for persons employed in material production. There was also a wage rise for the intermediate categories, and higher salaries for doctors, teachers in all types of schools and other educational personnel. These, plus a number of other measures, meant higher earnings for more than 75 million people.

Another important factor in raising living standards under socialism is the public consumption funds. These are formed both at factory and national level, and are used to finance free education and vocational training and re-training, free medical services, pensions, student, family and other grants, free and reduced-price accommodation in sanatoria and holiday camps, kindergartens, annual paid holidays, etc.

Table 2
Grants and other benefits from public consumption funds

	1965	1970	1975
Grants and other benefits, billion rubles	41.9	63.9	about 90
Per capita, rubles	182	263	352

Among the major measures financed out of the public consumption funds in 1971-1975, mention should be made of higher old-age pensions for workers, collective farmers and other categories, also invalids and families who have lost their breadwinner, additional benefits for invalids of the Great Patriotic War and families of men killed in the war. A number of other grants and benefits introduced in the course of the ninth five-year plan are designed to improve the conditions of unmarried mothers and low-income families. Grants to students, trainees or special, technical and vocational schools have likewise been increased.

All told these measures benefited about 40 million people.

Table 3
Growth of average monthly wages and salaries (rubles)

	1965	1970	1975
Average cash wages	96	122	146
Grants and other benefits from public consumption funds (exclusive of annual paid holidays) — average per person employed	33	42	52
Average wage, including grants and other benefits from public consumption funds	129	164	198

Wages rose at a faster pace in industry, which accounts for the biggest population group. See Table 4.

Considering that usually there is more than one wage earner in the family, average wages per family, including grants and benefits from public consumption funds, amounted to 356 rubles in 1975. The proportion of the population with an income of 100 rubles and more per family member increased 8.5-fold compared with 1965.

The CPSU and the Soviet government attach special importance to keeping prices of basic foods and consumer goods stable as a means of raising living standards. See Table 5.

Table 4
Average wages of industrial workers (rubles)

	1965	1970	1975
Average cash wages	102	131	161
Grants and other benefits from public consumption funds (exclusive of annual paid holidays) — average per person employed	37	48	59
Average wage, including grants and other benefits from public consumption funds	139	179	220

Table 5
State retail consumer goods prices (1970 = 100)

	1970	1975
All goods	100	99.6
Foods	100	100.9
meat and poultry	100	100
butter	100	100
vegetable oil	100	100
sugar	100	100
bread and bakery products	100	100
vegetables	100	102
Consumer goods	100	98
cotton fabrics	100	100
woollen fabrics	100	100
clothing	100	98
knit goods	100	98
footwear	100	100
cigarettes and tobacco	100	100

Real per capita incomes in the USSR double approximately every 15 years, so that there are qualitative changes in the living standard of each new generation.

Living standards and way of life

The social program formulated at the 24th CPSU Congress and carried out in the ninth five-year plan signified an important step toward the new way of life, particularly in the more balanced structure of material and cultural requirements and also in the socialist way of their satisfaction.

There is no unemployment in the USSR. This is coupled with a steady increase in the workforce, as follows: 1965 — 76.9 million, 1970 — 90.2 million and 1975 — 102 million.

Higher incomes made for a higher demand for goods and services. Retail trade over the past five years increased 36 per cent, with steep increases in sales of meat and meat products, eggs and other staple foods. Thus, per capita meat consumption in 1975 was nearly 21 per cent, and eggs 35 per cent, up on 1970.

More consumer durables — furniture, TV sets, radio sets, refrigerators, washing machines, etc. — are being produced to meet the growing demand. Now there are 45 per cent more TV sets per 100 families, nearly twice as many refrigerators, 25 per cent more washing machines and 58 per cent more vacuum cleaners than five years ago.

The ninth five-year plan was the fourth to carry out an intensive housing program, with most of the new housing built by the state. Over 11 million new flats and single-family cottages, with a total floor space of 544 million sq. metres, were built in 1971-75. This has meant better living conditions for 56 million people, and also that in the main housing can now be allotted on the principle of a separate flat to each family. All in all, over 2 billion sq. metres of housing were built in the past 20 years, a figure unmatched in any other country.

A characteristic feature of the socialist way of life is in the low proportion of the family income that goes into rent, upkeep of private housing and taxes, which have remained virtually unchanged over the past 10 years. The following figures are typical of a working-class family budget: rent, maintenance amounted to 2.5 per cent in 1965, the same in 1970 and 2.6 per cent in 1974, with the respective figures for heating 0.4, 0.3 and 0.2 per cent.

Conditions are changing in rural areas, too, with 99 per cent of all houses now having electricity and many thousands of rural communities also gas. Television, radio sets, refrigerators, motorcycles and automobiles are increasingly becoming part of rural life.

Bigger expenditure on improving working conditions, education, public health and environmental protection are all components of the social program carried out over the past five years.

The transition to universal secondary education has been virtually completed: in 1975, over 96 per cent of all 8-year school leavers went on to the 10-year school. In 1974 state expenditure per student

amounted to 153 rubles in general schools, 617 rubles in specialized secondary schools and 977 rubles in higher educational establishments.

In 1974 accommodation per child in day nurseries cost 503 rubles and 454 rubles in kindergartens, with the state defraying about 80 per cent.

Constantly rising cultural requirements matched by rising opportunities for their satisfaction is still another characteristic of the socialist way of life. The USSR holds top place in the world in the number of readers of newspapers, magazines, and books, size of theatre and cinema audiences, etc.

In 1971-75 the USSR printed 8 billion books and pamphlets, an increase of 1.4 billion over the preceding five-year period. Book sales for the five years amounted to 2.8 billion rubles, or 800 million rubles more than in the previous five-year period.

Behind the facade of the 'welfare state'

The present capitalist crisis has markedly slowed down improvement of the worker's living standard, and in some cases has even depressed it. Today even the more zealous defenders of monopoly do not venture to claim that capitalism has given way to the 'welfare state.' For capitalist reality is such that the working people are meeting with mounting dificulties.

This concerns, above all, one of man's most vital rights, the right to work. Unemployment in the leading capitalist countries now stands at more tha 15 million; in Western Europe it is as high as 4-5 per cent, and nearly 8 per cent in the United States.

The tendency in the leading capitalist countries is toward a decline in real wages. Thus, total real incomes in the seven main capitalist countries (USA, Japan, FRG, Britain, France, Italy and Canada) decreased by an average of 1.3 per cent in 1974-75, and considerably more in some industries. In the U.S., real wages in the manufacturing industries registered a 9.7 per cent drop in 1974-75, and in Britain the decline was 7.5 per cent (December 1974 — August 1975).

The relative worsening of the workers' position stands out glaringly in any comparison between wages and monopoly profits. In the FRG, net profits of 100 leading companies rose by 28 per cent in 1973, while net wages and salaries rose by 7.9 per cent, and real wages by only 1.1 per cent.

Prices continue to soar in all capitalist countries, and this means higher living costs. In 1963-72 higher prices swallowed up 70 per cent of the rise in nominal wages in Britain, 68 per cent in France, 67 in Italy, 60 in the USA, and 53 in Japan. Living costs in these countries rose by an average of 56.3 per cent in 1971-75, and by an

average of 25.4 per cent in 1974-75, including an 11.2 per cent rise in 1975.

In the past few years price rises have been especially steep in consumer goods. In 1974-75, in the seven leading capitalist countries food was up by an average of 33 per cent, with these figures for individual countries: FRG 10 per cent, USA 24, France 26, and Britain 45. The U.S. consumer price index registered a 9.1 per cent increase last year, and the Department of Commerce forecast for 1976 promises another 6.5 per cent rise.

Taxes are still another burden on the worker: in 1975, they increased by 34 per cent in Britain, 27 in Italy and 12.5 in France.

The economic crisis has also cut into housing construction, in a number of capitalist countries, though there is a housing shortage in all these countries. Again the figures: housing starts in the U.S. dropped by 34.3 per cent in mid 1975 compared with 1973, and by 25 per cent in the FRG. Rent in leading capitalist countries is higher, too, having risen by as much as 33 per cent in 1974-75. For instance, in the USA it increased 22 per cent, coal and heating oil 70 per cent, and electricity and gas 32 per cent.

Medical care is more expensive. Recent years have seen higher doctors' fees, higher cost hospital accommodation, medicine, etc. The cost of medical care in the seven leading capitalist countries increased 27 per cent in 1974-75; the U.S. figure is 21 per cent.

In comparing soical and economic development in the two opposing world systems, people in the capitalist countries are coming to appreciate the fundamental advantages of socialism which assure every person material well-being, access to education and culture, the free and all-round development of the personality.

Migrant workers in capitalist Europe

Foreign workers driven out of their countries by want — Africans collecting refuse in French cities, Turks on unskilled jobs at Volkswagen plants in West Germany. Italians earning a living in Switzerland as seasonal workers, Spaniards mining coal in Belgian pits — are all doomed to poverty abroad as well as at home. In the more developed capitalist countries where they go in search of a living they are offered only the meanest and lowest-paid jobs. Many newspapers point out this fact, rightly describing foreign workers as the 'stokers of Western Europe.'

The total number of foreign workers employed in Western Europe after the end of the Second World War is estimated to have been 30 million (*Der Spiegel*, No. 34, 1975, p. 55). Toward the end of 1974 there were about 11 million (*Dagens Nyheter*, December 1, 1974). There was slight decrease by mid 1975, but the proportion of foreigners in the total workforce is still great, as shown in the following table (*Der Spiegel*, No. 34, 1975, p. 55).

	Work force (millions)	Foreign workers (thousands)	Percentage of foreign workers
FRG	26.5	2,500	9.4
France	21.4	1,930	9.0
Britain	25.1	1,835	7.3
Switzerland	3.1	861	28.2
Belgium	3.9	265	6.8
Austria	2.9	236	7.9
Sweden	3.9	222	5.7
Netherlands	4.7	160	3.4

The contemporary 'migration of peoples' is due to growing imbalances in the capitalist world economy, which also gives rise to discrepancies between demand and supply on the national labor market. On the other hand, and more important still, active behind the flow of vast numbers of workers from various countries is unmistakably, the 'guiding hand' of big business, the major monopolies. By massive imports of foreign manpower monopoly capital seeks opportunities to exploit cheap labor and, on the other hand, to step up competition on the labor market by opposing local and migrant workers, create added opportunities for holding down wages and ultimately weaken working-class unity.

By far most migrants in Western Europe are engaged in humdrum, unskilled, poorly paid work. Some estimates set the proportion of the unskilled among foreign workers in West Germany in recent years at 40 per cent, of the less skilled at 45 per cent and of the skilled at a mere 15 per cent. In recent years, the most laborious operations have been assigned almost exclusively to foreigners. The building industry, mining and metallurgy and auxiliary farm work account for 89 per cent of migrants in Switzerland, 72 in France and 56 in West Germany. In other industries, especially those equipped with new plant, foreigners are used only for preparatory operations. Automated in-

dustry, wrote Dominque Lahalle, a sociologist of the French National Scientific Research Center, needs more and more people merely preparing work for machines. 'But who will want to perform those monotonous and uninteresting operations tomorrow?' asks *L'Express,* adding: 'Mostly immigrants.' (April 16-22, 1973, p. 20).

Foreign workers are discriminated against in pay. In France their wages are 20 to 30 per cent lower on the average than those of French workers, and in the building industry the difference is 40 per cent *(Rabochy klass i sovremenny mir,* No. 2, 1975, p. 64). Statistics show that migrants supply the greater part of capitalist profit. The rate of industrial accidents is highest among them. In big industrial countries of Europe, the number of industrial accidents among foreign workers, including fatal cases, is twice as great on the average as among nationals.

Brutal exploitation in industry is matched by harsh living conditions. Cut off from their families, migrants live in shanty towns and the slum neighborhoods of industrial cities. Numerous foreign workers are cooped up in crude hostels lacking elementary facilities, in incredibly crowded quarters and unsanitary conditions. Often one hostel room is occupied by eight people working in three shifts. A. Vieuguet, Secretary of the French Communist Party, estimates that in the case of foreign workers in France, the lack of proper housing is three times as great as in the case of French workers (A. Vieuguet, *Francais et immigrés*. Paris, Editions Socialies, 1975, p. 30).

With the crisis still on, foreign workers are becoming a burden for monopolies and states and are summarily dismissed and sent out of the country. Between September 1973 to March 1975, their number diminished by 500,000, according to *Frankfurter Allgemeine* (January 6, 1976, p. 9).

The crisis was seized on as a signal to adopt a series of discriminatory measures aimed at reducing the number of foreign workers, such as limiting work contracts to one year, barring migrants' families from the host country, curbs on social rights, a constant threat of deportation, difficulties in receiving an education or improving one's skills.

Monopolies take advantage of government restrictions of migrants' rights to step up exploitation. Much as the economic situation in industrial countries of Western Europe is deteriorating, it is even worse in countries where the migrants come from This is why many of the deported return clandestinely to the countries where they had looked for jobs. Unlike their officially recruited compatriots, most of them have neither permission to work, nor a residence permit. Fearing exposure, they place their trust in go-betweens, to whom trade in 'living merchandise' is a highly profitable business. In West Germany's extractive industries alone, 400 such 'businessmen' have been

exposed in the past four years. Their annual dealings totalled 10 million marks (*Der Spiegel*, No. 23, 1975, p. 45).

Illegal migrants are more brutally exploited. Employers save by paying them less and refusing to spend money on social insurance or to pay established taxes. The massive import of illegal migrants would have been impossible had it not been profitable to both the employers concerned and the frontier and immigration officials connected with them.

Migrant workers have lately been intensifying the fight for their rights. It is backed by the trade union movement, and Communists are the staunchest defenders of their interests. There is a growing conviction in the working-class movement that the migrants' demands can be met only if all that isolates migrants from their class brothers is removed. Foreign workers have common interests with other workers in the struggle against monopoly capital, their common enemy.

M. Schneider

Notes on international organizations

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION

The development of the mass women's movement after the Second World War has been inseparably linked with the activity of the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF), founded in December 1945 at the International Women's Congress in Paris by representatives of the national organizations of 41 countries. By 1975 its membership included organizations of 106 countries.

The principal aims of the WIDF are the struggle for women's equality, protection of the rights of mother and child, and defense of the right of all children to life, welfare and education. The Federation unites women regardless of nationality, social standing, political, ideological or religious views. It takes an active part in the movement for peace, national independence and democratic freedoms.

The WIDF leading bodies are the Congress, and in the interim between congresses, the Council and Bureau. The day-to-day leadership is exercised by the Secretariat composed of the General Secretary, secretaries and the Treasurer with headquarters in Berlin. The WIDF has consultative status at the UN Economic and Social Council and UNESCO.

Throughout the 30 years of its existence the Federation has been fighting against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism. On its initiative an international committee of solidarity with the people of Vietnam was established in 1964. The Federation actively campaigns against Israel's aggressive policy in the Middle East, against repressions in Spain, the atrocities of the fascist junta in Chile, against reactionary attempts to block détente and whip up anti-communism.

The WIDF was a co-sponsor of International Women's Year in 1975 under the motto: Equality — Development —Peace! The World Congress held in Berlin on the occasion of International Women's Year was an important event in 1975. In addition to the WIDF, dozens of other international associations and groups took part in convening this forum, attended by 2,000 delegates, observers and guests from 140 countries. Seven hundred of them delivered reports and speeches stressing the close connection of the struggle for women's equality with the fight for progress, peace, détente, international security and disarmament. It was proposed at the congress to launch a worldwide campaign to wipe out illiteracy. The WIDF has actively joined this campaign, coordinating its activities with other public organizations, as well as with specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The WIDF's Seventh Congress (Berlin 1975) adopted an extensive program of the Federation's activity for the next five years. Its main aim is to impart still greater scope and effectiveness to the worldwide democratic women's movement. The Federation renders every support to the strengthening of national organizations. Centers for coordinating WIDF activities in different regions and courses to train cadres for the women's movement will be established in a number of countries.

The Federation strives to take a deeper approach to the problems of the women's movement. This is evidenced, among other things, by the subjects of the international conferences and seminars planned by it: the specific condition of women in the rural areas of Asia; the influence of the policy of multinational monopolies on the condition of the Latin American family; the problem of enlisting women into the development process in African countries; the scientific and technological revolution and the conditions of women's work in industrially developed capitalist countries; the position of immigrant women workers and their families; the education of children and youth in the spirit of international solidarity and understanding among peoples.

The fight for peace and disarmament is a matter of special attention. The WIDF has called on all women's organizations to organize a

broad campaign to collect signatures to the 1975 Stockholm Appeal, and for the earliest convocation of a world disarmament conference.

The implementation of the plan of actions will contribute to the further progress of the women's movement. The WIDF's contribution to the struggle for peace, national independence and social progress will become still more weighty and effective.

Fanny Edelman
General Secretary, WIDF

THE WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS

Last October the World Federation of Trade Unions celebrated its 30th anniversary. Its founding in 1945 culminated the process, begun in 1941, of concerted trade union efforts in the war against nazi Germany. The war was not yet over when, In February 1945, trade union representatives from 36 countries gathered in London and decided to establish the World Federation of Trade Unions. Its inaugural congress in Paris, nine months later, was attended by representatives of 64 million trade unionists in 56 countries.

The founding of the WFTU gave organizational expression to the united labor action forged in the common fight against nazism. Workers in all countries needed a trade union organization capable of acting on their behalf and effectively upholding their common interests in world affairs.

The situation at the close of the war largely determined the concept and character of the WFTU and the main directions of its activity.

From the very outset, ours has been a unitarian federation, that is, open to all trade unions irrespective of ideology, religion, social and economic system. WFTU affiliates act in concert in order to be stronger and more effectively uphold the common interests of the workers, in accordance with its program and jointly worked out forms of organization and activity.

The WFTU is a fully sovereign democratic organization whose policy is formulated at its congresses by democratic procedures, with each affiliate having an equal share in decision-making. More, WFTU congresses and the international conferences, seminars and colloquia it sponsors are open to non-affiliated unions. This is a characteristic feature of our Federation and its trade union internationals. For instance, the last General Council meeting, in October, was attended by representatives of 30 non-affiliated organizations.

The WFTU considers itself a mass and class organization opposed to the policy and practice of class conciliation. Its main task is to fight for the economic demands of the workers and for social progress. Its

ultimate aim is a world order free of social injustice and all forms of exploitation.

The basic aims adopted at the inaugural congress 30 years ago are: durable and stable peace; extirpation of fascism; satisfaction of labor's economic and social demands; an end to the colonial system; an end to economic backwardness in developing countries and to their exploitation in inter-government agenices, and closer trade union unity.

The 30-year WFTU record has been one of steady and persevering struggle to achieve these aims, which have been supplemented at more recent congresses to adapt to the rapidly moving international situation.

True to its unitarian principles, the WFTU did not slide into a sectarian position following the 1949 split of the trade union movement. On the contrary, its open and democratic policy has always been premised on the belief that the split can and should be healed. Accordingly, worldwide trade union unity has been an important goal in all our activities.

The world has changed considerably over the past 30 years. The class struggle in capitalist countries has grown in strength and scope and has reached a new qualitative level both in terms of organization and goals. The class conciliation policy is receding as labor struggles acquire a deeper class content. Trade union unity is proceeding apace, for the workers are coming to see that the most effective way to win their basic demands is through the united effort of the trade unions.

In this situation the tasks of the WFTU can be briefly listed as follows:

— to promote the struggle against the causes and consequences of the crisis in the capitalist world;

— energetic and sustained effort to support the workers and peoples fighting for complete political and economic independence, for closer international economic cooperation;

— to promote expansion of détente, combat imperialist maneuvers to impede its progress, and make the Helsinki principles part of international practice;

— strengthen the militant solidarity of the working people to achieve these aims;

— expand and consolidate united action of the working class and its trade unions.

Our efforts to further the workers' interests and trade union unity are bearing fruit: the Federation now represents about 160 million workers in 68 countries, and maintains contact and cooperates with

numerous union organizations of diverse persuasion. Its influence and prestige in the trade union movement are steadily growing.

Enrique Pastorino
President, WFTU

A BREAK WITH THE MAOIST PAST

A revolutionary organization of the working class cannot be built on the basis of 'Maoism,' an expression of petty-bourgeois ideology exploited by imperialism to split the progressive, democratic and revolutionary movements. Maoism bears direct responsibility for splitting the communist and working-class movement in many countries including Peru. This was stated at a press conference in Lima by a representative of the so-called Communist (Marxist-Leninist) Party of Peru — a group which in the mid-1960s broke away from the Peruvian Communist Party as a result of the divisive activity of the Maoists.

This group held its congress on January 17-18, 1976, at which the report of its central committee was discussed. It concluded that Peking is conducting divisive activities in the international working-class and communist movement and pursuing a dangerous adventurist course.

We are convinced, the representative of the group emphasized, that the Peking leaders tried to use us to pursue their narrow nationalistic and great-power aims, against the genuine interests of the Peruvian working people. The Mao Tse-tung clique, he said, has resorted to open confrontation with the socialist countries, the world communist and national-liberation movement. The congress documents emphasize Peking's anti-Sovietism, noting that it clashes with the attitude of the overwhelming majority of the peoples, the working people in the first place, toward the homeland of the Great October Revolution.

The primary aim of Peking's foreign policy today is to thwart positive world developments, détente and the world revolutionary process. This is proved by the Maoists' actions in Latin America, where the groups under their control virtually make common cause with the counter-revolutionary forces.

The representative of the so-called Communist (Marxist-Leninist) Party of Peru declared on behalf of its leadership that other parties, all revolutionaries should learn from the errors and sad experience of this group and 'not swallow the Maoist bait.'

The congress unanimously approved a 'declaration' stating that

there is no political, historic or ideological justification for the existence of the Communist (Marxist-Leninist) Party of Peru and adopted a decision on its self-dissolution. The members of the dissolved party are advised to joint the ranks of the genuine Marxist-Leninist party — the Peruvian Communist Party.

POLITICAL POSTERS AND VISUAL PROPAGANDA OF THE CPUSA

In its ideological activities the Communist Party of the United States of America makes use of various kinds of visual information methods. These include posters and placards which illustrate Party positions on topical issues and which notify the public of Party events and also of events sponsored by democratic and progressive movements in which the Party participates. Posters and placards are also used in mass meetings and marches to demonstrate Party participation and underscore the issues and demands which the Party considers significant. Experience has proved their usefulness in projecting the Party's ideas and in building the Party press. They are an important tool for mobilizing and organizing popular support of Party campaigns.

The press of the CPUSA has always made use of the work of artists. The *Daily Worker* and its weekend edition, *The Worker*, regularly exhibited political art and cartoons of some of the most gifted progressive artists in this field — Clive Ward, Art Young, William Gropper, Robert Minor and Fred Ellis, Hugo Gallert, Anton Refregier and Tecla. This tradition is continued today by the *Daily World*, *World Magazine* and the *People's World*, which regularly feature work by Oliver Harrington, Bill Andrews, Pele DeLappe, Seymour Joseph and others.

Their work portrays the Party's emphasis on the struggle against the monopolies and the aggressive tendency of U.S. imperialism, against the ever-growing military expenditures and their effect on the poeple's living conditions, and against the racist oppression of Afro-Americans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, native American Indians and Asian-Americans.

John Pittman

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, Perú.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracàs, 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.