WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

July 1976, Vol. 19, No. 7 75¢

Mexico / 40

GDR—Ninth Party Congress / 13

The Soviet Union and the modern world / 3

The burden of the Bicentennial / 71

Bonn Congress German CP / 23

Middle East / 100

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

July 1976, Vol. 19, No. 7

Features

3 The Soviet Union and the modern world
F. Muhri

13 New stage in the development of the GDR
W. Lamberz

23 The people need socialism
H. Gautier

33 Confidence in the present, orientation on the future
D. Stanishev

Party experience

40 The freedom Mexico needs
J. Perez

46 Vanguard role in the mass movement
A. Vieuguet

55 The Party of the people in the battle for socialism
M. Rossi

63 'For your freedom and ours'
L. Argenti

68 History repeats itself
L. Vasilyev

Viewpoints

71 The burden of the Bicentennial
H. Winston

79 The peace front in Asia
B. Lhamsuren

84 The developing countries and disarmament
N. Ashhab

89 Program of courageous emergency measures
D. Konstantinou

94 Venezuela: problems unsolved by nationalization
J. Carrera

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

100 The crux of the Middle East crisis
F. Kaddoumi, A. Maizar

104 The racist-Zionist alliance
Z. Karkabi

Comment

107 What causes inflation?
S. Nikitin, S. Pronin

114 Class alliances and the strategy of change
A. Kohen

The press

123 In the name of peace and communism
I. Vorozheikin

126 New strategy of development
S. Wronski

130 Nine brave days
I. Cox

132 Loyalty to revolutionary ideals
A.K.

134 U.S. farm workers against the monopolies
V. Zvyagin

136 New books

Facts and figures

140 The proletariat in developing countries

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.

The Soviet Union and the modern world

Franz Muhri
Chairman, CP of Austria

World developments in the 20th century, particularly in the period after the Second World War, represent a highly complex and contradictory process of the interaction, confrontation, clashing and intertwining of differing socio-political forces, movements and classes. Its main trend, however, has been determined completely and finally, and that is the constant growth of the role and influence of the socialist countries, first and foremost of the Soviet Union. The socialist coummunity is the decisive factor in international development.

I was fortunate to have attended the 25th CPSU Congress. The all-encompassing report based on deep scientific analysis delivered by General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, the speeches made by the delegates and foreign guests and the Congress documents fully reflect the historic significance of the socialist world for the future of humanity and particularly of the Land of the Great October Socialist Revolution. For nearly 60 years now the winds of October have been moving history forward, reaching to the most remote corners of the world.

It is no exaggeration to say that the first socialist country has given the world an example of a qualitatively new type of social development and international policy, convincingly demonstrating the advantages of socialism over capitalism and, consequently, becoming the pioneer of mankind's social progress.

And it is precisely in this that we Austrian Communists see the source of the uninterrupted growth of the international significance and role of the Soviet Union, the magnetic force of its example, the foundation of its growing prestige in the eyes of millions of people the world over.

The close connection between world progress and the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policies was apparent from the very first days of its existence. As the Soviet Union's social system and might grew, this connection became increasingly more effective and manifold, and today it stands out in greater clarity than ever before. This natural development can be seen throughout its entire history.

The victory of the 1917 October Revolution and the Decree on Peace hastened the end of the First World War. The socialist revolution in Russia was a lodestar for the international workers' movement and led to a strong upsurge in the revolutionary struggle of many countries. Its influence was one of the factors that helped the working people in several countries gain important social, political and democratic reforms. In Austria, for example, at the end of the First World War, the workers won the eight-hour day, the monarchy was replaced by a bourgeois democratic republic and the Austrian bourgeoisie, fearing a socialist revolution, agreed to several socio-political concessions.

It is no secret that both events in Russia and the world after the victory of the socialist revolution did not follow the direction forecast by the opponents of socialism who were blinded by their class hatred. They believed that the Soviet regime was to be a short-lived episode lasting no more than a few days, at most a few weeks. However, when this did not happen they started fanning the flames of a civil war and organizing a military intervention against the Soviet Republic. In spite of their superiority in military equipment, the internal counter-revolution and imperialist intervention forces were defeated. The young Soviet regime won the civil war because it was supported by the workers and peasants at home and enjoyed international working-class solidarity. At that time it was already obvious that there could be no 'takeover of power' or 'dictatorship by a minority.' The socialist revolution was a people's revolution in the direct and full sense of the word.

The enemies of socialism then staked on the Soviet Republic's inability to cope with the economic difficulties and problems that had gradually accumulated during the war years. However, notwithstanding the imperialist economic blockade, the Soviet people were able in a historically short period of time to restore their war-ravaged economy, carry out the early five-year plans and lay the foundations of a socialist industry. At a time when the capitalist world was experiencing a devastating crisis, the economy of the Soviet Union was steadily progressing, demonstrating to the world the advantages of planned socialist economy.

This should have been a good lesson to the anti-communists. But today, just as in those years, they continue unsuccessfully to predict a crisis of the socialist economic and social system. Developments, however, shatter all their 'forecasts,' proving that those blinded by anti-communism are blinded also to historical realities.

Then the Soviet Union was attacked by German facism and other imperialist forces. Hitler, the Italian and Japanese imperialists regarded the Soviet Union as a 'colossus on clay feet' which would

crumble under the pressure of their armies. And in Britain, France and the United States there were certain influential groups bent on avoiding a direct confrontation with nazi Germany and directing the fascist aggression against the East. The heroism of the Soviet Armed Forces, effective use by Soviet foreign policy of the contradictions between the imperialist powers, the danger of fascist enslavement facing the peoples, the mighty upsurge of anti-fascist sentiments the world over, of the resistance movement in occupied and nazi-dominated countries, all this helped build up a strong anti-Hitler coalition. The historical truth, however, is that for all the significance of the contribution of the other members of the anti-Hitler coalition, it was the Soviet Union that bore the main burden of the war against German fascism and played the decisive role in liberating the peoples of Europe from fascism and this includes the Austrian people also. This feat has no historical precedent.

Humanity will never forget what this victory over fascism cost the Soviet people: the Soviet Union lost a total of over 20 million people, many of them belonging to the most active section of the population; the nazis killed six million civilians, destroyed hundreds of towns, more than 70,000 villages and some 32,000 industrial enterprises. But the vitality of the socialist system, the Soviet people's unshakable faith in the communist ideals, enabled the USSR to overcome the dire consequences of the war in a remarkably short time and achieve new and impressive heights in all fields of endeavor.

Soviet society became still stronger as a result of the victory in the Great Patriotic War. The Soviet Union's international prestige rose to a qualitatively new level. The USSR became a great socialist power and today there is not a single international issue which can be resolved without its participation.

There have been radical changes in the world balance of class and political forces in the postwar years. Outstanding among these are the emergence and growth of the socialist world system, the upsurge of the national-liberation movement and the mounting activity of the forces of socialism, democracy and peace in the developed capitalist countries. Existing socialism is the most powerful international support of the world's revolutionary forces. The 1969 Moscow International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties justly pointed out that the defense of socialism is an internationalist duty of Communists.

It should be stressed that the steady growth of the Soviet Union's economic, political and defense potentials, its peace policy were decisive in bringing about the failure of the cold war policy, in diminishing the danger of a new world war, in the transition to a

relaxation of tensions and in the growing affirmation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations.

The main trends of the Soviet Union's peace policy are expressed in the Peace Program approved by the 24th CPSU Congress and supported by the socialist community, the Communist and Workers' parties and all forces of peace and progress. Today, it is only the inveterate opponents of peace and progress who deny the fact that major changes have been achieved on the international scene, thanks to this policy in spite of resistance by the forces of imperialism and reaction.

The heroic struggle of the Vietnamese and other Indochinese peoples defeated the U.S. aggressors and their local puppets. The Soviet Union from the very outset wholeheartedly supported the just struggle of the Southeast Asian nations for their freedom and social progress. This was recalled at the 25th CPSU Congress by Le Duan, First Secretary of the Working People's Party of Vietnam. The Vietnamese people's victory in the war of liberation against the U.S. aggression, he said ' . . . is inseparable from the mighty support, the all-round, great, valuable and effective aid from the Soviet Union.'

The turn toward better relations between the Soviet Union and the United States was highly instrumental in consolidating peace and security. If some politicians in the United States and other leading capitalists countries have gradually started recognizing peaceful coexistence in relations with the socialist world, this is certainly not because the essence of imperialism has changed. It is because the Soviet Union and the socialist community together with the international working class and the national-liberation movement represent such a force today that sober-minded circles in the capitalist West are beginning to realize that there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence.

The Peace Program adopted at the 24th CPSU Congress posed this task in reference to European security: '. . . to bring about a radical turn toward a détente and peace on this continent. To ensure the convocation and success of an all-European conference.' Thanks to the persistent efforts of the progressive forces, the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, these goals have been achieved. It is no accident that the greatest progress in détente has been made in Europe, for the socialist positions and influence are strongest here. The most powerful socialist bastion in Europe and the world is the Soviet Union.

Political détente is closely bound up with a broadening of economic, scientific and technical ties between the socialist countries and the West European states. Austria has greatly increased its trade, and economic, scientific and technical cooperation with the Soviet

Union and other socialist countries and this has, in turn, increased job opportunities in our country. Such economic relations built upon equality, non-interference in each other's domestic affairs and mutual benefit are an important factor in Austria's independence.

A good deal has been achieved in liquidating the remaining colonial regimes. The successes of the liberation movement can be seen in the collapse of Portuguese colonialism, the victory scored by the people of Angola against the imperialist intervention, for freedom and the right to self-determination, for social progress. Addressing the 25th CPSU Congress, member of the MPLA CC Politbureau Alves Batista, thanked the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union and Cuba, for their political, moral and material support. 'Our victory over Portuguese colonialism,' he said, 'was made possible thanks to the Soviet Union's aid.'

Attempting to slander the selfless, internationalist aid extended by the Soviet Union to nations defending their freedom and independence, the capitalist press, and this includes the Austrian press, claims this aid is prompted by 'Soviet expansionist ambitions.' In his report to the 25th CPSU Congress, General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev said the following concerning the Soviet Union's stand in relation to forces fighting for national independence, democracy and progress. 'Our Party,' he said, 'supports and will continue to support peoples fighting for their freedom. In so doing, the Soviet Union does not look for advantages, does not hunt for concessions, does not seek political domination, and is not after military bases. We act as we are bid by our revolutionary conscience, our communist convictions.'

However, it was pointed out at the 25th Congress that the danger of a new world war had not been fully liquidated and that lately the extreme right, anti-communist groups clamoring for a cold war had become more active, that the military budgets of the NATO countries were growing. These aspects of the present-day international situation are of concern to Communists, to progressive and democratic forces, to all who cherish peace and security. And that is why there was such broad response throughout the world to the Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples contained in the Central Committee report delivered at the 25th CPSU Congress by Leonid Brezhnev. This is a development of the Peace Program in line with present-day conditions.

The 25th CPSU Congress ushered in a new stage in the Soviet Union's foreign policy and its core is the struggle for the materialization of détente, first and foremost an end to the arms race and the transition to a reduction of accumulated stocks of weapons and to disarmament. The foreign policy program of the 25th CPSU Congress

likewise calls for energetic effort for the full implementation of the Final Act of the European Conference, eliminating the remaining seats of war, ensuring Asian security, working for a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, completely eliminating all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression, and all seats of colonialism and racism, and also eliminating discrimination and all artificial barriers in international trade, and all manifestations of inequality, diktat and exploitation in international economic relations.

This program benefits not only the Soviet people. We are deeply convinced that it benefits all the peoples of the world and that it fully accords with the national interests of our own people, who long for durable peace. There can be no doubt that, brought to reality, it will assure Austria a reliable peaceful future. We Austrian Communists welcome Chancellor Kreisky's appeal for continuing détente at the Socialist Party Congress in March. We are mustering public opinion to induce the Austrian government to make a bigger contribution to peace and détente, in line with its policy of active neutrality and not limp in the wake of world politics, as it did in the recent past.

The present intensified international propaganda campaign about the so-called 'Soviet menace' is obviously meant to justify the continued imperialist arms drive. The close link and direct continuity of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses' foreign policy programs is conclusive proof that the Soviet peace policy is not a transitory expedient, but follows from the very nature of socialism. For peace and socialism are an insoluble unity. The Soviet Union's role as the key international peace factor has never been greater. The stronger socialism, is, the better is the outlook for peace.

The Soviet Communists reaffirmed at their Congress that peaceful coexistence does under no circumstances imply retention of the social status quo, but presupposes the right of each people to work out its destiny without outside interference and to follow its chosen road, including the socialist road. The Party of Lenin has thus again demonstrated its international solidarity with all the currents of the world revolutionary process. But this solidarity has nothing in common with what anti-communist propaganda is so anxious to attribute to it.

The anti-communists have been harping on the allegation that the Soviet Union wants to impose socialist revolution on other peoples, though they know that the Communists have always rejected the 'export of revolution.' In his Congress report, Leonid Brezhnev stressed that 'every revolution is above all a natural result of the given society's internal development'; it cannot be injected from without, nor by a 'radical minority' from within; it must be carried out by the working people of the country concerned.

The beneficial influence of the Soviet Union and the CPSU on the world revolutionary process finds expression in a variety of forms. In present-day conditions the dominant form is the building of a new, better social system whose economic, political, cultural and moral superiority over capitalism is making itself more and more cogently felt as communist construction advances from one success to another.

The Soviet Union's impressive economic progress under the ninth five-year plan demonstrated anew the incontestible superiority of the socialist planned economy over the capitalist. Firm faith in the future is an integral feature of the Soviet way of life, whereas in the capitalist countries the picture is one of mass unemployment and inflation, which destroys the worker's confidence in his future. And implementation of the new imposing undertakings of the 10th five-year plan (1976-80) will still more vividly demonstrate and consolidate the advantages of socialism. Steady improvement of the material and cultural standards of the people is central to all the CPSU's social and economic undertakings.

The superiority of existing socialism is manifested also in the fact that the socialist social system guarantees the people incomparably more democratic rights and freedoms than does bourgeois democracy.

The 25th CPSU Congress stressed the unity of democracy and socialism: '... just as genuine democracy is impossible without socialism,' Comrade Brezhnev declared, 'so socialism is impossible without a steady development of democracy.' And this unity is not merely a theoretical principle, but a cardinal element in all the practical work of the Communist Party and Soviet state.

One of the most decisive criteria of democracy lies in Party and government policy being geared to the interests of the working class and all working people. And if we apply this criterion to Soviet life, we can say without any exaggeration that every element of the Leninist Party's home and foreign policy fully accords with the interests of the Soviet people.

Another equally important criterion of socialist democracy is active participation by the people in decision making, the provision of conditions enabling the masses to share in the administration of public and government affairs. And in this respect, too, the Soviet Union has scored remarkable achievements. It should be perfectly clear that the present dynamic development of Soviet society would have been impossible without the extension and deepening of democracy and, of course, if democracy were really impaired.

The 25th CPSU Congress worked out a concrete program for the continued development of socialist democracy. Its main aim is to give

the working people a still bigger part in the management of society, strengthen the democratic foundations of socialist statehood and provide conditions for the all-round development of the personality.

All this stands out in sharp contrast to the situation in the capitalist world, where the monopoly bourgeoisie and its placemen have been encroaching on the democratic gains of the working people. And when there is a realistic threat to their rule, they do not hesitate to engineer reactionary coups and install fascist-type regimes. To conceal that and weaken the attractive example of socialist democracy, the reactionaries have launched an anti-Soviet campaign based on the lie about the 'absence of democracy' in the USSR and the 'violation of human rights.'

The facts will show that in the USSR the main human rights are respected and guaranteed as in no capitalist country. For in the Soviet Union there is the guaranteed right to work and education, opportunities to develop one's personality in accordance with one's abilities and inclinations, the right, also, to free medical care for every citizen, equality for women, ethnic groups, etc.

Experience has shown that appreciation of socialism's superiority over capitalism does not come of itself, automatically. For bourgeois propaganda stints no effort to falsify reality in the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. Consequently, the fight against anti-Sovietism of every variety and the effort to bring to the people the truth about existing socialism are important components of the fight against monopoly domination, for the progress of the working class, for peace, democracy and socialism in our own country.

The record of the past few years convincingly demonstrates that closer unity and cooperation between the USSR and other socialist countries has done much to enhance the international role of the Soviet Union and the socialist community. Unity and cooperation of the Marxist-Leninist parties of fraternal countries have been carried forward in all spheres: ideology, foreign policy, coordination, strengthening of the Warsaw Treaty Organization's defense capacity, bilateral economic cooperation and multilateral within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. Fresh successes have been scored in socialist economic integration. This finds expression, in particular, in the fact that industrial development of CMEA countries in 1971-75 was four times faster than in the developed capitalist countries.

Anti-communist propaganda has been at pains to present a distorted picture of the Soviet Union's relations with other socialist countries, alleging that they are based on inequality between the 'dominant' partner and his 'satellites.' The real picture is that the socialist world has evolved an entirely new type of relations between

states and peoples, based on equality, solidarity and fraternal mutual assistance. This is the very opposite of the exploitation, oppression and rivalry that dominate relations between capitalist countries, multinational corporations, etc. In the socialist world there is a process of gradual evening-out of development levels, with all the countries coming closer together. In the non-socialist world there are glaring contradictions between the developed states and the dependent countries, which are trying to break out of neo-colonialist exploitation.

Taking the ties between Cuba and the Soviet Union as an example of the advantages of socialist international relations, Fidel Castro, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, told the 25th Congress: 'Throughout the history of international relations which for thousands of years were motivated by egoism and based on force, there have never been such fraternal relations as those that now exist between a powerful state and a small country. This is possible only under socialism.'

The results of the 25th CPSU Congress are, in our opinion, a valuable contribution to the worldwide struggle of the Communists and of the democratic and progressive forces. For this was a Congress of solidarity, of internationalist unity of Soviet Communists and the world communist movement, the national-liberation movement, the Vietnamese people, the fighters for freedom and independence in Chile, Angola and other countries, the Communists of Portugal and Spain — solidarity, in short, with all the progressive and peace-loving forces. The Congress was attended by 103 foreign delegations, more than at any earlier congress of Lenin's Party. This was positive proof of the growing internationalist unity of the revolutionary forces. And we can say with full justice that the 25th Congress was a forum not only of the Soviet Communists, but also of the world revolutionary forces, which are increasingly determining the course history will follow.

The anti-communist mass media are clamoring about the 'insuperable and growing differences' between the CPSU and other parties which, allegedly, surfaced at the 25th Congress. In particular, much has been said and written about the Soviet Union's drive for 'hegemony' vis-à-vis other Communist parties. Actually, however, neither the Congress, nor the CPSU international policy as a whole, provide the slightest ground for the accusation that the CPSU 'lays claim to leadership.' The document adopted by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties declared that there was no longer any leading center of the international communist movement. And in addressing the 25th Congress, Leonid Brezhnev confirmed that the Soviet Communists fully abide by the ' . . . immutable standards of equality and respect for the independence of each

party.' This independence allows for various forms of transition to socialism in accordance with the national specifics and concrete conditions in each country and on the basis of creative application of the common laws of Marxism-Leninism. Foreign guests speaking at the Congress gave a high appraisal of the successes achieved in building communism, spoke of the vast international importance of the Soviet Union and expressed their solidarity and internationalist unity with the first land of socialism.

It will thus be seen that the distinguishing feature of the 25th Congress of Lenin's Party was not differences of views, but internationalist solidarity. And the Congress demonstrated the growing ideological and political importance of this tested weapon of the international communist movement, thereby contributing to its further development and consolidation of internationalism.

This found expression also in the Congress's creative and profoundly scientific analysis of communist construction in the USSR and of the international situation, an analysis based on the firm ideological foundation of the Communist and Workers' parties, Marxism-Leninism. This confirmed anew that the CPSU is making a valuable contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory, creatively applying it to the problems posed by progress in the social, scientific, technical and cultural fields.

We fully share the opinion of our Soviet comrades that differences in the approach to one or another problem, which at times crop up between Communists of various countries, should be resolved from positions of internationalism, through genuine comradely discussion, but always mindful of the need to strengthen the unity of our movement.

We also believe that the CPSU took a principled, Marxist-Leninist attitude toward the policy of the present Chinese leaders, who are increasingly becoming factual allies of the most reactionary imperialist forces.

In our opinion, the statement of the Soviet Communists that proletarian internationalism is in no way contrary to the independence and autonomy of each party (as bourgeois politicians and ideologists would have us believe) is highly important and timely. For the experiences of our Party and of the international communist movement provides irrefutable evidence that internationalism and national interests, independence, the sovereignty and equality of each party comprise a solid unity. To this should be added that proletarian internationalism implies also solidarity and mutual assistance of fraternal parties and is a cardinal source of our movement's strength. To disregard or underestimate this aspect of internationalism can, we feel, only weaken the position and potentialities of each fraternal

party and is factually tantamount to rejection of this battle-tested revolutionary weapon of the working class.

For us Austrian Communists the conclusions and judgments of the 25th CPSU Congress are a reliable guide in the fight for peace, freedom and socialism, also in struggle which we are waging in Austria for the interests of the working class and all working people. The 25th Congress decisions and the CPSU's effort to translate them into reality are exerting a potent positive influence on world development in this concluding quarter of the century.

New stage in the development of the GDR

Werner Lamberz
PB member and CC
Secretary, Socialist Unity
Party of Germany

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the German Democratic Republic have entered a new development stage. The Ninth Party Congress, which met in Berlin from May 18 to 22, adopted important decisions directed at the continued building of the GDR's socialist present and its communist future. The SUPG is fully equipped to accomplish that. Shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries, in close alliance with the entire world communist movement and the forces of national liberation, our Party will continue to discharge its duty and make a weighty contribution to peace and the continued revolutionary transformation of our planet. That firm confidence is inspired by the Central Committee report delivered by Comrade Erich Honecker, who was elected General Secretary of the Party Central Committee, and by all the Congress proceedings and resolutions.

The Ninth Congress was, beyond all doubt, an event of momentous national significance, for it set long-range goals for the people of the socialist GDR. But it was also of great international significance, for it was attended by delegations from 103 parties and movements from 92 countries representing all the continents. Their speakers at the Congress produced a panoramic picture of the global struggle in all its multiformity, of the three principal revolutionary currents of our time.

They showed, also, that the overall trend of the world revolutionary movement is toward indestructible unity.

The Ninth Congress met with a wide and lively response both among friends and foes. Even inveterate opponents of socialism could not but reckon with the stability of our Party's policy. The London *Times* (May 24, 1976) commented: 'The whole course of the five-day congress demonstrated continuity, unity and solidarity.'

The optimism and confidence with which the delegates approached discussion of our goals created a strong impression on all. All the more so, since the Congress discussed not only the 1976-1980 five-year plan, but also adopted a new Party Program and brought the Party Statutes into conformity with it. The Congress decisions go far beyond the framework of the second half of the 70s. The far-reaching goals approved by the Congress are based on substantiated analysis and on the democratic way in which they were prepared. As Comrade Honecker remarked, the Congress documents were, in the full sense, 'written by the entire Party, more, by the entire people.'

Their formulation began at the end of last year at the report and election meetings of Party nuclei. More than 90 per cent of the more than two million strong army of Communists took part in them, and more than 40 per cent shared in the discussion, with half of the speakers being workers. Four months before the Congress, the full text of the main documents, the draft new Party Program, the modified Statutes and the directives on economic development up to 1980, were subjected to discussion not only by Party members but by the entire people. Millions were involved in this. The Central Committee alone received 1,186,000 letters containing proposals, suggestions, amendments and addenda, also reports on personal and collective obligations and major economic initiatives. And in all cases the aim was to surpass the goals set in the above drafts. Furthermore, the initiative came not only from Party members, but also from work collectives, mass organizations and friendly parties. This was in every sense a nationwide discussion, and the thoughts and proposals it brought found expression in the Congress debates, providing a firm foundation for the decisions it adopted.

The Congress thus became an effective demonstration of the close ties between Party and people, a demonstration of the Party's growing strength and action ability, of its growing directing role in the life of society.

The main results of our home and foreign policy in the period between the two congresses can be capsuled into these words of the Central Committee report: 'The tasks set by the Eighth Congress have been accomplished.' The fact that the Party was true to its word, that the course mapped out at the Eighth Congress in 1971 has fully

justified itself, is of special importance, for the goals we then set ourselves were anything but simple and required intensive effort. Their attainment — and the way in which they were attained — gives us every right to say: this has been the most successful period in our country's history.

The Ninth Congress analyzed the development level of our society and on that basis plotted the road of our continuing advance to the ultimate aim of the Communist movement, i.e., classless communist society. 'The Socialist Unity Party of Germany,' the new Party Program says, 'aims at continuing the building of a developed socialist society in the German Democratic Republic in order to create the fundamental prerequisites for gradual transition to communism.' Acting in full accordance with the interests of millions of our citizens, who in the preceding period dedicated all their efforts to implementing the political line of the Eighth Congress, and by word and deed supported the Party in the nationwide discussion preceding the Ninth Congress, we will determinedly continue to promote unity of economic and social policies. The main goal formulated by the Eighth Congress, a continued rise in the material and cultural standards of the people on the basis of a high development rate of socialist production, its higher effectiveness, scientific and technical progress, and growing productivity, accords with the essence of socialism. At the stage of developed socialism these aims are realized more fully and tangibly than at earlier stages. This was clearly demonstrated immediately after the Ninth Congress, when the SUPG Central Committee, the Central Board of the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions and the Council of Ministers decided on a series of far-reaching social policy measures.

It should be perfectly clear that the first half of the 70s enhanced the socialist world's economic strength, ideological and social level, spiritual and political influence on world affairs to a much greater degree than any of the earlier five-year plans. Every member of the socialist community has made marked progress in home and foreign policy. Evidence of that can be seen in the results of the 25th CPSU Congress and of the congresses of Communist and Workers' parties of other fraternal countries.

In assessing the SUPG's contribution to strengthening socialism, it has to be said that the outstanding results of our Eighth Congress and the firm foundation of all our internal and external successes, are due to consolidation of our ties within the socialist community, and, especially, our indestructible militant alliance with the Party and Land of Lenin. This unity is a reliable basis for our people's continued advance in building a developed socialist society. The Central Committee report to the Ninth Congress noted our economic and

social progress over the past five years. The policy of unity of economic and social policy has yielded good results. National income rose by 30.1 per cent between 1970 and 1975, an annual growth of 5.4 per cent compared with the 4.9 per cent envisaged in the five-year plan. Industrial output rose from 172 billion marks in 1970 to 235.4 billion in 1975, or 14.5 billion over and above the five-year target.

Rapid economic progress has meant a substantial improvement in material and cultural standards. Thus, net cash incomes increased by an annual average of 4.8 per cent as against the 4 per cent envisaged in the plan. We have used our economic achievements also to expand the social services. We have considerably surpassed our housing program of 500,000 new flats by building new housing and modernizing the old. About 1.8 million people, more than a 10th of the entire population, now enjoy better housing. About two-thirds of all new flats have been allotted to worker families and 11 per cent to large families. Rents are low and stable. Retail trade increased from 64.1 billion marks in 1970 to 82 billion in 1975, with retail prices remaining stable.

In education, the Eighth Congress decided to complete, in the main, universal polytechnical 10-year schooling, so that 90 per cent of all pupils could go on to the ninth and 10th grades. This, too, is now a reality. Our Party has devoted much attention to improving public health and working and general conditions in industry.

Comrade Honecker recorded in his report to the Ninth Congress: 'In the period from 1971 to 1975 we carried out the most ambitious social program ever undertaken by our Republic, not only in terms of investment, but also, and above all, in terms of benefits for the people.'

The result of the past five years clearly indicate that our successes are of truly historic dimensions. For they have demonstrated anew the superiority and advantages of socialism over capitalism, which precisely in these years is going through the worst crisis since that of the 1930s.

The GDR's dynamic economic and social development enabled it to make a constructive contribution to the peaceful coexistence policy. The peace concept formulated at the Eighth Congress has been realized in full. The imperialist diplomatic blockade of more than 20 years collapsed in the early 70s: at the time of the Eighth Congress the GDR maintained diplomatic relations with 29 states, the present figure is 121. The GDR plays an equal part in the United Nations and other international organizations. The Ninth Party Congress regarded this as a success for world socialism and expressed its sincere gratitude to our allies, to our friends in all parts of the world, for their solidarity and support.

The GDR had an active share in preparing and carrying out the Helsinki Conference which consolidated, through multilateral procedures, adjustment of Europe's postwar issues. The GDR's constructive policy helped conclusion of the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin. We concluded a treaty on basic relations with the FRG. Our Party wants relations between the socialist GDR and the capitalist FRG to continue to develop on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the standards of international law.

The applies also to stringent observance and full implementation of earlier treaties and agreements.

The new Party Program set tasks of a truly historic significance, and the Party Statutes, accordingly, set higher standards for members of the SUPG.

The need to formulate a new Program governing the activity of the SUPG as the leading force of our people became obvious soon after the Eighth Party Congress. Accordingly, at its sixth plenum, the Central Committee elected commissions to reformulate the Program and Statutes. The Program Commission, of which Comrade Honecker was Chairman, spent several years on serious research in cooperation with many prominent social scientists and experienced Party officials. Their task was to give expression in the draft Program to the changes in the internal and external conditions of our Party's struggle and the new experience accumulated since adoption of the 1963 Program.

In the early 60s we could record the victory of socialist production relations in the GDR. All farmers were united in agricultural cooperatives. True, in industry there were still thousands of small private enterprises and also enterprises in which the state had a share. Our economy was developing mainly by adding new capacity. The imperialists refused to recognize our Republic under international law and, more, challenged its very existence as a state.

Our people are now building a developed socialist society. The Republic's productive forces have grown many times over and its socialist production relations have made great progress. The socialization and concentration of production have increased considerably. Most industrial workers are employed in large complexes. Over 11,000 private and mixed industrial plants and handicraft cooperatives producing industrial goods have become people's enterprises since 1972. In farming, industrial methods are widely used on the basis of cooperation between agricultural cooperatives and state farms having thousands of hectares of land. We have switched from chiefly extensive to chiefly intensive methods of increasing the economic potential. Radical changes have come about in every public sphere.

International conditions have changed, too. The independent de-

velopment of the two socially-opposite German states has continued and they are more closely integrated in the two opposite world systems. A socialist German nation is developing in the GDR as one of the fraternal nations of the socialist community. The existence of the GDR as a sovereign socialist state has been recognized throughout the world and the inviolability of the Republic's frontiers with imperialism has been confirmed under international law.

The social and political dissociation of the GDR from the FRG, formalized in treaties, was followed by dissociation formalized under international law. Speaking at the Ninth Party Congress, Erich Honecker said that no part of the German question is 'open' any longer. History has long since pronounced its verdict. The basis, content and forms of national life in the GDR have undergone qualitative changes. The working class increasingly moulds the distinctive traits of the socialist German nation.

All this provides much more favorable conditions for building the new society than in the early 60s and this naturally calls for higher standards in working toward the strategic objectives set out in the new Party Program.

As our Party sees it, the twofold task of continuing to build a developed socialist society and thus creating the fundamental prerequisites for the gradual transition to communism, shows that there can be no rigid dividing line between the two phases of the communist social formation. Indeed, the Party regards the construction of a developed socialist society as a historic process of deep-going political, economic, social, cultural and moral changes paving the way for the gradual transition to communism.

By specifying the objectives of the next stage of social development in the GDR, the Party accomplished a task of great theoretical and practical significance. It is looking ahead, to the communist future, as it sets and carries out current tasks. By setting objectives for the next period, the Party creatively applied the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the two phases of communism as one socio-economic formation.

In keeping with our people's historical experience, which is also reflected in numerous letters to the Central Committee, the Party Program explicitly proceeds from Marx's thesis that the period of transition from capitalist society to a communist state can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat. 'Never has a socialist society been built without the dictatorship of the proletariat,' the General Secretary of our Party said at the Ninth Congress.

Whereas the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie invariably means minority rule, the domination of exploiters over the working majority of the people even if the latter enjoy this or that form of bourgeois democracy, dictatorship of the proletariat means rule of the working

class and its allies, who make up the majority of the people. In our state, in which there are no exploiters, it really serves the interests of the whole people.

This state is the main instrument used by the working people, with the working class at their head, for building the new society. It directs the steady development of the productive forces and socialist relations of production, the process of raising the people's cultural and educational standards, social policy and national defense. It protects public and personal property and safeguards civil rights and freedoms. This logically implies that the main line of carrying forward socialist statehood is to perfect socialist democracy. Active participation by the people in government and economic management is becoming increasingly decisive under socialism.

During the discussion of the pre-Congress documents, many people proudly pointed out that socialist state power and democracy guarantee them political freedoms and social rights which no capitalist state can really provide in adequate measure. What they mean is the right to work, rest and recreation, free education, medical care, maintenance in old age, in case of illness or disablement, equal rights for all citizens irrespective of race, nationality, world outlook, religion or social standing, equal rights for men and women in every sphere of administrative, economic or cultural activity.

The Program stresses that the SUPG is a contingent of the world Communist movement. it firmly adheres to proletarian internationalism, a most important criterion of which the Party sees in fraternal unity with the CPSU, the most experienced Communist party. This is in line with the experience of our own people as described in the statements of numerous citizens, with the experience of a people who have come to know in practice that the socialist revolution triumphed in the GDR because it was carried out in inseparable connection with the world revolutionary process and closely interlocked with socialist revolutions in other countries and with the construction of a developed socialist society in the Soviet Union. We will continue along this tried and tested path. Indestructible friendship and cooperation with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, the preamble to the Party Program states, have been, are and will be a source of strength and the basis for the development of the socialist German Democratic Republic.

Proletarian internationalism permeates the content, objectives and tasks of the foreign policy formulated in our Program: to provide, in concert with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the most favorable international conditions for building socialism and communism; to promote the unity, cohesion and all-round cooperation of

socialist countries, foster friendship and closer relations between them; support the struggle of the working class and its Communist and Workers' parties in developed capitalist countries and build up relations with these parties; show solidarity with national-liberation movements and with countries that have won national independence; pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries; firmly resist the aggressive forces of imperialism, safeguard mankind against a new world war and assure lasting peace.

The genuinely internationalist objectives of our Party at home and abroad require determined ideological struggle against every variety of bourgeois nationalism, whether in the form of direct revanchist calls for the 'reunification' of the GDR with the imperialist FRG, or of manifestations of right-wing opportunism, Maoism, and so on. The Party Program attaches great importance to 'steadfast struggle against all bourgeois-nationalist conceptions.'

The Program statement that the SUPG is 'the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class and other working people of the socialist German Democratic Republic' and the leading force in the construction of a developed socialist society has won widespread approval among our people. The Party's task consists in politically directing social processes based on scientifically grounded strategy and tactics. The role of the Party grows in step with the growth of the complexity and scope of tasks involved in the management and planning of social processes.

The Party sees the pivot of its leading activity in ideological work, which must equip the working class and other working people with the revolutionary ideas of Marxism-Leninism, explain Party policy, foster socialist thinking, sentiments and behavior, mobilize the masses for the fulfillment of constructive tasks and supply them with a weapon in the fight against bourgeois ideological influences.

Citing 30 years of positive experience, the Program stresses that the Party will continue its leading activity in cooperation with other democratic parties and mass organizations within the framework of the democratic bloc and the National Front of the GDR.

In accordance with Program objectives, the Ninth Congress adopted Guidelines for the Economic Development of the GDR for 1976-80, which specify the tasks following from the long-term strategic line adopted by the Eighth Party Congress.

To accomplish these tasks, we need steady and balanced development of social production over a long period. We must raise its effectiveness by improving the quality of work in every economic sphere. This will help to establish ever closer links between economic and social policy, between growing production and a rising standard of life.

Recent years have shown that intensifying social production is a decisive factor for our economic growth, an essential condition for building a developed socialist society on an adequate material and technical basis and for furthering socialist economic integration. We are certain that growing integration will become, more than ever before, the fundamental condition for steady development according to plan in both our country and all other socialist countries.

The five-year plan guidelines envisage high growth indices. The national economy is to go up by 27-30 per cent, industrial output 34-36 and productivity in industry 30-32 per cent. Crops are expected to increase from an average of 39.7 centners in 1971-75 to 46-48 centners in 1980 (in conventional grain units per hectare of arable). With the livestock population unchanged, meat and milk production will increase.

In the current five-year period, we plan to invest 240,000-243,000m. marks in the economy, or 60,000m marks more than in the 1971-75 period. The state will allocate 7,000-8,000m. marks for industrial projects, primarily plants for processing raw materials, in cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Exports to socialist countries are to go up by roughly 50 per cent (in CMEA prices).

Housing construction at a higher rate is to become the centerpiece of an extensive program to raise the standard of living. We aim to solve the housing problem by 1990. About 750,000 flats will be provided under the five-year plan, including 550,000 in new houses. The housing conditions of roughly 2.2 million people will be improved. Furthermore, the trade unions proposed at the Party Congress to build another 100,000 flats by 1980.

The people will also be better supplied with consumer goods. Retail trade is to expand by 20-22 per cent, with stable prices and with net cash incomes increasing proportionally. Public funds, or government appropriations for education, health, rest and recreation, culture, sports, and measures to improve housing conditions and keep consumer prices, rent and other charges stable, will go up by 29-31 per cent.

Working and living conditions will be improved, first of all, by gradually reducing the number of jobs requiring great physical exertion or injurious to the health.

The tasks set before public education, the system of higher and secondary specialized education, cultural workers and artists will require much effort. Culture, in particular the arts, should develop in accordance with the people's differing requirements, which are growing due to the rising standard of education, the changing role of workers in the labor process and new leisure time requirements. They should also help to form and encourage these requirements.

The plan approved by the Congress devotes special attention to the development of Berlin as the political, economic and cultural capital of our republic.

In hundreds of thousands of letters received by the CC SUPG, the population fully supports and approves of the tasks laid down in the guidelines.

The Ninth Congress demonstrated the unbreakable unity and cohesion of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and its increased strength and efficiency as the vanguard of the working class and other working people of the German Democratic Republic. The delegates, who represented 2,043,697 Communists, unanimously approved all the Congress decisions and expressed their unqualified confidence in the Party leadership and the General Secretary of the CC SUPG, Erich Honecker.

The composition of the Congress delegates is expressive of the deep connection between the Party and the leading class of our people: 63.8 per cent of the delegates were workers and 76.6 per cent were of working class origin; 14.2 per cent of full delegates were men and women below 25 years of age. This is evidence of the influx of young workers, cooperative farmers and intellectuals — about 100,000 having joined in the past few months.

Foreign guests, delegates of the Communist and Workers' parties of all continents, spoke highly of the resolute stand taken by our Congress in defense of proletarian internationalism and the invincible Marxist-Leninist teachings. M.A. Suslov, leader of the CPSU delegation, stressed in his speech that the SUPG 'is following a correct policy line based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and protelarian internationalism, creatively applying in the conditions of the GDR the general laws of building socialism.'

'Your tremendous gains in building developed socialism in the GDR,' said Luis Carlos Prestes, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Brazil, '... are also due in substantial measure to the internationalist essence of your policy.' 'We in Africa, and more particularly in the Congo,' said Jean-Pierre N'Gombe, representative of the Congolese Party of Labor, 'greatly appreciate the policy of peace and active solidarity followed by the people of the GDR, who are always on the side of the peoples fighting for liberation, against foreign domination and every form of oppression.' On behalf of the French Communist Party, Paul Laurent said that 'in alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the GDR has made an important contribution to the changes in favor of peace that have occurred in Europe and the rest of the world in recent years.'

Representatives of many fraternal parties spoke highly of our Party's gains in moulding the new man, stressing that this progress

has been made in a country where imperialism and fascism achieved particularly disastrous results in injecting the poison of chauvinism and racism into the minds of the masses. Speakers assessed it as proof of the superiority of socialism over capitalism and of communist over bourgeois ideology. Nguyen Duy Trinh of the Working People's Party of Vietnam described the achievements of the GDR as a 'brilliant example of building socialism in what was a developed capitalist country.'

The Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany was a new demonstration of the irresistible force of socialism, a force transforming the world. It expressed confidence that in the second half of the 70s as in the past five years, the Communists of the Republic would fulfill the undertakings given to the people by the Party's highest forum.

The people need socialism

Hermann Gautier
Vice Chairman, German CP

No event in our Party's life has attracted such keen public attention in the FRG or abroad as our latest Congress, held March 19-21, at the Beethoven Halle, Bonn's largest concert hall. The Congress was covered by 250 newsmen, among them more than 100 representing daily newspapers and correspondents of more than 20 radio and television stations. Their presence served to emphasize that our Party has become a significant factor in FRG public life. Not for nothing was it said in one TV broadcast that the 'GCP must be taken seriously and given more attention.'

Most of the reports on the Congress were slanted in the spirit of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. This did not surprise us. We knew that insofar as the bourgeois press can no longer ignore the GCP's constructive proposals and policies aimed at defending the working people's interests, it would attempt to present the public a distorted picture of our activities.

The Bonn Congress demonstrated that, despite all obstables erected against our Party and its newspaper, *Unsere Zeit,* despite anti-communist campaigns, the GCP is steadfastly following its course, it speaks for the interests of the working population, it has a

constructive action program, it contributes to the strengthening of the unity of the world communist movement.

The report of the GCP Executive states that the period since the Hamburg Congress in November 1973 was filled with major events in the life of our country and the world. It was characterized by sharp confrontations between socialism and imperialism, by new successes of the three components of the revolutionary process — the socialist world system, the revolutionary working-class movement in capitalist countries, and the national-liberation movement — and by new defeats of world imperialism. Contrary to the maneuvers of its opponents, détente has become the main trend in international life. One can recall, in this connection, the treaties between the FRG and the Soviet Union, the GDR and the Polish People's Republic, the agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States, the main imperialist power, the Helsinki Conference and its Final Act which recognize the principles of peaceful coexistance as the basis of development of relations between countries with different social systems as binding under international law. The report and delegates' speeches stressed that the GCP, too, contributed to the struggle for détente and disarmament.

As a Party consistently advocating peace, the GCP continuously elaborates constructive proposals aimed at deepening the détente process, it extends its hand to all who work for peace. We have invariably supported the federal government whenever it contributed to the cause of détente and peace. We have done so in the past and shall do so in the future.

The main factor in the changing international correlation of forces is the growing political, economic and military strength of the socialist community, the Soviet Union in the first place. Today the strength of the Soviet Union and its allies is so great that only hopeless political adventurists can gamble on direct military confrontation. But in the FRG they still have a degree of influence.

Whereas in the capitalist world the crisis is deepening, the CMEA countries represent the most dynamically developing economic region of the globe. Today more than ever before it is apparent that socialism is a boon for the working people, that it alone can offer continued confidence in the future and throw open genuine long-term perspectives. The 25th Congress of the CPSU and the congresses of fraternal parties in other socialist countries have vividly demonstrated the remarkable results achieved through the labor of the peoples of the socialist world in the last few years alone and the impressive forward-looking tasks they have set themselves.

The existence of the community of socialist states and its all-round strengthening is in the best interest of the working people of our

country. It is the strength and growing attraction of socialism that made it possible, after so many years of cold war, for the FRG and its people to live in conditions of a more stable peace.

While expressing its satisfaction with the strengthening of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, the Bonn Congress also stressed that imperialism still possesses a considerable political, economic and military potential. Forced to adapt to the changed correlation of forces, it has retained its aggressive character and continues to oppose social progress and socialism, striving to preserve its historically obsolescent power.

In our country, reactionary forces in the CDU/CSU are campaigning against détente, against cooperation with the socialist countries, against the treaties concluded with them. They tried to prevent the ratification of the recent agreement with Poland. They are whipping up the arms race, they attempt to blackmail the GDR and strive to mislead West German public opinion by harping on the so-called 'threat from the East.' Thereby they once again demonstrate their hostility to the interests of the people of the FRG. Their attempts to resuscitate the cold war are detrimental to the country.

Not only the CDU/CSU reactionaries, but also some representatives of the federal government and the ruling parties are striving to block progress in détente. One of the right-wing Social Democratic leaders, Defense Minister Georg Leber, for example, claims that détente is hardly conceivable without arming the Bundeswehr with the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction. In an interview with the *Frankfurter Allgemeine* (April 10, 1976) he insisted on stepping up the arming of the Bundeswehr and improving NATO. Among other things, he insisted on the provision of 322 MRCA multi-purpose combat aircraft capable of delivering nuclear warheads. Leber's statements were quickly lauded by the CDU/CSU. Also in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine* (April 12), that mouthpiece of monopoly capital, a former officer of the nazi General Staff, Albert Weinstein, wrote that Leber's plans represented a 'reassuring conception' and the improved armaments, of which the minister spoke, were a 'new political weapon of the West.'

All these attempts of imperialist forces to turn back the wheel of history by stepping up the arms race are as hopeless as they are dangerous. At our Congress we emphatically declared: What the country needs is not new confrontations, not the stepping up of the arms race, but expanding cooperation with the Soviet Union, with the GDR and other socialist countries, continuation of the policy of détente. Our country will not benefit from maneuvers against the GDR, nor from claims to West Berlin, but from new constructive agreements with the GDR that serve the cause of peace.

The national interests of the FRG, the peace-loving interests of its people demand the rejection of any actions in the spirit of neo-colonialism and of ties with the EEC and NATO.

The working people will by no means benefit by the claims of our country's ruling circles to hegemonism or their overbearing posture with respect to other West European countries. That is why we resolutely denounced the nationalistically self-righteous attempts of the Bundestag parties to intervene in the election struggles in Portugal or influence Italian domestic affairs by issuing 'warnings' against Communist participation in government. We have denounced the pressure brought to bear on trade union organizations of neighboring countries to compel them to pursue a policy of 'social partnership.' We have also denounced the campaign against joint action by Communists and Social Democrats in other countries.

The GCP struggles against interference by the leaderships of the CDU and CSU, the SPD and FPD in the internal affairs of other countries, against nationalism, against attempts to dominate in Western Europe, against those who would impose submission to the policies of U.S. imperialism and NATO. We Communists want our country to pursue a policy of peaceful cooperation with all countries of Western and Eastern Europe, a policy free of expansionist ambitions. At our Congress we voiced the conviction that the peoples of the capitalist countries of Europe, the progressive and democratic forces, would not permit representatives of West German imperialism to tell them how to arrange their public and political affairs.

The German Communist Party wants the FRG to take an active part in ensuring a lasting peace in Europe. That is why we firmly supported the Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples drawn up by the 25th Congress of the CPSU. This program, like other peace initiatives of the CPSU, is aimed at limiting armaments and armed forces, at convening a world disarmament conference, at promoting cooperation between different countries, eliminating the remnants of colonialism, concluding a worldwide treaty on non-use of force in international relations.

The Bonn Congress of the GCP appealed to all forces of our country that want a life without wars, a stable peace and security, with a proposal to work together for carrying out the Helsinki decisions, for ending the arms race, annually reducing military expenditures by 15 per cent, carrying out the treaties concluded with the socialist states, for normal, good-neighbor relations with them.

Our country's internal development is characterized in the first place by the economic crisis developing against the background of the mounting general crisis of capitalism and diverse crisis phenomena in

all spheres of public life. Developments in the FRG have confirmed our predictions made at the Hamburg Congress: contrary to the prophesies of the apologists of state-monopoly capitalism, it is incapable of guaranteeing social security for the working people.

More than a million unemployed, nearly 400,000 of them under 25 with no opportunities to work or study, hundreds of thousands of underemployed, half a million foreigners who lost their jobs in the FRG and had to return to their countries: all these facts are an indictment of the capitalist system, which is incapable of assuring wage and salary earners their basic rights, the right to work and education.

Mass unemployment is exploited by the monopolies and federal government as a means of keeping workers, office employees and their unions 'in line.' Even if an upswing sets in, government and monopoly spokesmen concede, 800,000 to one million people will remain unemployed. Private concerns and state enterprises continue to jack up prices, and workers are also robbed through rising taxes.

Those who bear the main responsibility for the crisis — the company owners, big shareholders and their managers — try to boost their profits even in this situation. The employers' unions and the federal government plan to increase the profits of business by 18 per cent this year. Yet the working people's incomes are to go up only 3.5 per cent. With prices up more than five per cent and with increasing taxes and social insurance contributions, the result will be a lower standard of living.

The GCP Congress took a firm stand against paring real wages and curtailing the working people's rights. In the Communists' view, it is not the wage and salary earners, let alone the pensioners who must foot the bill of the crisis but those who have caused it. To save on social benefits is wrong — the need is for cuts in excessive military spending and in subsidies to business. The Party will continue to support the wage and salary earners, pensioners, trade unions and other organizations against attempts to shift the burden of the crisis on to the people.

The experience of recent years has shown that West Germany is no exception in this respect and that big capital can be resisted even at a time of crisis. We have witnessed massive stoppages in reply to the employers' provocative stand and threats to cut real wages. The workers occupied plants in protest against the owners' arbitrary methods. We have also witnessed numerous civic actions against higher charges for municipal services. Not long ago 60,000 young trade unionists were joined by their elders in a demonstration demanding better vocational training. Tens of thousands of students have protested against the lamentable state of higher education and

reactionary attacks on the students' rights. There have been joint actions by parents, school children and teachers demanding measures to improve public education.

The Congress stressed that the key to success in the confrontation with big capital is, now as in the past, united action by the working class, joint struggle by the Communists and Social Democrats, and a broad alliance of anti-monopoly, democratic forces.

Our constructive policy, aimed at achieving unity of action, finds favorable response in the enterprises, universities, working-class and youth organizations, and a furious response from the leadership of the CDU/CSU and FPD and spokesmen of big capital. The right-wing Social Democratic leaders rejected our call for joint action out of hand and threatened members of their own party whom numerous actions have convinced of the need to cooperate with the Communists.

But we will not allow ourselves to be led astray. We confirmed that the effort to bring about unity of action of the Communists and Social Democrats is part of our policy and activity. On the other hand, we will persevere in our struggle against the opportunism, anti-communism, anti-Sovietism and divisive policy of the right-wing Social-Democratic leaders.

The crisis tells above all on the conditions of the youth. In the past two years, 100,000 school-leavers each year have been unable to find jobs as apprentices. Unemployment, one of the worst scourges of capitalism, hits young people harder and harder. Young workers come up against numerous obstacles in trying to continue their studies. As for those who are studying, they are not sure they will have a chance to use their knowledge on graduation.

From the Congress rostrum we accused big capital of robbing the younger generation of a future. The millionaires' anti-democratic rule dooms hundreds of thousands of young men and women to insecurity and lack of freedom. Capitalism fetters the development of the individual, makes it difficult to choose a profession and ignores the right to work. To stem the growth of unemployment among the youth, the GCP proposed creating at least 250,000 apprentice's jobs in the foreseeable future. We also demanded that on finishing their training, apprentices be given jobs according to their qualifications.

The crisis has a particularly adverse effect on the youth. Despite bourgeois propaganda, which misrepresents the causes of economic and social anomalies, young people have lately taken numerous actions in defense of their interests. Their struggle is gathering momentum. We Communists attach decisive political importance to the fact that more and more young people are joining in struggle for social progress. The Bonn Congress of the GCP stresses this by adopting an appeal to the young workers and students of the FRG —

'Against Unemployment, for a Secure Future for the Youth.' Besides, we resolved that a primary duty of every Communist is to look into the questions raised by the youth, know their problems and uphold their rights and interests everywhere and always.

Monopoly capital and its political exponents attack both the working people's social gains and their democratic rights. They would like in this way to break resistance to their attempts to put the burden of the crisis on the working people and intimidate the democratic forces.

At our Bonn Congress, we stressed that the fight for social and democratic rights should be seen as a single whole. We insist on unfailing respect for the basic democratic rights laid down in the Constitution and oppose all attempts to restrict them. We campaign for ensuring the political and social interests of the working people. No amount of talk about a 'free democratic order' can conceal the fact that the majority of West Germans are under big capital oppression. It is big capital and its political representatives in the CDU/CSU, as well as in the SPD and FPD, that constantly violate the Constitution by enforcing the scandalous 'ban on professions' law, which bars GCP members and other democrats from the civil service.

That law is at variance with the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and the human rights enshrined in the UN Charter. Nevertheless, it is still used against GCP members as well as against Social Democrats, progressive liberals and Christians. The bans imposed under this unconstitutional law, which has already affected over 2,500 democrats, including sons and daughters of anti-fascist Resistance fighters, the growing surveillance apparatus and the 'loyalty test' applied to more than 800,000 applicants for civil service jobs, not only run counter to the interests of our working people, but injure the international prestige of Federal Germany.

On behalf of the Congress, we emphatically demanded the repeal of the 'ban on professions' and an end to persecution on political grounds, to surveillance over Communists and other democrats. We thanked all genuine democrats at home and abroad who are fighting along with us against this outrageous practice. When people in neighboring countries speak of a 'bad spiritual climate' in the FRG and are concerned about political trends in our state, they are neither slandering West Germany nor interfering in its domestic affairs, but identifying themselves with those in our country who fight for freedom and democracy.

'Strengthen and extend links with the working people and youth' has been our motto in campaigning to increase the Party's action ability. During Congress preparations we had a lively discussion on progress in this direction, with thousands of Party members and sympathizers participating. The report submitted to the Congress put

it on record that the Party had grown stronger and won great influence. This is seen, for example, in the success of our action called 'Stop rising prices, guarantee jobs.' It was backed by more than 500,000 people, who put their signtures to a bill drafted by the GCP. In view of continuing inflation and the diminishing number of jobs, the questions raised by us are highly relevant. Credit is due to the Party for its role in social battles, its support of trade unions and actions in defense of the rights of the working people and youth, its participation in civic initiatives and its struggle against the 'ban on professions.'

The two *Unsere Zeit* festivals held by us attracted 650,000 people — evidence of public interest in the GCP. We have won thousands of new members, increased the readership of *Unsere Zeit* and collected millions of marks for Party needs. However, the Congress report stressed that the Party and its influence must be substantially strengthened. Building up the Party, circulating *Unsere Zeit* and carrying on systematic and concrete work among the masses are all priority tasks.

The Party has always represented the working people's interests in the enterprises, which we regard as the principal class battlefield. We analyzed our activity in the enterprises since the Hamburg Congress and found it fruitful. Many of our enterprise branches have grown numerically and play an active part in the fight against attempts to make the wage and salary earners bear the burden of the crisis. New Party groups have sprung up and factory papers have considerably improved. The Congress pointed out, however, that the Party must continue to focus attention on supporting factory groups.

We have lately made headway in extending our influence among the youth. Nevertheless, bringing young people into the Party and winning votes among them remains a most important task.

The next few months will be dominated by the election campaign. The Bonn Congress re-emphasized that, as we Communists see it, the working people can achieve successes first of all through extra-parliamentary activity. However, winning positions in parliament would benefit this activity. We maintain that the working people's extra-parliamentary and parliamentary struggles are inseparable. This is why our Party will enter the Bundestag elections scheduled for October 3, 1976. We will put forward our candidates in all constituencies. They will uphold our constructive policy geared to the working people's interests and oppose it to the policy of other parties, whose spokesmen range themselves alongside big capital each time the question is asked: who should make the decisions in our country. 'Only through GCP candidates,' says the election appeal approved by the Congress, 'can the people vote for a policy expressing their interests.'

Every day confronts us Communists with new political, ideological and other problems. Reaction is increasing ideological pressure on progressive forces by fomenting anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. We have witnessed bitter attacks on the fundamental principles of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This makes us more keenly aware than ever that we must devote still greater attention to Marxist schooling and the ideological consolidation of our Party. The situation requires of us profound Marxist knowledge and firmness in matters of world outlook. This is also indispensable if we are to make our work among the masses more effective.

We will continue to take guidance from the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin as a dependable basis for correct Communist policies.

Federal Germany has long had sufficient economic prerequisites of ridding its every citizen of want. It is a wealthy country. What splendid opportunities would have been afforded if this wealth had not been in the hands of the few but at the people's service, and if development had not been broken off by recurrent capitalist economic crises! The report to the Bonn Congress and delegates' speeches stressed that the working people of West Germany want radical social change, that they need socialism. All that our people need and want cannot be achieved by battered capitalist methods.

Our conviction that the people of Federal Germany need socialism in no way contradicts the everyday practical policy of the GCP, which concentrates on defense of social and democratic rights and on struggle for continued détente and for disarmament.

Indeed, the capitalist crisis stimulates reappraisals among the population, prompting it to wonder whether the capitalist social system is the best after all. Discussion centers on what our country and its people need and whether they would benefit more from preserving the capitalist system than from advancing to a new, genuinely humane system, socialism.

We contribute to the discussion by revealing the socialist outlook for our country. We show that a socialist FRG would meet the working people's interests. Our people need socialism because they want the economy to make steady progress and satisfy the working people's material and cultural requirements to a growing extent. They need socialism because they want social justice and real freedom. They need socialism because they want to be certain they will never lose their jobs and because they want an end to the shortages of teachers. Lastly, they need socialism because they want to live in a climate of lasting peace.

At the Bonn Congress we reaffirmed our readiness to conduct a dialogue on the socialist alternative to the capitalist system with all

forces seeking social security, peace and social progress. We are often asked whether we have a special model of socialism for Federal Germany. The Congress answered that there is only one socialism, the socialism that Marx and Engels transformed from a utopia into a science and that Lenin's Party translated for the first time into reality, the socialism which is being built in socialist countries and to which the future of the world belongs.

To be sure, in our country as elsewhere, socialism will have distinctive features stemming from tradition, historical conditions and national characteristics. Experience has shown that as the revolutionary process develops and more countries drop out of the imperialist system, the actual forms of transition to socialism and the organizational forms of socialist society are becoming more varied. But this multiformity in no way alters the fact that socialism can only be won by breaking the fierce resistance of capitalist exploiters and that it always means power of the working class in alliance with other working people.

At the Bonn Congress we said, as we had at the Hamburg Congress, that the GCP is a party fighting for the national interests of West Germany's working people. We abide by this line. At the same time we stressed that ours is a party of proletarian internationalism and is closely linked with the socialist world and the working-class movement in other capitalist countries. The Bonn Congress was also a demonstration of anti-imperialist solidarity. Our Party will continue its efforts for the West German working-class movement to contribute to the fight against imperialism.

The Congress flatly rejected the brazen demand of bourgeois politicians and the mass media that the Party sacrifice internationalism, if only to some extent. As far as we are concerned, proletarian internationalism is by no means 'outdated.' 'The GCP,' the Congress report says, 'has always regarded the principles of proletarian internationalism, solidarity and mutual support, respect for sovereignty and equality, and non-interference in internal affairs as a dependable basis for relations between fraternal parties.'

We regard the world communist movement as the mightiest political force of our time, as a movement of people holding common views and enjoying equal rights, people who are fighting against a common enemy — international monopoly capital — for peace and socialism. This is why we will go on resisting all attempts to split the Communist and working-class movement and will do our utmost to build up our Party on internationalist principles. Accordingly, we have a constructive part in preparations for the conference of Communist and Workers' parties of Europe and will contribute our share to its success. The Congress reaffirmed the Party's opinion that the time has come to

hold a new international meeting of Communist and Workers' parties.

Summing up, we may say that the Bonn Congress again showed the German Communist Party to be the political force that champions both the immediate and the long-range interests of the working people of the Federal Republic. Furthermore, our Party is a reliable partner of the Communist and Workers' parties of the world in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.

Confidence in the present, orientation on the future

Dimitr Stanishev
CC member, Bulgarian CP,
member of *WMR* Editorial Board

There has been a series of congresses of the ruling parties of the socialist community countries. In the past 18 months they were held in Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Cuba, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the GDR, and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party will have concluded its congress by the time this issue appears. Now the thoughts and actions of Communists in the socialist community are centered on the congress documents. They analyze the activity of the parties over the past five years and chart the course for the future, set out the Communist view on the world situation, the new trends in its development, the ways and perspectives of the revolutionary struggle and of social progress.

Time brings with it new events, but the recent congresses are still the focal point of attention of world opinion, of the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, the many contingents of the national-liberation movement, of all progressive, democratic forces. Bourgeois and imperialist circles, too, have shown an interest in the congress decisions, and very often seek to impose on public opinion assessments and judgments that are a far cry from objectivity.

This wide response to the congresses is natural and logical. For these were congresses of parties that organize and direct the development of that part of the world which today exerts a determining influence on the entire course of world affairs. All the questions discussed at these congresses — whether of the results and perspectives of economic development, or problems of home and international policy — were examined from the standpoint of the country

concerned and of the entire community, in the overall context of the people's fight for peace, national emancipation and social progress.

The importance of the congresses cannot be fully discussed in a magazine article. Nevertheless, I shall try to deal with some of what I consider their important aspects.

What is behind the magnitude of the problems discussed, the confidence in the strength and abilities of socialism, the firm conviction of its continued victories? Existing socialism owes its strength and growing influence — and this was emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, the 11th BCP Congress and at congresses of other fraternal parties — to the united action, and fraternal mutual assistance that are built-in features of the socialist community. The increasingly closer relations of these countries have now become a law of their development. For reality has shown that concerting their efforts for the common goals of building the new society does not merely add to their strength, but multiplies it.

This is strikingly manifested in the political field: coordinated action by members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization is a decisive factor in the positive changes in the world situation; it reliably safeguards the sovereignty and independence of the peoples of the socialist countries. This is just as strikingly manifested in the economic field: constructive cooperation within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, especially after adoption of the Comprehensive Program, has made for further progress in solving key socio-economic problems and enabling the community to map the course of socio-economic development up to 1990.

World public opinion, judging by the wide response to the congresses, sees their international importance especially in their decisions on questions of war and peace, in the single foreign policy course they adopted for the socialist community, a course that accords with the peoples' innermost aspirations. Last year, in celebrating the 30th anniversary of victory over fascism, progressive mankind paid tribute to the Soviet Union both for its crucial contribution to that victory and for the fact that throughout the postwar period it has, in close cooperation with other socialist countries, championed international peace and security. Our ideological opponents find it hard to challenge the positive role of the 24th CPSU Congress Peace Program. The Program met with active support from the Communist parties and the progressive and peace forces throughout the world. Now the realistic way from the threat of thermonuclear war to a lasting peace has been charted in the Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples, adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress. It has been approved by Party congresses in fraternal countries and public

opinion at large. Every unbiased person can now see: socialism's peace offensive continues.

The socialist community has accumulated rich and fruitful experience in fashioning international relations of a qualitatively new type. Their central principle — as repeatedly emphasized in the congress documents — is proletarian, socialist internationalism. It is no secret that the bourgeois press has assiduously been inculcating the idea that the Communists, in upholding this principle, are acting as 'dogmatists,' refusing to reckon with the profound changes in the world, and so on. At their congresses the Marxist-Leninists reaffirmed their responsibility for a scientific and class analysis of the most pressing problems of our time. And this analysis provides no reason to 'bury' — as the bourgeois ideologists would like — the principle of proletarian internationalism, which has stood the stern test of history.

These congresses vividly demonstrated the solidarity of the working class of the socialist countries and its political vanguard with the struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries, the national-liberation movement and all progressive forces.

'Proletarian internationalism' Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party, has said, 'acquired its clear-cut class character with the emergence of the revolutionary working-class movement. After the Second World War and the founding of the socialist world system . . . on the basis of proletarian internationalism there arose socialist internationalism as the expression of the common interests of the working class and people of countries that have adopted the socialist system.' Of course, this is not some special regional variety of international contacts. Socialist internationalism is an organic part of proletarian internationalism and has absorbed the rich historical traditions of international working-class solidarity forged over many decades of struggle for social and national liberation, democracy, peace and socialism. The point is that existing socialism, the socialist community, was the first in history to create conditions in which the victorious working class can fully and consistently discharge its internationalist mission. And it is no accident that, in their speeches, the numerous foreign guests at the recent congresses forcefully reaffirmed the conclusion drawn by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: 'the defense of socialism is an international duty of Communists.' And equally forcefully they voiced the need for genuine Leninist internationalists to administer a stern rebuff to anti-Sovietism of every variety, including Maoism. As for our Party, today as 50 years ago, it has remained true to the firm declaration of Georgi Dimitrov that the attitude toward the Soviet Union, the first worker-peasant state, is the touchstone of genuine internationalism.

The Party Congresses of the fraternal countries were a forum of collective Marxist-Leninist thought. They demonstrated the inexhaustible content of proletarian internationalism, the way it reflects the growing scale and multiformity of the revolutionary struggle in the present-day world. It is now perfectly clear that the achievements of the revolutionary forces are all the greater, the closer the unity of the communist movement. The great internationalist responsibility of Communists for the development of the revolutionary process need hardly be emphasized. For it is precisely our unity that is the earnest of success on every national sector and on the entire front of the international communist and workers' movement. One is inconceivable without the other.

The bourgeois press carries all manner of allegations about a 'crisis' in world communism revealed at the recent congresses. Differences in approach to one or another problem that arise at times between Communists of some countries, are presented as sharp contradictions. This wishful thinking was effectively exposed at the congresses, which also demonstrated the determination of Marxist-Leninists to strengthen the cohesion of the world communist movement.

To take one example: the broad representation at the congresses of Communist and Workers' parties and revolutionary contingents of the national-liberation movement. There were more foreign delegations than ever before and the vast majority voiced their full support for the policy of the fraternal parties of the socialist community. I think we have every right to say of these congresses that they were an effective form of cooperation in the international communist movement and provided added evidence of the fruitful application of internationalism by Marxist-Leninists.

Characteristically, too, the intransient value of proletarian internationalism was emphasized also by representatives of the advanced contingents of the national-liberation movement, who expressed their solidarity with the principled foreign-policy line of the ruling parties of the fraternal countries.

The joint efforts of Communists of various countries contribute to the further elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory, enrich our collective experience in applying the common regularities of the class struggle and the transition to socialism in differing conditions. In this context, the congresses especially noted the value of the CPSU's experience. The Communist party of each country works out its strategy and tactics of transition from capitalism to socialism independently. In charting the road to this great goal, there naturally arise distinctions due to the specific conditions in which the parties have to work, and there can be dissimilarity of views on some problems. The

congresses stressed anew that a Marxist-Leninist approach requires discussion of such problems from positions of proletarian internationalism, with concern for the unity of our movement.

Anyone who studies congress records is bound to see that the tasks the ruling parties of socialist countries are carrying out are more alike now, and that their activities and development have common features and are governed by common laws.

In the 60s and early 70s, many fraternal parties finished laying the foundations of socialism, achieved impressive successes in evening out economic levels and set out to build developed socialism. As socialist society matures; its social, political and economic advantages become more evident. Equally important, the features of the new system and the regularities of its development stand out more clearly in the process and shed what Marx called the 'birthmarks of the old society' (see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 17).

It would be wrong to interpret the growing unity of the socialist system as disregard of national or concrete historical aspects of development, or blind imitation of the example of others. All the key problems of building the new society — economic strategy, specific lines of social progress, and ways and means of perfecting the political and social system — have been solved by the Communists of each socialist country at their highest forums. Their decisions are based on analysis of the domestic situation and a creative scientific approach, with due regard to historical and national conditions.

Nor could it have been otherwise. The fraternal parties, which have undertaken to build the new society, would be unable to cope with their tasks if they, to use Lenin's phrase, had painted the past, present and future 'in a monotonous grey' (see *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 70). Furthermore, they cannot fulfill these tasks unless they draw on each other's experience and respect the general laws of social development discovered by Marxism-Leninism. Innovating and enriching the theory and practice of scientific communism do not consist in revising, let alone renouncing, these laws but in creatively applying them to new problems. We believe the recent congresses were important because they forcefully reaffirmed this.

In regard to this aspect of the significance of the congresses, I would like to stress that they produced new evidence of the growing role of Communist and Workers' parties in guiding the development of socialist society and contributed to our experience and our ideas of how the parties should perform this role at the stage of building developed socialism and communism.

Speakers at the congresses stressed the indisputable fact that the magnitude of the tasks and the parties' growing prestige and respon-

sibility make still greater demands on every Communist and every Party's organizations. Our immense experience indicates that the key to success in Party leadership is to further develop Leninist methods: scientific approach, creativity, collective leadership, criticism and self-criticism, checking to see that decisions are carried out and an exacting attitude to oneself and to others, an uncompromising stand against all formalism and red tape. All this was evident at the congresses, which discussed fundamental political issues in a businesslike, critical and self-critical spirit. Speakers did not confine themselves to listing gains, but pointed to difficulties, unsolved problems and shortcomings and suggested ways of dealing with them. As the political vanguard and leader of socialist society, the parties will continue, the congresses noted, to uphold the tried and tested principle of democratic centralism and foster democracy in the Party and throughout society.

Closer links with the working class and other working people is the guarantee of effective Party leadership. Today ours are mass parties but they remain parties of the working class. Even under developed socialism, on becoming parties of the whole people, they lose none of their class character, as the experience of Lenin's Party shows. 'By its very nature, the CPSU has always been, and remains, a party of the working class,' L.I. Brezhnev pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress.

The attention and efforts of Communists center invariably on people, on providing the conditions for their further harmonious development. We think one of the most remarkable features of the recent congresses is that they re-emphasized the humanist nature of the policy of ruling Communist and Workers' parties. Congress documents show that, with the vast potentialities the socialist countries command, the fraternal parties will continue to follow a social development strategy centered on man, his steadily growing material and spiritual requirements.

The material basis of this strategy is, now as in the past, dynamic growth of the economic potential. The socialist countries' economic achievements, with the severe crisis gripping the capitalist world, need hardly be emphasized. They enabled the socialist community to carry out an extensive social program aimed at improving living standards. The previous five-year period saw a substantial increase in real incomes, wages and salaries, and various benefits out of social consumption funds. It was a period of vast housing construction and further improvements in social maintenance, health care and public education.

Drawing people into public activities and encouraging their initiative is the parties' special concern. Marxist-Leninists regard the

people's political activity, production effort and daily participation in the management of public affairs — activities unknown and unthinkable under the capitalist system — as a decisive advantage of socialism and a clear indication of its democracy. The measures adopted so far to extend the functions and jurisdiction of elected government bodies and non-governmental organizations, primarily those of the trade unions and Communist Youth leagues, and the vast programs approved by the congresses to carry out further measures in this direction invite the conclusion that building mature socialism and communism must mean promoting socialist democracy. Indeed, it is a decisive factor in our advance.

It is fair to say that in the competition with capitalism, socialism has not only provided better living conditions fit for man but has created a new man, a man free from the dehumanizing impact of relations based on exploitation. The predominant type of individual in our society, it was said at the 11th BCP Congress, is the socialist type, an individual whose qualities and features are expressive of the genuinely humanist and collectivist nature of our society. This is not to say, of course, that educational work has lost its importance. On the contrary, it is gaining in importance, for as society advances to developed socialism and communism the cultivation of ideological, political and moral qualities plays an increasing part. After all, it is man that has always been the greatest asset of our social system.

The Communists' forums devoted much attention to the youth. This is only natural, since the future of the socialist community and implementation of its plans running to 1990 depends to a considerable extent on the character of today's younger generation. 'The overwhelming majority of our youth,' Todor Zhivkov has said, 'are genuine sons and daughters of their socialist epoch, young men and women with alert minds and pure souls, with sound ideological and moral principles.' The young people of our countries make a tangible contribution to the progress of socialist society by taking an active part in its economic, social and cultural development. By inspiring youth with loyalty to revolutionary traditions, to proletarian, socialist internationalism, the fraternal parties are training a new generation of fighters for communism.

The scale of the work done by the Communists and peoples of fraternal countries in the past five years and their plans for the future, convincingly show that in competing with capitalism, the socialist community has scored historic successes in every sphere of construction of the new society. The far-reaching, optimistic plans made by the congresses increasingly influence the thinking and behavior of hundreds of millions, who are coming to realize that socialism is the main line of social progress.

Party experience

The freedom Mexico needs

Jose Encarnacion Perez
Executive Commission member,
Mexican CP

Developments in Mexico bear out the correctness of the political forecasts made by the 17th National Congress of the Mexican Communist Party (late 1975) and the fundamental tactic approved by the Congress. Unlike the previous Congress (1973), concerned chiefly with working out the Party program, the latest Congress concentrated on specifying and carrying forward the Party's general tactical line, in particular by putting forward a democratic and left-wing electoral platform.[1]

The period separating the two congresses saw new signs of a deepening political, social and economic crisis. Differences within the ruling class intensified, especially over the form of government. The bloc of officially recognized political parties is beginning to crack and the undemocratic electoral system of today is being criticized ever more sharply.

The deterioration of the economic situation is indisputable.[2] Dependence on U.S. imperialism has not diminished in the least. In spite of official criticisms of the activity of multinational companies, the government does its utmost to attract foreign investments, primarily from the United States.[3] The trend toward establishing capitalist monopoly domination over the economy is more manifest than ever.

Through these years, the government has demagogically affirmed that it wants to distribute the national wealth more equitably. Yet its economic policy of 'development in the interests of all' helps private capital, primarily the biggest firms, to boost their profits. Inflation, aggravated by government measures (prices have been going up by almost 25 per cent a year), has widened the gap between the working people's and the capitalists' share of the national income. What is known as 'fair taxation' actually benefits big capital. The government has refused to levy a proportional progressive tax on corporate profits, alleging that such a measure might discourage private investment, so the Treasury draws on the working people and middle strata for extra funds.

The social and economic crisis has a disastrous effect on agriculture. Export of cotton, sugar, cattle and other items has diminished considerably. Mexico has begun to import maize, wheat, rice, beans, milk, butter and other foods. The government calls for greater investments in farming. It plans to reorganize the *egidos* (peasant communes — *Ed.*) with irrigated land and encourages the establishment of mixed agricultural enterprises. However, these extremely limited measures have not appreciably increased output. The crisis in farming cannot be ended unless progressive changes are effected in agrarian policy to get rid of imperialist dependence (which cannot be done under the present social economic system).

There is widespread discontent over worsening living and working conditions. The workers, peasants, students and other groups are stepping up the drive for immediate demands. The workers insist on higher wages to offset the rapid rise in the cost of living. The strike movement is expanding. The trade union bosses, who are linked with the government, are losing ground as the working class fights with increasing resolve for democratic and independent trade unions.

More and more often, agricultural workers, semi-proletarians and small producers seize vast uncultivated tracts belonging to big landowners, that is, property that should have been transferred to the peasants under the existing agrarian laws, and use other forms of mass struggle.

The authorities' invariable reaction is repression. True, two and a half years ago the government slightly liberalized the regime, with the result that it became possible to settle conflicts between workers and employers by negotiation. But the 'thaw' was short-lived. The authorities fell back on suppressing strikes (described by the President as 'crazy') and on giving their unqualified support to the union bosses. Official hostility to the working people is also seen in the suppression of the movement for independent and democratic trade unions. This movement exists in the united trade union center of electricians and is backed by independent unions and progressive political forces. A demonstration in support of the democratic current in the electricians' union was held on November 15 last. It brought together up to 150,000 people, which is noteworthy in itself in view of the government ban on public rallies.

Persecution on political grounds has never stopped.[4] Universities led by democrats independent of the government are under constant attack from state governors, the police and the armed forces and are denied government subsidies. Their autonomy and democratic freedoms are infringed. Two university lecturers, Joel Arriaga and Enrique Cabrera, were assassinated in Puebla.

In their hounding of progressives, the police are guilty of grave

crimes. They torture and kill their victims with impunity. In January 1975, Professor Hilario Moreno Aguirre, a veteran Communist, was tortured to death as retaliation for our Party's solidarity with the Guatemalan Party of Labor over the assassination of its General Secretary, Huberto Alvarado. The President ordered an investigation to punish the culprits but the judicial authorities have so far thrown no light on the case.[5]

The alternative put forward by our Party in contrast to the despotic, paternalist presidential regime is the slogan of political freedoms, i.e., 'the direct participation, guaranteed by law (by a constitution), of all citizens in the government of the state, the guaranteed right of all citizens freely to assemble, discuss their affairs, influence affairs of state through their associations and the press' (Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 2, p. 118).

In calling for political freedoms, encouraging the working people's fight for their demands and building up the unity of action of revolutionary and democratic forces, our Party expresses its opposition to the existing social system, to the political regime and government of President Luis Echeverria, a government of the big bourgeoisie committed to anti-democratic policies. The MCP urges the people to deny this government all support.

Even before the 17th Congress, our Central Committee began to work for the unity of democratic and left-wing political organizations and engaged in bilateral talks with parties willing to discuss the aims and forms of cooperation and the possibility of united action in the given political context.[6] In line with this tactic, the Party leadership proposed to all who wanted unity to put forward a democratic left-wing alternative in the general election, formulate their own program, draw up a list of candidates and demand their registration.

However, no left-wing democratic electoral coalition could be formed at the time. In view of this, the 17th Congress decided to nominate for the Presidency of the Republic Valentin Campa Salazar, a veteran of our Party and the working-class movement, a seasoned revolutionary who had spent more than 15 years in jail. The Congress stated, however, that the MCP would be willing to withdraw its candidate if a democratic and left-wing bloc were formed during the election campaign and if it agreed on a common candidate. The Socialist Organization Movement and Socialist League, which agreed to back Campa, joined our Party in formulating a common electoral platform. This led to the emergence of a left-wing coalition ready to negotiate a broader alliance with other organizations. According to a decision of the 17th Congress, our CC proposed to the Socialist Popular Party (SPP) to discuss the possibility of putting forward a common presidential candidate, on the understanding that he might

also win support from other parties and political organizations. The SPP rejected our proposal, saying that it was going to vote for the candidate of the ruling party, Jose Lopez Portillo, favored by the oligarchy and the top bureaucracy. It has become customary with that party to regard each new government as anti-imperialist, as a government of the so-called 'national democratic and patriotic front.' This means something more than invariably backing candidates of the government of the big bourgeoisie. It means condemning the trade union, peasant, student and other movements, which are fighting for their economic, social and political demands from positions independent of the government.[7]

It follows that only two presidential candidates are still running. They are Valentin Campa Salazar from the workers and Communists and Jose Lopez Portillo from the oligarchy and political bureaucracy. This puts a special responsibility on our Party and the left-wing coalition. The task now is to find the most effective ways of acquainting public opinion with our platform and draw the people into the struggle for democracy and political freedoms.

Although the election campaign started only a few months ago, the MCP and its allies have already made substantial gains. Our Party's political and social influence is growing. In urban and rural areas alike, thousands of working people hear the Communists and their presidential candidate. They support our position and demand that the MCP and Valentain Campa be officially registered. Many apply for Party membership.

We have made unquestionable if modest headway in the fight for political freedoms. This includes the bill on amnestying those who were put on trial after the 1968 events.[8] The President of the Republic recently submitted it to Congress, and even though this belated bill is limited in scope, with its preamble distorting certain facts, it marks a victory for the democratic forces and makes it possible to wage the class struggle in an atmosphere of respect for civil freedoms and for the existence of diverse political trends.

It is certainly not because we covet the presidency that we joined in the election campaign. Under the current regime, the election of the next president is a foregone conclusion. The MCP is using the campaign to expose the violation of civil rights, including the rights of the working class. Our purpose is to increase our mass influence, first of all among the working class, organize it more effectively, strengthen our own ranks and win over new organized forces so as to have an even more active part in a class struggle that is daily gaining in intensity.

In this campaign, the Communist Party advocates unity of the democratic and left-wing forces and united action by working

people's organizations for independent and democratic trade unions. It sharply criticizes the regime and proposes an electoral program aimed at solving acute social and political problems. At the same time, our Party sets out its general plan for reorganizing society on democratic and socialist principles, states its view on the causes of the political crisis and the possibilities of its democratic resolution, and urges the masses to form independent organizations, close their ranks and strengthen their vanguard, the political party of the working class.

The Communist Party has serious difficulties to cope with. Public bickering between the top political bureaucracy headed by President Echeverria, on the one hand, and the oligarchic group uniting the Cerveceria Cuauhtemoc Co., the London-Mexican Bank and other sections of the bourgeoisie, on the other, is indicative of a political crisis (discord within the ruling class) stemming from the crisis of the social and economic structure. This bickering does not affect the foundations of government, of the despotic, paternalist presidential political regime, and the various groups of the bourgeoisie agree that it should not. They now argue over the forms and methods the government should use: continue, in the present situation, to use force and repression against the working people defending their interests and the revolutionary left-wing organizations demanding respect for democratic freedoms, or resolve the problems and socio-political conflicts that arise by negotiation and allow diverse political movements to operate unhampered.

We Communists want the government to adopt an economic policy that will raise living standards. We seek progressive changes in electoral legislation and want the law on amnesty to be extended to all political prisoners, all who are awaiting trial on political charges. We demand an immediate end to political repression and insist on respect for the right to demonstrate, especially in the capital where demonstrations are unlawfully banned, the right to strike and other trade union rights, registration of the candidates of the left-wing coalition, and so on.

The 17th Congress stressed the connection between our gains and the new world balance of forces and the policy of peaceful coexistence, the most valuable achievement of which is détente.

In these circumstances the big bourgeoisie, which is in power, maneuvers to preserve its economic interests and tries to create an image that would bring in both foreign support and the backing of internal political forces in the class struggle. There is no contradiction between the Echeverria government's home and foreign policies, for they uphold the same class interests. In view of the new world situation, however, the government has severed relations with the

Chilean military junta, improved relations with Cuba, given its backing to such institutions as the Latin American Economic System, established relations with almost all socialist countries, and makes friendly statements about Vietnam. All these acts coincide with the positions and demands of Mexico's left-wing, democratic forces. They are also an unquestionable result of our struggle over a long period and of our solidarity with fraternal peoples. By their devoted efforts in the open struggle against bourgeois positions, the Mexican people have strengthened their traditional brotherhood and friendship with peoples defending their rights and independence.

The 17th Congress devoted much attention to Party matters, to methods of leadership at all levels, the work of Party branches and their numerical growth, primarily among industrial workers. The Congress has deepened the conception of the Party as a highly organized force whose function is to lead the masses and awaken them to the economic and political realities of our country and the world.

The situation in Mexico is favorable to the Party's all-round growth. The Communists have a vast audience among the people, their links with the masses are becoming stronger from day to day and their friendly relations with other revolutionary and democratic forces are expanding. On the whole, practice shows our general line to be correct.

The Party is united and prepared to carry out its tasks. This is not to say there are no difficulties or mistakes. The process of putting an end to spontaneity in Party work generally and to sectarianism in organizational matters is near to a successful conclusion. Our Party is making progress, showing militancy and exercising self-criticism.

1. The reference is to the general election to be held this year. The MCP has lately followed the tactic of actively boycotting elections, a tactic backed by millions of Mexicans. — *Note by Samuel Melendrez, MCP representative on the journal.*

2. The GNP growth rate is but slightly ahead of the rate of population growth. In the past 10 years, agricultural production has been increasing by an annual average of 1.6 per cent while the population has been growing at a rate of 3.4 per cent. The external debt is estimated by some economists to have reached $22,712m. in December 1975. The foreign trade deficit in 1975 approximated to $4,000m. and the state budget showed a deficit of nearly $2,500m.

3. Jose Lopez Portillo, former Minister of Finance and prospective president of the Republic, has repeatedly met with representatives of the Morgan and Rockefeller corporations to spell out — in case it is misinterpreted — official Mexican policy toward foreign capital and to ask for more investments in our economy.

4. In 1974, the army kidnapped 300 peasants, schoolteachers and shopkeepers in the Atoyac area (Guerrero State) on the pretext of fighting guerrillas. It is believed that the kidnapped were sent to military camps without legal procedure. Several hundred men and women are in jail for alleged crimes involving guerrilla activity. Although the government calls them 'common criminals,' they are actually political prisoners. Many peasants who fight for land are charged with 'stealing cattle' and with other criminal offences, and are put behind bars by the police or the armed forces.

5. Lately repression has eased somewhat. Democratic and revolutionary political parties opposed to the regime are allowed to publish newspapers and to have premises of their own. The government raises fewer obstacles to public activity than before. It has become possible freely to carry out publicity and other campaigns. Nevertheless, the authorities will not hear of any serious amendments to undemocratic and unconstitutional laws ruling out the above parties' participation in elections on an equal footing with others.

6. We have made the greatest progress in this respect in talks with representatives of the Socialist Organization Movement, Socialist League, Mexican Party of Working People and Socialist Action and Unity Movement. Joint communiques have been published on economic problems and on social and political rights. It is very important that the MCP and these organizations are establishing friendly relations enabling them to discuss a wide range of problems in a comradely spirit in order to achieve lasting unity. As regards the Socialist Popular Party, our Party has serious differences with it over the attitude to the government but we emphasize the points we agree on, which should make it possible to work out a common social and political platform.

7. The latest national assembly of the Mexican Party of Working People decided to stay out of the election campaign. The Socialist Party of Working People, founded not long ago, is not on the electoral lists. It has refused to hold talks with the Communists. The right-wing National Action Party cannot nominate a candidate in view of internal discord.

8. That is, members of the MCP and Mexican Party of Working People, non-party militants and ordinary citizens falsely accused of committing criminal offences during student and popular actions in 1968.

Vanguard role in the mass movement

André Vieuguet
PB member, French CP

We continue our series of articles in which the authors set out their views on building a mass Marxist-Leninist party and discuss experience in their particular countries. Earlier articles appeared in the April and June issues of *WMR*.

The 22nd Congress of the French Communist Party gave a substantiated answer to a question being asked by most people in France: What kind of society does the country need, and how is it to be built?

'We Communists are convinced,' the unanimously adopted Congress Statement says, 'that the new society will be socialist. And we are not proclaiming a utopian idea, nor seeking to impose a structure born of our imagination. No, our aims accord with the requirements and aspirations of the working people, and with the potentialities and conditions of France as we know it today, and of the world of today.'

We are also convinced that the effort to build such a society — a

more just, reliable and humane one — can unite all workers, and all the democratic and national forces, irrespective of their differing views. The very diversity of these forces enables each of them to make its own specific contribution. This is bound to have a positive effect on unity of the French people, because more and more men and women are coming to realize that their interests coincide with those of the working class.

At their 22nd Congress, the French Communists sought to explain to the people what distinguished their Party as a political force: its vanguard role, mass character, unremitting effort to promote the interests of the working class, the people and the nation.

We can give leadership to the mass movement because our's is the only Party whose strategy is based on the realities of the world, the time and the country we live in, and on the longings of the working class and people. At the same time, materialization of this strategy, which has already begun, stimulates the social and political struggle and brings nearer the fundamental changes which, beyond all doubt, will be the crucial test of our ability to march in the van of the movement.

All this means that strengthening the Party's vanguard role and its mass character are inseparable from its political arims, and its advance to socialism along a democratic and revolutionary road.

Throughout its history, the French Communist Party has been able to play a vanguard role and win the active support of the working class and working people because its political and ideological activity always realistically concentrated on vital issues around which the broad social strata and their political organizations could unite.

The very conditions in which our Party was founded predetermined its vanguard role and mass character. Contrary to all the reactionary allegations, the party did not emerge as an 'alien element' in the French labor movement. From its inception in 1920 and throughout the years of ideological struggle against right and 'left' opportunism, it enriched the gains of the French labor movement, won in more than a century of struggle. For it was the Communists, and not the minority that sought to continue the policy and activity of the old Socialist Party, that took up and has held aloft the banner of the Paris Communards.

Lenin had implicit faith in the possibility of merging the rich heritage of the French workers' movement with the epochal experience of the victorious October Revolution. It was this faith that prompted the Presidium of the Second Comintern Congress to appeal to the French Socialists to create a 'powerful Communist Party.' That appeal met with a ready response from the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Party. That is why the 'transformation' of the most representative

working-class party into the Communist Party saved us from becoming an isolated sect.

There was also another factor that helped the young Communist Party win mass influence. The collapse of the Second International during the imperialist war was painfully felt by all active Socialists — they had been betrayed by their leaders. They wanted a party that would preclude a repetition of this, a Party whose decisions would be binding on all. There followed a hard struggle for adoption of democratic centralism. This was of decisive importance in transforming the Party into a militant and far-seeing organization enjoying the trust of the masses. Appreciation of the national significance of the working-class struggle took firm hold in the course of the difficult confrontation with sectarianism and opportunism.

By its activity, the Communist Party demonstrated its ability to inspire and stimulate the mass movement. The national character of the Party was further emphasized by the slogan advanced by Maurice Thorez: 'A popular front for bread, freedom and peace.' Its class substance and profound democratic and national character assured its wide acceptance by the people.

The Popular Front idea, brought to reality in 1936, had not been fully formulated in the works of Marx and Lenin. Premised on the general principles of scientific socialism and on a searching analysis of the concrete situation, it was thus an innovative contribution to the international workers' movement.

In the Resistance years, in the battle to liberate France, there was born the idea of a national front which replaced the Popular Front slogan and re-emphasized its genuine patriotic character. Our policy of alliances bore fruit, and in 1945 the Communist Party was the country's strongest in terms of influence, organization and parliamentary representation.

The Party's vanguard role and mass character are inseparable from its policy of uniting the workers and all the democratic and national forces. This was clearly demonstrated at the most crucial moments of our history.

If the Communist Party cannot muster sufficient strength at difficult turning points in the internal and international situation; if, despite all its efforts, it cannot play the leading role in a broad amalgamation jointly to solve national problems, then unity of the working class and the masses cannot counter the blows of reaction or the opportunistic compromises of the Socialist and the other class-collaboration parties.

These lessons of the past have a very special relevance today, for never before has the question of changing France's policy, power structure and the social system been so sharply posed.

We draw on the experience of past broad democratic alliances which no manipulation by the big bourgeoisie can erase from history. Our aim is to stimulate and use the vast potential of the popular movement which originated in other conditions.

Monopoly oppression is being intensified. The stranglehold of the big capitalist groupings, the multinationals, over the economic and political life of France is becoming intolerable to the working class and the mass of the people. Everyone feels the ruinous effects of monopoly domination. The social and political struggle for immediate demands and deep-going and permanent change is growing in scope and militancy. In fact, all the non-monopoly social strata are suffering from the crisis. The only ones to benefit from it are the financial oligarchy and the big industrialists, with their immense wealth and immense power over the lives of millions of Frenchmen.

President Giscard d'Estaing's reactionary policy is helping the crisis penetrate every pore of public life. The result has been more acute social contradictions, which are placing in question not only the efficient functioning of the system, but also its very existence. For those who run the country's economy and shape its policy can offer the people only more hardship, more authoritarian rule, and continued disregard of national interests. This is bringing home to the people the realization that capitalism has lived out its day and the time is ripe for social change.

The 22nd Congress, which centered on this question, on changing the social system, on the content of socialism in our country and the ways and means of achieving it, truly reflected the interests of the French people. Our purpose in organizing increasingly united and conscious mass action is to win the majority of our people for socialism. Never before has the Party set itself such far-reaching goals. They are daring and at the same time realistic, for the French people, the working class and its allies, play a much bigger role today, and that applies also to their vanguard, their democratic and revolutionary party, the French Communist Party.

The positive changes in the world alignment of forces have helped to enhance the role of the working class and the popular masses. Developments have fully confirmed the statement of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that 'the present phase is characterized by growing possibilities for a further advance of the revolutionary and progressive forces.'

The imperialists have no qualms about combating the liberation struggle in all parts of the world. But they no longer have the same economic, political, military and ideological means to do that, for the balance of world forces has changed to the disadvantage of imperial-

ism. Its historical retreat hampers action against progressive popular movements.

And never before have the people had such immense opportunities to shape their destiny and advance to national and social emancipation. These new opportunities are the result of the strengthening and solidarity of the leading forces of progress and peace: the socialist states, the working class and popular masses of the capitalist countries, and the national-liberation movement.

And so, international conditions favor unprecedented development of the French people's struggle.

The events in Chile and, though in different conditions, those in Portugal, should leave no doubt about the vast opportunities of our time. The main lesson to be drawn from this is that the success of the democratic forces depends on the existence and development of a sufficiently broad popular movement united to bring about change. That main lesson confirms the correctness of our analysis of economic, social and political evolution in France. This is how Georges Marchais put it at the Party congress: 'The convergence of fundamental interests of all (non-monopoly — *A.V.*) social forces presents unparalleled opportunities for enlisting the majority of the people in the work of restructuring society and creating around such a great force as the working class a broad movement encompassing the majority of the people. That is the new historic reality. Should we avail ourselves of it? Certainly.'

How can we unite this vast multifarious mass into an integral whole without impairing its effective action? Only through democratic struggle to uphold and steadily expand the freedoms already won by the people.

The big bourgeoisie and its political henchmen fear freedom. As never before they are working to intensify the authoritarian character of the present regime. And only the working class, united in struggle, can bring a new renaissance of freedom. It alone, with its ability to involve the popular masses in the democratic and national struggle, can carry freedom to its consummation, i.e., the abolition of exploitation and the establishment of socialism. We are exerting every effort to activize the workers' struggle in the factories for their political rights. Only the working class, through active participation in administering the country, can assure the transition from monopoly control of the economy to control by the nation of its economic and social development; the transition from the authoritarian rule of the political servitors of big capital to the broadest democracy.

The development of that democracy, the extension of individual and collective freedoms, will strengthen the popular movement and win its support for a democratic, and subsequently, socialist govern-

ment in which the masses will play their part. At the same time, the mass struggle will help to change the relation of social and political forces in favor of the workers and the people.

The Congress statement emphasizes that 'the democratic road to socialism which we offer the French people represents stages in a persistant mass struggle ... Every such stage will prepare the democratic expression of the people's will through universal suffrage and will guarantee its respect.'

Making freedom and democracy the *focal point of the revolutionary struggle,* and utilizing all means to enable the working class to play the leading role, will create the political conditions for an alignment of popular forces that will isolate the big bourgeoisie and prevent its use of violence against the gains and government of the working people.

The strategy we offer our people to achieve genuine democratic socialism in the conditions obtaining in a country like France, envisages a road differing from dictatorship of the proletariat which no longer reflects the realities of our country. For a government organized to direct the socialist reconstruction of society will be a government of the working class and other sections of the working people, i.e., of the overwhelming majority of the population. It will be based on a freely expressed choice through universal suffrage and its tasks will include deep-going democratization of every aspect of economic, social and political life. It will itself respect, and guarantee respect, of the people's democratic choice.

Backed by such a government, the working class and the people, who will have an active part at all levels of public life, will become the main factor in building and defending socialism. An important step in developing democracy, which is the very essence of our road to socialism, must be the implementation of the common government program of the left forces. Its underlying idea is democratization of national life through a series of reforms of an anti-imperialist character and with a progressive social, cultural and political content.

In short, the socialism we want for France will be based on the universal principles of scientific socialism as adapted to our reality and reflecting our specifics. It will be a socialism in the colors of France.

In the fight to change life our people have such solid assets as a battle-seasoned working class, tempered revolutionary labor movement and a strong Communist Party.

Society will not be changed by some miraculous collapse of capitalist domination under the weight of its own crisis. Change requires dedicated activity by all victims of the crisis, i.e., the overwhelming majority of the French people and, above all, the working class. The objective identity of interests of the social forces that represent the

people of France cannot spontaneously lead them to appreciate the need for an alliance to attain our transformatory goals.

Besides, the present thoroughly reactionary regime is trying to divert every movement capable of achieving positive results for the people and the nation. Of decisive importance today is the ability to transmute the people's resentment and opposition into action, into a conscious movement for genuine change. Of special importance in this context is Lenin's idea, enunciated in the early years of the century, about the need for a revolutionary party capable, even in its embryonic stage, of understanding and evaluating the spontaneous movement and directing it, through united mass struggle, to a clear understanding of its tasks.

For our Party to win decisive influence in the popular movement it must become the propagandist and organizer of the revolutionary struggle. This is a formidable task calling for energetic effort in the ideological, political and organizational fields, and constant development of Marxist-Leninist theory and our political orientation. The Congress statement stresses: 'To successfully accomplish this task, the Communist Party must constantly enrich its theory. This theory, formulated by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and the world communist movement, is enriched also by raising the level of knowledge of Party members and by taking account of the experience of existing socialism, the evolution of social reality, international developments and the struggle of the peoples. This implies constant progress of the Party's collective thought and of each of its member's ability to combine fidelity to principles with an understanding of realities.'

Our analysis of these realities underscores the decisive role of the working class, discloses the reasons why the Communists, under all circumstances, are working for its unity and for alliances that accord with the interests and aims of the movement.

Our theory is in line with the national character of the measures we are using to fight the crisis. Socialism can come only as the result of the motion of history, the people's struggle, with all their traditions and aspirations. The fight for socialism continues and enriches the fight for individual and collective freedom which the French people have been waging for more than a century. It provides a realistic basis for the development and flourishing of humanism.

From all this there follows that the creative development of our scientific theory saliently brings out the liberating character of popular unity around the working class. There is another aspect of our Party's vanguard role in the present political and ideological struggle. Reference is to the forms of organization and the principle of demo-

cratic centralism, both of which are attracting so much attention and interest among Frenchmen.

The norms governing internal Party life stand out more sharply against the background of the disintegration trends in other political parties. We abide by the principle of majority decisions in all our discussions; this implies that the word should be matched by the deed. All this contributes to the effectiveness of our work and makes for greater support of our Party, the only realiable force of change. And our supporters are convinced that the Communist Party will always serve only the interests of the working class and the nation.

The past reverses and shortcomings of the Socialist Party caused by big bourgeois pressure and, on the other hand, the increasing strength of the left alliance as the political core of a united popular majority for democratic renewal, makes democratic centralism, which presupposes adherence to obligations assumed, an earnest of faith in the alliance and respect for the multiparty system. It is precisely the principle of democratic centralism that is helping to ingrain the belief that the Communist Party is the tested bulwark of the working people.

If our political line is to be translated into practice, it is necessary, along with developing theory and enriching internal Party life, to enlarge our organization.

With the battle for socialism gaining momentum in France, our correct perspective, based on close analysis can be accepted by the masses only if there is a well-organized Communist Party, with a large membership and with strong support in town and country, and especially in the factories. The mass character of our Party is determined not only by the success of its initiatives, but also by its organizational strength.

The 22nd Congress devoted special attention to this aspect of French political reality. No other party can set such bold and realistic organizational goals as we have set for 1976. The explanation for that is simple enough: no other party has come before the people of France with such far-reaching aims; no other party — and this is evident from the response of our 22nd Congress — enjoys such active and wide support, nor can it recruit new forces to stimulate its continued development. No other party can place at the service of the workers and the people the dedicated efforts of 500,000 men and women organized in more than 23,000 Party nuclei.

Our goal now is to increase Party membership to 600,000 and the number of nuclei to 25,000 and we are successfully coping with that task. We want to have 10,000 factory nuclei by the end of the year.

And so, the battle for the unity of our people, for the reorganization of society, does not overshadow the determining features of our van-

guard role, or our mass influence. More, with the upsurge of the workers and democratic struggle, it is necessary to develop and accentuate these features.

In his Central Committee report to the Congress, Georges Marchais emphasized: 'To lead the country out of the crisis, uphold the workers' cause today so that it shall triumph tomorrow, vanquish the big bourgeoisie today and prevent it from encroaching on the people's democratic choice tomorrow, we must have a stronger, more influential and active Communist Party. That is the decisive condition for the triumph of socialism in France.'

We want to exert a decisive influence not in order to dominate, but in order to ensure the victory of the popular movement at every stage of the fight for social progress, freedom, democracy and socialism.

We attach the greatest important to these words of Lenin, in his *What Is To Be Done?* 'It is not enough to call ourselves the "vanguard," the advanced contingent; we must act in such a way that *all* the other contingents recognize and are obliged to admit that we are marching in the vanguard' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 5, p. 426).

To march in the vanguard and attract new supporters, we must have a clear perspective, show self-sacrifice and determination in our everyday efforts on behalf of the workers and the popular masses. We want to be in the front ranks of the fight for the interests of all the people; in the fight to uphold and extend freedom, democracy, national independence and cooperation and friendship among the nations.

A more influential, strong and active Communist Party will help us increase the intensity and effectiveness of the fight for the interests and aspirations of our people, for closer solidarity with other Communist parties, with all the working-class, democratic and anti-imperialist forces, with all who want a world at peace.

And we shall redouble our efforts for a democratic France, for a socialist France in a world of peace and cooperation.

The Party of the people in the battle for socialism

Michele Rossi
Representative of Italian CP
on *WMR*

This year there have been about 5,000 section conferences of the Italian Communist Party (a section is composed of several nuclei). The Party Statutes call for annual section conferences, biannual federation and regional conferences and quadrennial national congresses. This makes for more democracy 'from below,' brings membership into discussion of the Party's political line and activity, provides democratic control of the various leading Party bodies and ensures the continued influx of new and young cadres into section, federation and regional committees. Since 1971 this process of cadre renewal has become a distinguishing feature of Party life.

'Open door' conferences

The section conferences are conducted on an 'open door' basis: they are open to all who support the Party, those who vote for it, in short, to all concerned citizens and local branch representatives of other political parties and democratic organizations. Far from constricting, this has enlivened and enriched the discussions. The development of this dialogue with Socialist, Christian Democrats, Republicans, representatives of Catholic labor organizations trade unions, the women's and youth movements, can only produce positive results. Conference discussions of topical issues, based on concrete analysis, widen the political vision of all participants, set concrete goals and work out a uniform perspective for the masses. To this should be added that these 'open' conferences do not inhibit self-critical analysis of Communist activity or the disclosure of shortcomings and mistakes. In fact, this gives the discussion a more businesslike and serious character, all the more so as it is keenly and critically followed by the workers and the public generally.

This type of conference is not entirely new, but it has now acquired special importance and responds to an objective necessity. Mass democratic activity has widened considerably over the past few years. Every Party section is confronted with a multitude of difficult

and complex problems concerning conditions at a particular factory or school, the functioning of local government, the public services, housing, the position of handicraftsmen, shopkeepers, etc. And all these problems have to be solved against the background of increasing political and social tension. That being so, only united action by the workers — by the entire people in fact — at every stage of preparing, organizing and conducting an increasingly vigorous democratic struggle can produce positive results.

The Party sections must concentrate on extending and consolidating grass-roots democracy in all its diverse forms. This makes for more mass pressure on existing elective institutions and activizes the various people's organizations and committees that have sprung up in recent years. This living and effective multiformity contributes to the struggle and enables more and more people to acquire democratic consciousness throught their own experience. In this respect the conferences have revealed a number of shortcomings that have to be overcome without delay.

But it has to be said that our Party sections, as distinct from comparable organizations of other parties, are constantly extending their activities. Their annual conferences stimulate the work of other democratic parties, especially now, when the situation demands more vigorous action. We are far from boasting and have no intentions of setting ourselves up as an example for others. We take a realistic view of our potentialities, limitations and shortcomings. But we do think that other democratic parties with long popular traditions and a broad support base, should make a bigger effort to stimulate membership activity and thereby contribute to the general democratic struggle. We Communists do not fear competition: the more activity by other parties, the quicker will we achieve our goal of bringing all the people into the struggle. 'Politics,' Lenin emphasized, 'begin where millions of men and women are; where there are not thousands, but millions, that is where serious politics begin . . .' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 100). Millions of men and women, and especially young people, have come to appreciate the decisive importance of their organized democratic struggle, of their control over the administration of the state and the political parties. Incidentally, this growing activity 'from below' can be observed in other democratic parties, too, as was clearly demonstrated at their recent national congresses. Delegates from local branches brought strong pressure to bear on the leadership for new policies and methods. The results of last year's June elections were a contributing factor in this respect.

Recruiting new members

In four years, from 1971 through 1975, we recruited 208,811 new

members, bringing total Party membership to 1,730,453. Judging from the latest returns, we can anticipate a still higher figure before the year is out. Recruitment is not something haphazard, conducted from one occasion to another, but is regular and systematic. This shows that to join the Communist Party, in the words of Enrico Berlinguer, means to 'make a choice entailing sacrifice and commitment, a choice that cannot be made light-heartedly,' and the presentation of Party cards is not just an ordinary occasion, but the 'result of unremitting and conscious effort by the Party and serious consideration by those who decide to join it.' For they know that they will belong to a 'political organization dedicated to struggle, that they have chosen a hard road which can bring joy and satisfaction, but certainly not privilege and an easy life' (*L'Unita,* March 28, 1976). And the facts show that the Party is being joined by those who want to share in its work, devote their spare time to Party activities and are ready to bear sacrifices, including financial sacrifices.

Leading American media have tried to play down the scandal caused by the exposure that some Italian political parties were financed by the CIA. To do that, and to discredit the Communist Party, they put out the story that it has been receiving financial assistance from 'Eastern Countries' through some 'commercial companies.' That proved a fiasco. The Italian press is practically unanimous in admitting that the Communists are the only Italian party to give account of its budget at press conferences, and that the same procedure is being followed by its federations and sections. The press admitted that the Communist Party depends mainly on its own financial resources (initiation fees, membership dues, contributions to the Party fund, etc.). In 1975 this accounted for 60 per cent of all the Party's revenue (with 40 per cent coming from state financing), and by 1979 self-financing will account for 75 per cent of the Party's revenue, in other words, will increase by 14 billion lira (see *Le Monde,* April 6, 1976). Italian and foreign journalists could satisfy themselves that in 1975 the Party's budget deficit, resulting from higher prices, amounted to more than 200 million lira. And they asked themselves, quite logically: how was it that other political parties, with much less revenue, are able to balance their budgets? The position of the Italian Communist Party on this issue, one Rome paper declared, should induce the public to demand that all political parties give account of their finances, just as the Communists do. And a mass circulation magazine declared that even if the Communists do receive money from their commercial enterprise, that is neither illegal nor amoral; at any rate, the Communists have 'clean hands,' all the more so — and this is now clear to everyone — no outside influence can determine or pressure their political line.

For all that, however, much still remains to be done to increase Party recruitment, both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

This applies above all to bringing in women, young people and workers. The number of women in the Party increased from 358,050 in 1971 to 406, 408 at the close of 1975, but that growth is inadequate considering the requirements of the present political situation, the increased part women play in political life and their specific needs and aims. Of course, the Communist Party has accomplished much more in this respect than the other parties: it has more women on regional, provincial and municipal councils. Nonetheless, the growing role of women in politics and the tasks ahead demand that we recruit more women, though this will not be easy.

The Young Communist Federation has grown, too, from 85,642 to 134,643 in the same period, and is now the country's strongest political youth organization. But here, too, we cannot say that the figures are adequate, considering the problems confronting the young generation. This was emphasized at the Federation's 20th Congress in Genoa last December. The youth vote was decisive in the May 12, 1974, referendum on divorce, and in the June 1975 elections. Concerted action, in which young Communists played an important part, compelled the government to do something about the difficult position of young Italians, promising to create and finance 50,000 new jobs, though this will not solve the employment or any of the other problems.

The present condition of the youth insistently requires that it be given a clear perspective and orientation. This, in turn, requires that the Young Communist Federation — and this was stressed at its congress — concentrate on priority tasks. One of these is to increase its membership, especially among girls, who now make up only 20 per cent. Another one — and this was especially stressed by the Federation's National Secretary, D'Alema — is to combat the policy and ideology of the extremist groups, with their opposition to united action and advocacy of a 'head on' struggle, which can only lead to the defeat of the labor movement. We must also resist their splitting tactics and attacks on the Communist Party. Equally, we must fight all manifestations of sectarianism and intolerance, always advocating a policy that accords with the interests of the youth and the country. That is the 'qualitative leap' the Communist youth organization must make with the Party's help.

And for the Party itself a priority task is to bring in more workers. Their share in the membership has increased over the four years from 39.5 to 40 per cent. Considering the general growth of the Party, this represents a more solid worker core. But the share of workers in leading Party bodies has declined. In the period between the 11th and

13th congresses the number of workers on federation committees increased from 1,654 to 2,054, but their percentage share decreased from 36.3 to 33.06. That tendency, though on a lesser scale, was apparent also at the 14th congress, as evidenced by the social composition of federation secretaries: at the 11th congress there were 39 workers among the 110 federation secretaries, and only 35 at the 14th congress.

Of course, this is attributable to many factors (for instance, it is impossible to combine Party leadership work with trade union activities) which I do not propose to discuss in detail. What has to be done is to bring more workers into the Party and give them more access to leading positions at all levels. Measures to that end have already been taken.

Cadre training

One of these is organization of a special one-year course at the Central Party School to prepare worker cadres. The curriculum — which, incidentally, astonished a group of foreign journalists who visited the school — covers a wide range of disciplines, from political economy to Italian history, from Marxism to modern literature, from the Spartacus movement to modern music. Most of the students have had experience of trade union and political struggle at their factory or residential area. What they lack is a general background, theoretical training consonant with the present requirements of Italian society. What they need is the knowledge and skill to enable them to analyze and solve problems relating to education, public health, transport, town planning, ecology, municipal administration, etc. The one-year course should also teach them research methods, because though collective research and discussion are of vital importance, individual research has lost none of its validity.

The training course avoids the dogmatic and the abstract. After every semester the students go back to their ordinary work in order to keep in touch with reality and renew their contacts with the masses and the mass struggle. For as Palmiro Togliatti declared at the Eighth Party Congress: 'From discussion of ideological positions we should descend to practice, and from practical reality we should rise to ideological conceptions.'

Party training is conducted also in Party schools at all levels, special courses, seminars, etc. and, what is especially important, through practical work and struggle. And here again we are guided by what Togliatti said at the 10th Party Congress: 'By ideological progress we mean not a more or less developed ability to repeat set formulas. We understand ideological progress to mean knowledge of our principles, ability convincingly to demonstrate the correctness of

our political line, explain its class basis and its democratic socialist content. We regard ideological progress as ability to understand the development of the Party's political line in changing situations.' What we need, Berlinguer has added, is 'a Party that studies and reflects,' at all levels, from bottom to top, in order always to be prepared to give the people an analysis of reality, 'to develop our theoretical, political activity, to breathe life into our doctrine and constantly to enrich the culture of Party members' *(L'Unita,* March 28, 1976).

While stressing the importance of ideological struggle, we should not attribute to bourgeois ideology the magic ability to penetrate, like some dangerous virus, even the strongest body tissues. The fact is that since the days when Marx and Engels proclaimed that 'a specter is haunting Europe,' the shoots of Marxism have not only broken through the jungle of bourgeois propaganda, but have become sturdy trees. To say that the purpose of our ideological struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism and its purity is, in our view, an imprecise formulation of the problem. For the ideological struggle must help to turn our ideas into a material force, so that they grip the minds of millions, extend to every sphere of human endeavor, penetrate university and school curricula, literature, science, art, the theatre, cinema, television, journalism, music, etc., and always in constant and free comparison with other positions and other schools of thought.

'Marxism,' our 10th Party Congress declared, 'is so rich and correct a doctrine that we should not fear, but encourage, comparison with other trends of modern thought; we should not reject, but encourage the search in pre-Marxist trends of sources and evidence that confirm the correctness of our ideology. Comparison with other trends of thought cannot be reduced to their dogmatic and biased rejection.'

A national and internationalist mass Party

For ours to become a mass party, it was necessary first of all completely to reject the old sectarian notions about the character of the Party and critically review the idea of the Party as a limited, select group organized on a near military pattern, and turn our attention to the workers, peasants and popular masses, bring them into the Party, adopt new forms of organization and activity, establish close links with all strata of the population, uphold their immediate interests and thus win over the working class and the people for consistent struggle for democracy and socialism. Such were the lessons of Togliatti. The mass character of our Party is the result of energetic and organized work, but at the same time, and primarily, it is the result and neces-

sary condition of a correct strategy and policy closely tied in with our national reality and concrete international conditions.

The Italian democratic road to socialism is the result of theoretical and political work, the sources of which should be sought in the history of our country and in the national and international workers' movement. In the discussion over why the 1917 October Revolution was not followed by revolutions in other European countries, Gramsci made the point that Russia's experience could not be repeated in the same form. He wrote: 'It seems to me that Ilyich appreciated the need to shift from a war of maneuver, so victoriously waged in the East in 1917, to a war of position, the only possible one in the West ... But Ilyich did not have the time to develop this formula; and we should bear in mind that he could have done so only theoretically, whereas the main task was of a national character — reconnoitering the territory and singling out the elements of civil society whose role could be likened to that of trenches, forts, etc.

'In the East the state was everything, while civil society was still rudimentary and amorphous. In the West there was a definitely established interconnection between the state and civil society, and if the state began to stagger, the firm structure of civil society immediately came to the surface. The state was merely the front-line trench, behind which was a firm chain of forts and strongpoints; of course, this applies in different degree to different countries, and this question requires thorough analysis in adaptation to each nation' (Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*).

It was on the basis of this Gramsci analysis of the historical evolution of Italian society, and the development of this analysis by Togliatti, who examined the features of this same society after the victory over fascism and against the background of the changing international situation in the 40s and 50s, that our Party worked out its 'position warfare' strategy, i.e., the Italian road to socialism: a powerful and united mass movement attacks and besieges all the 'bastions' of Italian civil society, and develops democracy to its ultimate, socialism. To achieve that it was necessary to preserve and constantly consolidate the mass, popular and national character of our Party, at the same time preserving and developing its internationalist character.

For us internationalism means more than merely international solidarity. This may sound exaggerated and paradoxical, but we could say that the internationalist consciousness and spirit of our working class and working masses generally today find expression even without our prompting. Throughout the cold war, during the events in Algeria and Cuba, Vietnam, the Middle East, Angola, Chile and Spain, the widest strata, the political and social forces of Italy, de-

monstrated their effective solidarity by strikes and other actions and demonstrations, often involving sacrifices — people being killed, wounded, arrested.

But internationalism cannot be reduced to that alone. Nor can it be reduced to praise of the Soviet Union and socialism for purely propaganda purposes. This would be very easy but not very effective. It is much more important to combat anti-Soviet prejudices so as to instill in public opinion a true understanding of the real international role of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. This also calls for a firm rebuff to all appeals — no matter from what quarter — to cut off our fraternal relations and internationalist cooperation with the CPSU and other fraternal parties on the pretext that this would win trust in our policy and prove our commitment to democracy.

For us internationalism also means influencing, above all through mass pressure, the foreign policy of the Italian government to compel it actively to develop détente, make a concrete contribution to a European and international security and cooperation system, unequivocally condemn reactionary and fascist regimes, accord hospitality and assistance to political refugees, the victims of these regimes, support national-liberation movements, establish just and equal relations with third-world countries that preclude the spirit and practice of imperialism and neo-colonialism. That is why we continue to work to bring into the struggle for these aims the widest possible spectrum of political and social forces. We are also endeavoring to concert the efforts and coordinate the struggle of the workers of Common Market countries, facilitate mutual understanding between all the left forces in order to democratize Common Market organs and turn the Europe of the monopolies into a Europe of the working people, and, consequently, into a factor of peace and cooperation. Internationalism implies also — and chiefly — accelerating as far as possible Italy's advance to socialism, worker participation in governing the country and thus strengthening the entire international anti-imperialist front.

The three revolutionary currents which are today shaking the world consist not only of Marxists, Leninists, Communists and proletarians. There are also non-Marxists, nationalists, democrats, progressives, adherents of diverse faiths, different social strata. That is why we believe that the expression '*proletarian* internationalism' is a restricted one both in form and content and no longer accords with the concrete conditions of our time. Internationalism must unite the entire mass of people of widely different philosophical, political and social views, but anxious to change the world and prepared to fight for that. They must find their place in this internationalism, which should

and can be — and partially already has been — accepted by everyone working for national liberation, democracy, peace and socialism.

'For your freedom and ours'

PAGES FROM THE *BOOK OF COURAGE*

The history of the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the world includes chapters that even years later quicken the heartbeat of every reader who cherishes the ideals of freedom and the brotherhood of peoples. The Spanish civil war is one such chapter.

Written 40 years ago, it records the treachery and brutality of the classes doomed by history, of those who brought Spain untold misfortune and suffering. It also gives the names of weaklings, capitulators and traitors as a warning to contemporaries and posterity. But above all it preserves the memory of the Spanish people's heroism and revolutionary élan and of the vast movement of international solidarity with their fight against fascism.

'In that battlefield,' Palmiro Togliatti wrote, commenting on the Spanish events, 'we met many friends and foes and came to know dangers and tasks common to all genuine democrats. In that battlefield, anti-fascist unity developed as a reality and a concrete school of warfare and politics, a school for peoples, classes, parties, far-sighted statesmen.'

The national revolutionary war in Spain (1936-39) has gone down in modern history as an outstanding event. In July 1936, reactionary Spanish generals launched a fascist rebellion to drown the democratic revolution in blood, destroy the republic and do away with the Popular Front, an alignment of anti-fascist parties and organizations that had won the general election in February 1936. The progressive changes effected under a parliamentary democratic system brought immediate intervention by external reactionary forces. What was an internal class conflict soon assumed an international character. It was in Spain that the democratic, peace-loving forces of the world fought their first battle with the forces of fascism and war.

The Communist Party of Spain (CPS) played a leading role in organizing resistance to the rebels. Long before the rebellion, it called on the Republican government to stop fascist provocations and take effective measures to head off a reactionary counter-offensive. The formation of a people's army during the war was an important

achievement of the revolution. By late 1937, the CPS had over 300,000 members and more than half of them were in the ranks of the Republican Army. The Party became a fighting party in the true sense of the word. It gave all its revolutionary energies to defending the people's freedom against fascism.

Proletarian internationalism was a mighty weapon in that fight. 'There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism,' Lenin wrote, 'and that is — working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle,* this, *and only this,* line, in *every* country without exception' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 24, p. 75).

The republic was in a trying situation. The fascist governments of Germany and Italy shipped war material to Spain on a growing scale, which assured the rebel troops technical superiority. Arms shipments from Germany and Italy were followed by the dispatch of troops. The republic had the means to buy weapons, but could not do so because the main capitalist governments pursued a so-called non-intervention policy.

First to come to the aid of Republican Spain was the country of the October Revolution, which was building socialism under the leadership of Lenin's Party, giving its all to the effort.

On October 13, 1936, a Soviet ship carrying arms for the Republicans arrived in Spain. Jose Diaz expressed the sentiments of his country's anti-fascists in a telegram to the CPSU: 'Our people who are sacrificing their lives in the fight against fascism, want you to know that your fraternal aid has aroused their enthusiaism, given new energy to the fighters and strengthened their confidence in victory.'

From October 1936 to February 1939, the Soviet Union delivered 648 aircraft, 347 tanks, 60 armored cars, 1,186 guns, 20,486 machine-guns, about 500,000 rifles, large quantities of ammunition and other military supplies.

By early August 1936, the fund-raising campaign in support of the Spanish Republic, launched in response to the appeal of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions (CCSTU), had yielded 12,145,000 rubles. This sum was deposited in the State Bank, which remitted the equivalent — 36,435,000 francs — to the Spanish government.

Two and a half months later, the CCSTU reported that by October 27 the Soviet people had raised 47,595,318 rubles 31 kopecks for the children and women of Republican Spain. With that money, the trade unions bought and shipped to Spain tens of thousands of tons of butter, sugar, grain and flour, many hundreds of tins of canned food, thousands of sets of clothing and pairs of shoes. Contributions to this relief continued.

'Hands off Republican Spain!' This was how millions of men and women felt. Huge solidarity rallies took place in France, Britain, Czechoslovakia, the Scandinavian countries, the United States, far-away Venezuela and other Latin American countries; relief committees sprang up and funds were raised to help Spain's anti-fascists. In the first two years of war, 800 million francs' worth of food, medical supplies and clothing was collected and shipped to Spain from 18 countries.

'Humanity! Humanity!' Romain Rolland wrote in 1936. 'I call you. I call on you, people of Europe and America, to help Spain. To help ourselves. To help yourselves. For if you remain silent today, all that you treasure will perish tomorrow.'

Anti-fascists on all continents held out a fraternal helping hand to the Spanish Republic. In the capitalist countries, its fight was backed without qualification by the workers and, along with them, by the overwhelming majority of scientists, creative workers, academics and students.

Albert Einstein, Frederic Joliot-Curie, Paul Langevin, Louis Aragon, Henri Barbusse, Jean-Richard Bloch, Paul Vaillant-Couturier, André Malraux, Franz Masereel, Heinrich Mann, Thomas Mann, Paul Robeson, Ernest Hemingway, Arnold Zweig and numerous other eminent scientists, writers and artists helped the anti-fascists of Spain by their talent and their civic activity.

The Communists made a decisive contribution to the movement of international solidarity with Spain, for with them proletarian internationalism is not an abstract notion but a firm conviction, a way of thinking, a standard of behavior.

Harry Pollitt commented in this respect: 'Friends of Spain who are not members of the Communist Party will pardon me if I refer with pride to the achievements that have been carried out by all sections of the Communist International in support of the Spanish government. Without the existence of this International of steeled and disciplined revolutionary fighters, the material and moral forms of aid sent to Spain would have brought no accomplishment.'

When the fascist rebellion broke out the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI) instructed its delegation in Spain to help the CPS leadership in mobilizing the masses for struggle. Subsequently a group of prominent members of the EECI and several Communist parties were sent to Spain. On the arrival of Palmiro Togliatti (Alfredo) in Spain in June 1937, the Comintern delegation was recalled and Victorio Codovilla was put in charge of the Co-ordinating Relief Committee for Republican Spain operating in Paris.

It was the Communist parties of various countries and the Comintern as a whole that shouldered the brunt of the effort to select

volunteers and send them to Spain across the numerous police cordons of capitalist countries.

Democrats throughout the world realized that the war against the Spanish people begun by international fascism was a first stage of aggression against the peoples of Europe. This helped to increase internationalist aid to the Spanish Republic. Numerous volunteers left for Spain to join in the armed resistance to home and foreign reaction under the slogan 'For your freedom and ours.' The formation of the International Brigade, Luigi Longo pointed out, was expressive of the idea of a popular front against fascism.

Norman Bethune, a Canadian doctor who won world renown and appreciation by organizing a blood transfusion service, thus helping to save the lives of many of the wounded, has given us a vivid picture in his notes of a freedom volunteer, as International Brigade members were called in Spain.

'The man was taken to a Guadalajara hospital direct from the battlefield. His bandaged head and face were crusted with blood. A shell splinter had lodged in his eye, one of his arms had been shot off and the doctors were about to amputate his other arm.

' "Ten days ago," the wounded man whispered, "I was in Sweden. I have been in Spain three days. This was my first engagement, and now I am no more use to my comrades. I have done nothing for the cause."

' "Done nothing!" We looked at each other with amazed eyes. "Done nothing!" What modesty, what courage, what a soul!

'Yet that is the spirit of the International Brigade; of 10,000 determined, unconquerable men, with no thought of themselves, with no thought of sacrifice, but simply and with a pure heart ready to lay down their lives for their friends. "Greater love hath no man more than this".'*

Fighting in the International Brigade were Communists, Socialists, liberals, people belonging to no party, Catholics and Protestants — about 42,000 people of diverse nationalities from 54 countries. No less than 20,000 were killed, died of wounds, were disabled or reported missing.

On September 23, 1938, the Republican government recalled the International Brigade from the front.** 'See you soon, brothers!' bleeding Spain said to them. '... Sons of all races, you came to us as brothers, as sons of immortal Spain ...'

*_The Canadian Tribune_, November 30, 1964.

**The decision was taken in reply to the proposal of the London Non-Intervention Committee to withdraw all foreign volunteers from Spain. In contrast, General Franco flatly rejected to withdraw Italian and German troops, dreading a showdown with the people.

'Comrade Internationalists. ... You may be proud, for you are history, a legend, an example of heroic solidarity and the all-embracing spirit of democracy,' Dolores Ibarruri said.

Soviet pilots, tankmen, field engineers, signalmen, military advisers and interpreters fought in Spain. They numbered about 3,000, and nearly 200 of them fell in battle.

The revolutionary struggle is international by its very nature. This is why 59 of the Soviet volunteers who distinguished themselves in the Spanish war were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, 19 of them posthumously. They included men who had emigrated to the Soviet Union — Zakhari Zakhariev, a Bulgarian, Primo Gibelli, an Italian, Ernest Schacht, a German.

'You were far away ...' Delores Ibarruri wrote to the Soviet people in those days. 'But even so, the echo of our struggle reached you. And you responded with this heartening message: "Stand firm, don't lose heart. Remember that a people of 170 millions is concerned for you and your children." After that, comrades, there was no more twilight or darkness ahead and our path became bright and clear. And our rifles began to aim better, our men became braver and our women more selfless.'

The overwhelming majority of Spanish anti-fascists shared these sentiments.

Leaving Spain, the freedom volunteers pledged everlasting loyalty to the ideas for which they had fought in the fields and skies of the Republic. They kept their pledge. They sealed it with their blood as they fought German fascism in the ranks of the Red Army or in the guerrilla units of Byelorussia and the Ukraine, in the anti-fascist underground movement or in Hitler's death camps, in the Resistance in Belgium, Italy, France or other countries overrun by the fascists. The internationalist exploit of the freedom volunteers, of all the anti-fascists who came to the aid of the Spanish Republic, fully retains its validity as an example of bravery for today's generations of revolutionary fighters on every continent.

It was highly symbolic that Fidel Castro and the group of *Granma* heroes led by him were initiated into the art of war by a Spanish war veteran, Alberto Bayo. The events in Spain moulded the political consciousness of the young Ernesto Che Guevara. In the Bay of Pigs, slogans of the battle of Madrid — 'They shall not pass' and 'It is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees' — expressed revolutionary Cuba's confidence in victory.

A very short time ago, that example was recalled in Africa, where socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union and Cuba, as ever loyal to the principles of internationalism, and progressives throughout the world came to the aid of Angola in its fight for independence.

The battle with imperialist reaction and fascism is not over. And now as in the past, the example of Republican Spain and the bravery of the International Brigades inspire revolutionary fighters everywhere.

Lina Argenti
Participant in the Spanish national-liberation war

History repeats itself

The established line-up of political forces in a number of Southwest European countries has undergone drastic change. There has been a shift to the left. Communist participation in the direction of national life is now a practical proposition. Even the men who speak for imperialism openly say that this is just as inevitable in France as in Italy. In fact, they admit that overcoming the aftermaths of fascist dictatorship makes a weighty role for the Communist Party just as necessary in Spain as it is in Portugal. Popular and active support for the Communists is spreading, and not only in Latin Europe. Their prestige has grown markedly in other West European countries too.

The Marxist-Leninist parties are the unifying core of all the healthy forces of the nation. Their strategy expresses the longing of the laboring majority for an end to monopoly omnipotence and capitalist exploitation and for a start on the road to socialism. No wonder the Communists' political successes are making the bourgeoisie so nervous. Their hopes are vanishing of avoiding payment for the economic hardships and chaos, for the social calamities capitalism has brought the peoples in the 70s along with the sharp crisis. They are losing their heads, acting in total disregard of the canons of their own morality and ideology and in defiance of their own laws.

U.S. imperialism has warned the West European countries in no uncertain terms that it will not tolerate the presence of Communists in government. And though this gross American pressure has forced some bourgeois governments to protest, the fact remains that a diplomatic bridge has been slung across the Atlantic and that for several months there has been a frenzied discussion of how to 'stem the Communist tide.' NATO, always prepared to assist concerted action against the left forces, the Communists, has not, of course, remained on the sidelines. Things have come to a point when some West European leaders have publicly come out with the formula: 'It's up to the U.S.' to decide whether or not Communists should be allowed in government.

And so what we have is, on the one hand, brazen encroachment on the freedom of national political life in foreign countries and, on the other, readiness to sacrifice that freedom. All the solemn declarations of respect for national rights have been consigned to oblivion. International capital can no longer afford to abide by its own principles when they prove inconvenient. Now, with its fundamental interests at stake, it has discarded all the propaganda camouflage and stands forth in its true image of world gendarme.

With the same ease monopoly capital has discarded the assurances of its own ideologists that bourgeois democracy guarantees respect for the will of the voters and raises no obstacles to the expression of political sympathies. But it is a fact that French big business is already demanding non-acceptance of the results of the 1978 elections if they end in a victory for the left. It is a fact that during the last Italian elections spokesmen for the Vatican threatened Catholics who supported the Communists not only with punishment in the hereafter, but with the very mundane punishment of excommunication. It is a fact that at the May congress of the West German Christian-Democrat Union representatives of West European conservative parties, casting aside all logic and common sense, insisted that the ideal of 'pluralist democracy for all' meant primarily destroying the communist movement.

In its present crusade against the Communists, international reaction has mustered under its banners Atlantic diplomats and generals, big business tycoons, Church obscurantists, outspoken fascists and adventurists of the 'left.' It is banking on the vacillation and political myopia of the right-wing Social Democrats, on the support of frightened liberals and on philistine sentiments among part of the workers.

'A specter is haunting Europe — the specter of Communism. All the Powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter . . .' These lines of the *Communist Manifesto* were written 128 years ago, but today they could well be blazoned on the front pages of the press. Of course, communism is no longer a specter. Today it stands forth in the flesh and blood of existing socialism and the powerful revolutionary working-class movement. The old world has changed too. Imperialism is employing in the defense of its moribund system technical, economic, political and ideological resources that were not even dreamed of by the alliance of the premonopoly bourgeoisie and feudal monarchs. But history repeats itself.

It repeats itself primarily through the immutable law of the class struggle: when the exploiting classes feel that they are losing the ground under their feet, they put aside all their differences, partial

interests and customs. They are obsessed by the single idea of uniting against communism, that is, against social progress, democracy, and the people, who want a complete renewal of public life.

History repeats itself. But it also confirms anew that no matter how profound the crisis of bourgeois society, the ruling class will never voluntarily relinquish any of its essential positions, nor can it ever be persuaded to do so. 'No, the world is not built so happily,' Lenin said, 'the exploiters, the brutal landowners, the capitalist class are not amenable to persuasion. ... The stronger the pressure of the oppressed classes becomes, the nearer they come to overthrowing all oppression, all exploitation ... the more furious does the resistance of the exploiters become' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 465).

History repeats itself, but on a qualitatively new level. To counter the compact of the reactionaries, Marx and Engels urged the working class to unite internationally. It took years for this appeal to meet with a practical response. Today proletarian internationalism is a reality, built on the effective experience of many decades of the world revolutionary struggle. It multiplies the forces of each national contingent of the international Communist movement. Every fraternal party knows that it is not alone in the face of the alliance monopoly capital is knocking together. There are forces on the support and solidarity of which it can count in these trying days and with which it can share the joy of its successes.

L. Vasilyev

---

viewpoints

The burden of the Bicentennial

Henry Winston
National Chairman, CP USA

As we have already reported, Henry Winston addressed a meeting of the *WMR* Editorial Council. He discussed some of the specific problems confronting the Communist Party, the working class and the broad masses of the United States of America. Below is an abridged transcript of his address.

The United States of America observes the bicentennial in conditions of a deep crisis bedevilling all aspects of the life of society. This journal has already discussed many developments of the present-day realities in this biggest country of the capitalist world in connection with this anniversary.* Analyzing, at the 21st National Convention, the crisis besetting ours as well as other capitalist countries, Comrade Gus Hall, our Party's General Secretary, stressed the impact of its ingredients such as inflation and unemployment on the situation of the working people.

What does inflation mean, concretely, for the working masses? It means that bread, which cost five to 10 cents for one pound a few years ago, is now 49 cents at a minimum, and, depending on its quality, is as high as 87 cents a loaf. Beans which used to be five cents a pound rose to 25 to 30 cents. Inflation means that meat is becoming harder for families of working people, especially of minorities and the poor, to obtain. Fish, which yesterday was the cheapest of all foods, is now among the most expensive. Inflation means that prices of the main staples of workers in industry, of the Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano, Native American Indian and Asian minorities, have risen to such an extent that providing food for the young, for the family, has become most difficult.

Then comes the problem of rent. Not so long ago, just a few years back, rent took about 25 per cent of the worker's income, and even that was high. Now the situation is scandalous, with increases of 30, 40, even 50 per cent.

*The problems of the United States of America at the threshold of its 200th anniversary were dealt with in the articles by John Pittman, Herbert Aptheker (*WMR*, July 1975), George Meyers (February 1976) and Gus Hall (April 1976).

In the housing project where I live in New York, a notice under the door demanded a 100 per cent increase in our rent. We tenants in this cooperative project elected leaders authorized to resist the rise and, if necessary, to call a rent strike.

Millions of Americans are fighting against rent increases. Only an all-out fight, involving all the tenants, will enable the working people to beat back the rent-gougers.

Inflation has aggravated the transport problems in the cities. I find here in Prague, for example, that to rise the buses costs 1 crown (roughly 10 cents), to rise the trams costs 1 crown, to ride the subway costs 1 crown. In Moscow you can rise the subway or buses for 5 kopecks, the trolley-buses for 4 kopecks and the tram for 3 kopecks. But in New York City it is 50 cents each way. One dollar per day for transportation, and this is without transfer privileges! Such an increase is in effect a wage cut. But it also means that an unemployed person finds it difficult if not impossible to go to look for a job. Need we mention that utility rates are periodically increased? This applies to electricity for lights and heat, to gas, to water and coal. There is no item of manufactured goods — such as clothing — which has not risen in price as a result of monopoly price-fixing. Inflation is a devastating attack on the living standards of the working class.

Inflation exists side by side with unemployment. Official statistics tell you that the jobless number about 7.6 million, but labor statisticians say the figure is about 10-12 million. The government does not count, for instance, those hundreds of thousands of Black youths who come out of school but have never seen the inside of a factory and have no perspective of ever getting into one because of the existence of racism in ideology and practice. Nor does the government take into account that great mass of unemployed who have exhausted all of the compensation from unemployment benefits. First, the payment period was 26 weeks, then, as a result of mass struggle, 39 weeks. But what happens to them after that? They become clients for welfare and are not counted in the labor market. These features of the economic crisis exist also side by side with some 37 million people who live below the poverty line — a fact which even the government is forced to admit.

There is rising in the USA the coalition for struggle against inflation and unemployment which was formed on the initiative of our Party. Not long ago a movement based on this coalition organized a march of 75,000 on the country's capital, Washington D.C. The specific demands of the marchers were directed at satisfying the needs of the workers, despite the resistance of AFL-CIO President George Meany. Earlier, this coalition helped to forge a united action with the

industrial department of the AFL-CIO, and this action was one of the biggest in Washington since the great depression of the early 30s.

The crisis has affected all spheres of U.S. society. For example, housing is at a standstill. Slums and dilapidated structures disfigure the land. Millions of families lack decent shelter, while a real housing program could put millions of the unemployed to work. There is a shortage of hospital beds. Just as I was leaving New York a strain of influenza hit the country. But there were no beds for many of those afflicted. When we look at educational facilities, we find that classrooms are overcrowded. There is a shortage of schools. Imagine what a program of building new classrooms, new school buildings, could mean for the children, and for the tens of thousands of teachers who are losing their jobs at the present time and who have no outlook for employment. All the social services without exception display such signs of deterioration and neglect.

There is a crisis of the cities. New York City, the country's financial center which the world knows as 'Wall Street,' is a recently widely publicized example of a city on the brink of bankruptcy. But it is necessary to digress for a moment here, for New York City is a special case. Behind this alleged bankruptcy crisis was an offensive of state-monopoly capital against labor and the people. New York City is a 'labor town.' And in New York City there has been a rapprochement between labor and the middle strata, and especially between labor and the minorities — the Black and Puerto Rican peoples. The masses' struggles there have won wage increases that are higher than wages in most other cities. Monopoly capital was interested in nullifying the gains won by the people's struggles in New York, and in undermining and splitting the alliance of labor and middle strata. If successful in this, monopoly capital would then be able to move against other cities, to smash the position of workers in Detroit, for instance, where we have a Black mayor and one of the most class-conscious sections of the working class.

So when New York City requested a loan from the federal government, it got a stubborn refusal. President Ford took to the platform and toured the country to mobilize the cities and the people against New York. He argued that if aid were given to New York, it would be discrimination against other cities.

However, the people rallied against President Ford's position and the plot against New York City was smashed. The working people are well aware that no city can solve its problems by its own efforts only, and that the crises of the cities must be solved on the federal level. The people answered the argument that the federal government could not help. Their answer was quite simple: nobody is threatening the United States, there is no danger of an attack upon the United States.

Why not reduce the military budget — these billions of dollars being allocated for destruction, for nuclear war — and channel these huge sums into meeting society's urgent needs, billions that can start the wheels of industry turning and improve the conditions of the masses?

These are some aspects of the manifold crisis that besets the United States, some of the specific problems we face today.

One consequence of the crisis is that mass anger is growing, first of all among the working class and oppressed minorities, but among the middle strata as well. And in addition to the people's anger, there is something else, something important — a lack of confidence in every governmental agency and department. This is repeatedly shown by the Harris and Gallup polls, the two main surveys of public opinion. These polls show that the people's confidence in the military, for instance, has reached its lowest point. They show a lack of confidence in the Executive, in the Congress and the Judiciary. There is a lack of confidence in the class collaborationist leadership headed by AFL-CIO president George Meany. There is a lack of confidence in the leadership of organized religion, which is something new in the USA. There is a lack of confidence even in the medical profession — this has never happened before.

Despite everything that the apologists for monopoly say about the crisis 'bottoming out,' and about the bright prospects for a coming economic boom, serious-minded people realize that there will be no real prospect of prolonged improvement until there are basic, anti-monopoly changes forged by an anti-monopoly movement — an anti-monopoly movement that will move in the direction of an anti-monopoly government. Only such a movement is able to resist state-monopoly capitalism.

Now, the growing indignation, lack of confidence in the power of the monopolies and the growing realization of the need for radical change is undoubtedly a positive kind of development. But at the same time many people have not yet settled on the forms of organization and action necessary to defend their interests. They do not always see that the fight against the rapacity of the monopolies is inseparably linked with the fight against anti-communism and racism, the two main weapons which monopoly uses against the labor movement and against democracy, with attacks on the Communist Party its usual starting point. This problem is in the forefront of our concern — how to help the working class and the masses express this largely spontaneous need for basic changes in organized forms and actions.

The urgency of solving this problem is accentuated now by the ongoing campaign of candidates for office in the national elections scheduled in November. At this time there does not exist a mass political party based upon the working class, and appealing directly to

the electorate for a resolute anti-monopoly struggle on a program of jobs, of nationalizing the energy, utilities and mining industries, of a complete basic change in policy toward discrimination against Black workers so as to reverse a trend whereby the wage gap is widening, the income gap is widening, and the gap of life expectancy for Blacks and the white population is widening. In order to win the masses for such a program there is need for such a party. Yet, neither party of monopoly capital, neither the Democratic nor the Republican party, stands for such changes or even seriously considers such a program.

Because of these circumstances, our Party's 21st National Convention decided to participate in these national elections so as to use this campaign for rallying the country's left forces. Gus Hall, our General Secretary, and Jarvis Tyner, Chairman of the New York State Organization of our Party, were named to stand for President and Vice-President. Our candidates and our Party as a whole believe that there are millions of voters who so far are not participating in the election campaign, and other millions who are protesting against the effects of the crisis in spontaneous but unorganized ways, who are waiting for a candidate who can say: 'This is the way out of this crisis, this is the way forward for the United States of America, this is a program you can support.' Our campaign will project our central policy, the policy of détente, of peaceful coexistence. Our campaign is geared to help the great mass of independent voters — rank-and-file Democrats, rank-and-file Republicans, non-fascists, anti-fascists, non-imperialists, anti-imperialists, and all democratic-minded people — to help them realize that the way forward necessitates more and more independence from the two parties of monopoly, necessitates a working class-based people's mass anti-monopoly party. Our campaign is geared to the development of a mass movement which can lead to the creation of such a party.

Contrary to the arguments of the apologists of capitalist democracy and their talk about 'free elections,' it is no simple thing for Communists to stand for election in the United States. Different states have their own laws laying down the order of candidates' registration. For all their variety, all these laws are obviously anti-communist and aimed at perpetuating the dominance of the Democratic and Republican parties in the country's public life.

In entering the campaign we have undertaken to do something never done before in our Party's history. We have studied the election laws, the qualifications for voters which the states determine, and which present many difficulties to our acquiring ballot status. We are developing a two-front attack on the anti-communist laws — a mass struggle, pressure from below, on the one hand, and a legal struggle, on the other. We believe that, despite all the anti-communist laws in

the statute books, it is possible in at least 30 of the 50 states to get 'on the ballot,' that is, to have our candidates placed on the ballot which voters will cast. Being on the ballot will enable our Party to speak to millions of voters, so we are going all out to obtain this status.

We can say that already we have scored some gains in the heart of the country where the basic working class lives, the area of mass production industry. For instance, we will be on the ballot in Ohio. This is of special significance. In Ohio there is the steel, auto and electrical industries. Sufficient numbers of signatures have also been collected in western Pennsylvania, which includes another great steel and coal center around Pittsburgh, and in northern Pennsylvania, which includes Philadelphia. So that getting on the ballot in Pennsylvania can be regarded as certain. The same thing can be said in regard to Indiana and Illinois. Now when these four states are added to New York, which will surely have our Party on the ballot, this augurs well for the future of our Party in this electoral struggle.

But consider some of the obstacles that must be overcome to take part in the national elections. Take California as an example. Until just a short time ago it was necessary in that state to collect some 350,000 signatures. It meant that at least two million doorbells would have to be rung and the inhabitants engaged in discussion. And the catch in this requirement was that signatures must represent voters who were not registered Democrats or Republicans, and that they must be secured from every county in the state. That latter stipulation meant that signatures would have to be collected in many reactionary Republican localities with their racist, anti-communist ideas. Our Party challenged these requirements and our case reached the Supreme Court and was sent back to the borough clerk for further proceedings.

When it appeared that we were about to win the case, the California Legislature amended the law, which was just signed by the governor. It provides that independent candidates may be placed on the ballot by petition of approximately 99,000 voters, the signatures to be obtained within a six-month period. While this new requirement will not be easy to comply with, we are now organizing a petition campaign with the hope of meeting the requirement.

In Michigan, where the law for many years permitted a party to place its candidates on the ballot by a petition signed by approximately 15,000 voters, our Party has met this requirement. However, after our petitions were filed the State Legislature amended this law, and it has been signed by the governor, to require a further qualification, applicable not only for the future but for this year as well. Under this qualification, a party which has fulfilled the petition requirement must appear on a preliminary ballot on which the Republi-

can and Democratic parties nominate their candidates and, in addition, secure a minimum of 5,000 votes for itself. So we are now moving to challenge the constitutionality of this new requirement through legal channels.

Consider the situation in the state of Alabama. This state requires the Party to obtain signatures of at least 10,000 voters to secure a place on the ballot. Under the conditions prevailing in Alabama with its fascist-minded governor, George Wallace, and where racist terror and oppresion is prevalent, obtaining this number of signatures is no easy task. One of our petition circulators was arrested on the frame-up charge of 'threatening the life of Vice-President Rockefeller,' who at the time was in New York, 1,000 miles away. Elsewhere in Alabama the circulators of our petitions were threatened with arrest when they exercised their constitutional right to solicit signatures on the streets. Nevertheless the Party set itself a goal of a minimum of 15,000 signatures, and it is clear that this goal will be over-fulfilled. But there is an additional difficulty. An Alabama law prohibits the Communist Party and its candidates from appearing on the ballot. Similar laws in other states were declared unconstitutional in 1972. We are now preparing to challenge this Alabama law and there is a good prospect of success.

There are other states in which there are anti-communist laws, and in which we are working to develop a massive fight to abolish such laws. We now have the legal grounds for this fight to be effective, such as the Supreme Court rulings on the McCarran and Smith Acts. We consider the fight against anti-communist laws on both the state and federal levels part of our Party's struggle for democratizing the electoral system. This includes a struggle against the omnibus repressive legislation known as Senate Bill (S. 1) which would enable the government to apply repressive police measures against any manifestation of dissent and presents a danger for all democratic-minded people in the country, especially militant representatives of the working class and the oppressed minorities. Passage of this legislation would throw the country back beyond the worst excesses of the McCarthyite period.

We feel that we can win our fight for ballot status in most if not all of the 30 states. The National Council of our Party met recently to guarantee that our struggle for ballot status would be successful. We set up an agitation and propaganda committee of a special kind. It is mobilizing the best talent we have in the Party — writers, propagandists, organizers, specialists in many fields. We want to make the maximum use of the free time on radio and television which candidates usually receive, and of paid time on these media as well. We are organizing house parties, listening-in parties, meetings, so that our

Party's voice will be heard. We are heartened by the distribution and sale of 100,000 copies of Comrade Hall's report to our 21st National Convention. We consider this a good omen for the success of the campaign, for the distribution of pamphlets and brochures in millions and millions of copies.

Notwithstanding the difficulties and obstacles, our Party enjoys certain favorable conditions for struggle. Here we have two very important developments which bode well for the future. There is, of course, the great advantage afforded by the turn to détente. Thanks to the growing strength of the socialist community, and especially to the persistent peace efforts of the Soviet Union, and thanks to the struggle of the international working-class and national-liberation movement, things have been made more difficult for the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital and their supporters. What is more, in the struggle against the U.S. imperialist war in Vietnam the U.S. imperialist policies in Angola, and in the struggle against the military budget, there has been created in the United States a pro-peace majority of the population. And this majority is subjecting the foreign policy of the United States to criticism on many fronts. This is something new. The problem we are concerned with is to introduce organization and clarity of aims into this mass, but more often than not spontaneous, movement, to rally it around the working class. We are making advances in this direction, though not yet sufficient.

Another important development is the burgeoning rank-and-file of the labor movement. The workers' growing discontent with the policies of the AFL-CIO reactionary leadership, their struggles against corruption, gangsterism, bribery, and class collaboration practices of the unions, have in several cases already resulted in removing reactionary, discredited union bosses and replacing them with new people adhering to progesssive views, real defenders of the workers' interests. And this is a development in which our Party is playing a very significant role.

Throughout our campaign, in all of our propaganda and agitation, we must convince the people that the road to the final and total solution of the problems the working class and people face is the road through struggle for basic social reforms, the road through struggle for genuine democracy. This involves a fight against Maoism, which is trying to introduce division and confusion into the labor movement by advancing the theory of 'the worse, the better,' and claiming that the immediate needs of the workers should be disregarded in an effort to bring socialism to the United States immediately. Of course, this position plays into the hands of the worst enemies of labor, the worst enemies of the people.

In conclusion, I would like to re-emphasize that the capitalist

apologists want to use the bicentennial to present the rank-and-file American with a glowing picture of the capitalist future. But the rank-and-file American is less and less inclined to believe the prophets of prospertiy and the heralds of a coming 'American age.' He is coming to realize that the parties of monopoly capital cannot spare the country the ruinous consequences of the general crisis of capitalism. So the main emphasis in all of our agitation, in all of our propaganda, is to help that great mass of independent voters, that great mass of rank-and-file Republicans and Democrats, anti-fascists, anti-imperialists, all genuine democrats, to see that there is a program and the road forward involving the development of greater and greater class independence from the old parties, a road to the final solution of the problems faced by our class and our people. This is the road shown by the Communists. The success of their fight — part of the struggle for democracy within the country — is dependent on the growing class consciousness and solidarity. And this struggle will, we presume, ultimately lead to the creation of a mass anti-monopoly party.

The peace front in Asia

Badamyn Lhamsuren
Member CC, Mongolian
People's Revolutionary Party

Progressives everywhere are increasingly associating the consolidation of peace with the foreign policy of the socialist countries and their persevering efforts for international security and détente. The humane and democratic nature of these efforts show that the ideals of peace and socialism are indivisible and that concern for the future of mankind is an inherent feature of socialism. The success of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation highlighted the fact that the main initiators of this epochal meeting, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, were motivated by concern for the peace of all nations, not only in Europe, but on all the continents. And progress in Europe naturally brought to the fore the question of ensuring peace in Asia too.

The idea of collective security in Asia, in its most comprehensive form, was first advanced by the Soviet Union. Addressing the 1969 International Meeting, Comrade Brezhnev said its realization was one

of those long-term international tasks that could powerfully influence the development of nations and states for many years to come.

Imbued with the democratic, constructive spirit of the many peaceful initiatives coming from Asian and African countries, this idea reflected the desire of the peoples of our continent for unity in the struggle for peace and against aggression. More, an Asian peace program would epitomize Asia's common social development trend and give concentrated expression to the ideas of a just peace and cooperation, so necessary for the historical progress of its nations. It is not accidental that the underlying principles of such a system are included in the many agreements between the USSR and other socialist countries and Asian states. The strong friendship between the Soviet Union and India, Soviet-Afghan relations, Soviet ties with progressive Asian regimes have become cardinal factors of peace in the region.

The positive trends in the Asian situation have become more pronounced of late. Neither imperialism's aggressive policy, nor the many conspiracies by the opponents of peace could halt the process. Particularly apparent in the region today is the beneficial influence of the historic victories in Southeast Asia scored by Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. 'There victories,' said Le Duan, First CC Secretary, Working People's Party of Vietnam, 'helped effect a deep change in the balance of forces and increased the opportunities for defending national independence and peace in this region and the rest of the world.'

The victories in Indochina signified not only failure of the imperialist policy of military intervention. They also exposed the severe crisis of the military-bloc strategy of containing and rolling back liberation revolutions; a strategy aimed against the socialist and other peace-promoting countries. They showed, too, that the future of our continent will be shaped not by the imperialists, but by the struggle of the Asian peoples themselves, who know that their alliance with world socialism, with the progressive and democratic forces, is the most reliable guarantee of the success of this struggle.

It is portentous that even conservatives and moderates in many countries, convinced of the unreliability of the 'American shield,' see an alternative in changing their one-sided, pro-imperialist orientation: there has been a good deal of re-thinking in Thailand, the Philippines and some other Southeast Asian states. Nor do the imperialists always succeed in pressuring Asian governments: in Thailand, for example, Washington had to comply with the new government's request to complete evacuation of American troops and advisers by mid-summer 1976. The tendency toward consolidating independence and

sovereignty can also be seen in other countries earlier brought into imperialist military blocs, Pakistan, for instance.

And so, the progressive changes in Asia, and particularly the victories scored in Indochina, have opened up new vistas in the effort to assert the principles of peace, security and cooperation on our continent.

The forces in Asia working for collective security have grown appreciably in recent years, and not only the socialist countries, but also the non-aligned countries, follow a realistic and peaceful course. Asian public opinion, too, is playing a bigger part in the peace movement.

The socialist countries, and notably the Soviet Union, are in the van of the efforts to assert new and truly democratic standards in relations between Asian states. The USSR is the largest European and also an Asian power and is closely bound to the life, affairs and fate of the countries of our continent. The interests of the Soviet people always coincide with the interests of the Asian peoples.

Speaking at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev said 'The Soviet Union intends to continue its active participation in the search for ways of consolidating peace and security on the Asian continent and of developing equal cooperation there too. We shall work for this through bilateral contacts, and also on a multilateral basis. We have repeatedly set forth our views on this score and stressed our readiness to treat with the utmost attention any proposals prompted by a concern for lasting peace and security in Asia, and for assuring them by collective effort.'

Together with the fraternal Soviet Union, the Mongolian People's Republic is working for Asian security. The Mongolian people wholeheartedly support Soviet peace efforts and initiatives. Speaking at the 11th Bulgarian Communist Party Congress, Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First CC Secretary of the MPRP and Chairman of the Mongolian Parliament Presidium, declared that Mongolia would do all it could to facilitate realization of the Peace Program on the Asian continent. The importance of this has been stressed in the joint Mongolian-Indian communique and Mongolian-Iranian Declaration signed after friendly visits to these countries by top-level Mongolian government delegations.

In March and April 1976 an official Mongolian delegation visited Thailand, Burma and Indonesia and talks centered around the problem of ensuring Asian security. 'We proceed on the assumption,' said Y. Tsedenbal, 'that in the present international conditions, the extension of détente to all parts of the world, in particular Asia, is a pressing issue. As a peaceful Asian state, People's Mongolia sincerely wishes to see lasting peace established on this continent, ensuring

favorable conditions for the social and economic progress of all Asian states and peoples.'

The outlook for peace has undoubtedly been improved with the strengthening of the front of democracy and socialism in Southeast Asia. The Indochinese victory against American imperialism played a decisive role in this. There is a clearly defined tendency for closer coordination of the peace efforts of these countries with those of the Soviet Union. Highly indicative in this respect is the recently signed joing Soviet-Laotian statement, which says in part: 'The Soviet Union and the Laotian People's Democratic Republic, being deeply interested in consolidating Asian peace and stability through the joint efforts of the nations of this continent, favor developing relations among the countries of the region on such principles as renouncement of the use of force, respect of sovereignty and inviolability of borders, non-interference in internal affairs, development of economic, scientific and cultural cooperation on the basis of full equality and mutual advantage.'

An important factor in normalizing the situation in Asia is the growing activity for peace and security by the non-aligned countries. They have already made several valuable proposals. There is growing support for Sri Lanka's plan for an Indian Ocean peace zone, and the idea of Southeast Asian neutrality is gaining ground among the ASEAN countries. The question of nuclear-free zones in Asia and the Southern Pacific is definitely on the agenda. The situation is being normalized in many regions, as evidenced, for example, by the recent successful negotiations between India and Pakistan.

The Asian nations are voicing their demands with growing determination. At international and regional forums such as the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow (1973), the international meetings in Dacca (1973), Samarkand (1974) and Baghdad (1975) where the idea of Asian collective security was subjected to detailed analysis, there was a well-defined and growing trend to build the edifice of Asian peace through the constructive, common efforts of its peoples. This was confirmed by the Asia Week held in April 1976, on the initiative of the World Peace Council.

Millions throughout the world feel that an Asian system of collective security would be the most reliable means of preventing imperialist aggression and strengthening trust and cooperation among Asian states. This idea is rapidly gaining popularity, and not only in Asia itself.

The historic gains of our nations in the fight for national independence and social emancipation, against imperialist expansion, have also greatly advanced the peace cause. But let us not be complacent: though the opportunities for imperialist aggression have been vastly

reduced, imperialism itself has not changed in character, and the peace forces must be vigilant.

It would be a delusion to think that such positive processes as establishing a climate of trust among Asian states and promoting peaceful coexistence would be welcomed by all. The imperialist military presence is still there. The imperialists are trying to maintain their strategic positions in the region, and impose their policies on its nations. This is the purpose of the U.S. 'new Pacific doctrine' proclaimed in December 1975 and based on the claim that U.S. might is needed to preserve a stable balance of forces in the Pacific. It relies heavily on alliance with Japan and close ties with the Seoul regime.

Peace supporters are particularly concerned over the marked tendency toward closer *practical* coordination by all opponents of Asian peace, independence and progress. There is, first and foremost, the alliance of Peking Maoists and U.S. imperialists. The new Pacific doctine lays great stress on U.S.-Chinese ties. And this is not accidental, because, for several years now, Peking has been zealously working to preserve the military presence in Asia of the biggest capitalist power. 'It is almost certain, wrote the Japanese newspaper *Yomiuri,* 'that this doctrine is the result of "agreement" or "understanding" reached at the American-Chinese summit negotiations. This doctrine, by its very character,' continues the paper, 'could be described as a "joint U.S.-Chinese communique."'*'

That such agreement does apparently exist is suggested by statements of U.S. and Chinese officials. The Chinese side not only promised it would '... not take any steps that could undermine American positions in Japan, Thailand and the Philippines ...' but has intimated its support for U.S. bases in these countries. British Foreign Secretary Anthony Crosland was assured by the Chinese leaders that Peking wanted continuation of 'the closest possible relations' between Japan and the United States 'both politically and militarily.'** All these facts show that in their pursuit of closer ties with the United States, the Maoists do not hesitate to sacrifice the national interests of entire states and their sovereignty, which is but small change in Peking's great-power game.

What is the mainspring of U.S.-Chinese rapprochement? Apparently, the U.S. imperialists and the Chinese chauvinists view Asia from geopolitical positions, in the context of spheres of influence. And for both the United States and China the Soviet Union's peaceful policy is the main obstacle.

That is why the imperialists and the Maoists are so dead set against the idea of collective security in Asia, and why the imperialist and

**Yomiuri,* December 13, 1975.
***International Herald Tribune,* May 12, 1976.

Maoist press launched such a furious campaign against it. For the principles of collective security are the very negation of expansionist policies and open the road to political, economic and inter-state solutions of problems founded upon equality, cooperation and collective effort. To realize these principles there must be a strong rebuff to the aggressive intentions of U.S. imperialism and the designs of the Maoist leadership.

In spite of the obstacles set up by opponents of a healthier climate in Asia, the ideas and principles of collective security will, through the joint efforts of the Asian nations, continue to win popularity. 'We are firmly convinced,' Y. Tsedenbal has said, 'that neither the imperialists, nor the anti-socialist actions and policy of the Chinese leadership will be successful in slowing down the natural historical development of mankind, the consolidation of world peace and security.' Such is the dominant world trend today.

The developing countries and disarmament

Naim Ashhab
Member of CC, CP of Jordan

Imperialism spares no effort to impede the independent socio-economic development of new states. It compels them to spend money for non-productive purposes, including military ones, and strives to reduce them, as in the past, to the role of an object of multinational monopoly plunder within the international capitalist division of labor. To achieve these aims, imperialism builds up international tensions and foments conflicts between new states, conflicts that go back to the past.

By stirring up old contradictions and provoking new ones, the imperialists have been trying ever since the 1950s, to draw some of the newly independent countries, especially those with conservative, reactionary regimes, into their aggressive alignments. They have increased pressure on these countries to involve them in a confrontation with the socialist world and to make them militarize their economies. While bringing some countries into military blocs, the imperialists have sown distrust and suspicion in others, forcing them to prepare for resistance to possible aggression and, consequently, to buy arms, and have even provoked wars. In all cases it is the foes of freedom and independence of developing countries who benefit.

Analysis of the direct and indirect impact of the arms race on new states invites the conclusion that their peoples badly need an end to the arms build-up. One should not overlook the low level and lop-sidedness of these countries' economic development, the meagerness of the financial resources of many of them, the perpetual lack of funds for vitally important socio-economic programs. Yet their share of the world's military spending exceeds 14 per cent — a much too heavy burden for them.

Iran is a case in point. It is a founding member of the Baghdad Pact, now known as CENTO. Imperialist countries, above all the United States, have always encouraged the expansionist and hegemonistic aspirations of the Iranian regime in the Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf area. They assign it the role of policeman protecting the interests of foreign monopolies, especially oil companies, in the Middle East. To perform this role, Iran requires powerful armed forces. Accordingly, it has been drawn into the arms race. While Iran's annual purchase of arms did not exceed tens of millions of dollars in the 50s, it topped $700m. in the late 60s and soared to $2,500m., an astronomical figure for that country, in the 1974-75 fiscal year alone. Added to this sum are military allocations from the Shah's private funds,[1] which exceed by half official budget appropriations. It follows — and the bourgeois press confirms — that in 1975 Iran spent over $7,000m. for military purposes, or slightly less than France and more than Italy.

Washington would also like to see Saudi Arabia in the role of defender of U.S. monopoly interests in the Middle East. That country is now forming a strong army with help from the Pentagon and ranks third in the list of importers of U.S. arms, ahead of the FRG, Greece, Spain and Canada. By 1982 Saudi Arabia plans to complete 10 military projects at a total cost of $10,000m.[2] They are to be built by U.S. engineers.

A complicated situation has developed in the Middle East. The arms race there is due, on the one hand, to the intrigues of imperialism and its accomplices — the Zionist leaders of Israel — against the Arab national liberation movement, particularly against recognition of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and, in the other hand, to Arab opposition to those intrigues. Since 1948, when the State of Israel was founded, to 1975, the countries of our region have spent on defense billions of dollars so urgently needed for economic, social and cultural development.

Military expenditure in the Middle East skyrocketed after the June 1967 war, started by Isreal and backed by imperialism. Israel occupied and still holds large Arab territories. Moreover, it persists in a policy of aggression. This compels the Arab states to adopt countermeasures, which means huge material expenditures. While world

military spending in 1970-73 increased by only 0.7 per cent, the increase in the Middle East was 78 per cent. That is why we Communists consider the task formulated in the CC Report to the 25th CPSU Congress on the basis of a thorough analysis of the situation in our region to be important and timely. 'Concentrate the efforts of peace-loving countries,' the Report says, 'on eliminating the remaining seats of war, and first of all on bringing about a just and durable settlement in the Middle East. In connection with such a settlement, the countries concerned should examine the question of helping to end the arms race in the Middle East.'

The imperialist powers are responsible in enormous measure for the situation in the Middle East. They, particularly the United States, supply Israel with most of its weapons, helping to build up the aggressor's war potential.[3] They encourage Israel to ignore UN resolutions calling for withdrawal from the occupied territories. They poison the political atmosphere of the Middle East by whipping up tensions threatening a new round of armed clashes which could jeopardize world peace and security as it has done before.

The arms race launched by imperialism and joined by Israel injures the Arab states most of all, primarily the immediate victims of Israeli expansion. To recover the occupied territories and be prepared to repulse new acts of aggression, they must build up their armed forces. A country of limited resources such as Syria is compelled every year to spend more than one-third of its national income on defense. This also applies to Egypt, which in 1973 spent 1,300 million Egyptian pounds out of a total national income of 4,000 million. The sum would have been sufficient to build two power stations the size of the Aswan plant.

As before, Israel is the pacemaker in the new round of the arms race in our area. The U.S. imperialists provide it with the most sophisticated weapons, including Pershing missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads. Characteristically, the United States committed itself to supply the missiles after the signing of the second, Sinai, agreement between Egypt and Israel, which it had itself arranged. Moreover, the U.S. flaunts its commitment as 'an important step toward peace' in the Middle East. Its real purpose, however, is to assure Israel's military superiority over its neighbors, which was challenged in the October fighting of 1973.

Now the country that is arming is the one whose rulers stubbornly refuse to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and often boast that they may come to possess nuclear arms.[4] Obviously, the imperialist-Zionist circles intend to involve our region in a new armaments escalation that threatens to become nuclear. This would cause irreparable damage to the economic and social progress of the peoples

of the Middle East, prevent them from ending the lag inherited from the past and keep them weak and unable to resist the pressure of imperialist monopolies.

Imperialism also provides conflicts and creates tensions in other parts of the globe. However, even the most bellicose imperialists are compelled nowadays to reckon with the new alignment of world forces and the deepening contradictions within their own camp (the disintegration of SEATO and signs of crisis in CENTO and even NATO). More and more often, imperialism is driven to adopt other means of combating the national liberation movements, and countering the desire of new states to follow the road of independence and progress. These means include stepping up the activity of intelligence and subversion services, such as the CIA, planning and carrying out coups, subversive activities against democratic and progressive forces, and acts of terrorism.[5]

The imperialists do their utmost to bolster the reactionary regimes of countries they regard as their bastions, such as Israel and Iran in the Middle East, the SAR in Africa or Brazil in Latin America. It is noteworthy that the ruling circles of some of these countries are not content with the arms they purchase from their patrons and are busy building their own military industries to manufacture up-to-date materiel, including aircraft and even missiles.[6] And there are indications that Brazil and South Africa (like Israel) either possess nuclear weapons or can produce them when they wish.

Needless to say, arms sales bring the monopolies vast profits and serve imperialist countries as an important source of foreign exchange, thus improving their balance of payments. Arms exports soared from $4,400m. in 1963 to $8,700m. in 1973, the United States accounting for the greater part of them. In 1974, the U.S. sold $8,300m. worth of weapons, and the 1976 figure is expected to reach $12,000m. The developing countries are among the main purchasers of arms, and they buy them to the detriment of their development programs.

The arms race and the spending of enormous sums to keep it at the highest possible level are the main cause of the inflation that is dragging the capitalist world deeper and deeper down. The rate of inflation in some capitalist countries is 12-15 per cent a year. Inflation admittedly leads, in particular, to a rapid increase in the prices of non-military goods, which the developing countries import in larger quantities than others.

The Communist parties of the developing countries point to the disastrous consequences of the arms race and suggest ways of withdrawing from it. Thus, the Policy Resolution of the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of India (1975) says: 'It is urgent that steps be

taken both to remove the danger of war and thoroughly reshape the system of international relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation, thereby providing political and economic guarantees of lasting peace and ensuring the abolition of all military bases on foreign soil.'

Participation in the arms race affects the economic and social situation in all countries, developed and developing alike. This is also true of Israel, despite the huge injections of aid from imperialist countries and big Jewish capitalists. Israel has devalued its pound 30 times since 1948, bringing it down from $4 to the pound to eight pounds to the dollar in 1976.

By restricting aid from developed countries to new states, the arms race keeps the gap between them wide. In 1970, per capita GNP was 12 times higher in the developed capitalist countries than in the developing countries (population, 2,600 million). This gap tends to widen. The majority of the new states form a veritable 'disaster area.' In the last 10 years, per capita income in the developing countries has increased by only one or two per cent a year. Every day 80,000 people in those countries die of hunger and chronic undernourishment. In Africa, one child in three dies before it is five years old.

The plight of new states moved the Soviet Union to take an important initiative. In December 1973, it submitted a proposal to the 28th UN General Assembly to reduce the military expenditures of the five permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and make part of the money saved available to the developing countries.

The General Assembly approved the proposal, but the imperialist powers, far from putting it into effect, steadily increase their military spending. While the U.S. military budget in the 1974/75 fiscal year was $85,000m., in 1975/76 it stood at $104,700m. and as for 1976/77, the Pentagon expects to secure $112,000m. If these sums were distributed among the inhabitants of the developing countries, each would get over $100, an amount that would double the annual income of hundreds of millions of people in Indonesia, Bangladesh, Afghanistan and other countries. What the world spent on arms in 1972 equals the total national incomes of the countries of Southern and Southeast Asia and Africa put together.

There are other aspects to the arms race besides the economic and social ones. It deeply influences the political climate and the situation in various parts of the world. Besides encroaching more and more on the living standard, reactionary regimes, as a rule, do away with the last vestiges of democratic freedoms.

The bitter experience of developing countries proves beyond all doubt the inherent connection between the arms race and increasing imperialist interference in the affairs of these countries, an inter-

ference often coupled with acts of aggression. This is seen in the wars in Korea and Indochina, the tripartite aggression against Egypt (1956), the landing of U.S. Marines in Lebanon, the dispatch of British troops to Jordan (1958) and other moves.

The facts show that the developing countries have a direct interest in the struggle for an end to the arms race, for universal and complete disarmament and a just and lasting peace. The Communists' historic mission is to bring the peoples of new states into the movement for the achievement of these great goals, using to this end their growing leverage in world affairs.

1. In 1974 and 1975, the Shah ordered 400 aircraft, 500 helicopters, 730 tanks, 18 warships and thousands of missiles of various types. — *Ed.*

1. In 1974 and 1975 Saudi Arabia alone contracted for 185 military aircraft, 150 tanks, helicopters, warships, missiles and many other weapons. — *Ed.*

3. Israel's military expenditure in the 1974/75 and 1975/76 added up to nearly $7,000m. and it plans to spend over $4,000m. in the 1976/77 fiscal year. Almost half its annual national income is spent on war. In military spending per person — $1,700 a year — Israel has long held an anything but honorable first place in the world.

4. Recent U.S. press reports say that Israel already has 13 nuclear warheads. — *Ed.*

5. This was revealed, in particular, by the findings of the U.S. Congressional committee investigating the CIA.

6. In 1975 Israel had plants manufacturing military aircraft (10 plants), aircraft engines (3), shells and missiles (8), electronic equipment (3), tanks and armored cars (4), and warships (4).

Program of courageous emergency measures

Dinos Konstantinou
PB member, Progressive Party
of the Working People
of Cyprus (AKEL)

Anyone who chanced to visit Cyprus before the treacherous rebellion launched by the Greek 'black colonels' ' junta on July 15, 1974, must have pleasant memories of the wonderful island in the eastern Mediterranean, of its friendly and hospitable people — the Greek and Turkisn Cypriots — who lived and worked together in every part of the country. Cyprus had a thriving economy and its people had achieved the highest standard of life in the Middle East. All that is a thing of the past now. The junta rebellion and the subsequent Turkish invasion inspired by NATO imperialists set the country far back and

brought the most severe ordeals on our people. Those who call the tune in NATO still hope to turn Cyprus into a nuclear base and a stronghold they could use to carry out their strategic and economic plans in the Middle East against the Arab peoples and the Soviet Union, defender of the interests of Arab countries and Cyprus.

Analysis of the effects of the junta rebellion and the Turkish invasion shows that no area of public life has been spared. Cyprus today is a semi-occupied country that has lost almost 40 per cent of its territory, including the most developed areas which accounted for 70 per cent of the country's economic potential and contributed as much to the national income — Famagusta, the main tourist and trading center, Morfou, the most fertile area, Kyrenia, an important farming and tourist area, Messaoria, the island's granary. Occupation extends to the industrial districts of Nicosia and Famagusta. The fighting took a toll of 7,000 lives, and another 3,000 Cypriots are still missing. The casualties include thousands of members or supporters of left-wing parties.

To give an idea of the dimensions of the national tragedy that has befallen Cyprus, I would like to cite a few facts. The occupation of almost half the country and the resettlement of Turkish Cypriots in the north under Turkey's pressure resulted in the inhuman expulsion of almost 230,000 people, or one-third of the population. They lost their homes, their property, their jobs. Winter was coming and it was necessary to provide shelter, food and other necessities, look after children and old people, arrange medical aid, prevent epidemics. In short, an acute social problem had arisen.

After the Turkish invasion, an army of 90,000 jobless, or 23 per cent of the economically active population, appeared in a few days in a country that had had no unemployment. A total of 220,000 people were left destitute, with nothing but government relief to fall back on.

Occupation led to the loss of most of the fields sown to wheat, 80 per cent of the citrus plantations and 43 per cent of the capital (over 150 million Cyprus pounds*) invested in the mining, tourist and other industries. The loss of property is estimated at hundreds of millions of pounds.

The damage caused to the economy had a disastrous effect on the balance of payments, which had been positive until 1973 and is now negative. The deficit rose to 10.6 million pounds in 1974 and 14.7 million pounds in 1975.

The drop in production and the resultant decline in incomes slashed revenues just at a time when the government needed large sums to cope with pressing social problems. Hence the budget deficit that

*C£1 = U.S.$2.70

developed for the first time since 1960. It stood at 18.6 million pounds last year and is expected to soar to 40 million pounds this year.

Standard of life, purchasing power, wages and salaries and bank savings show a sharp decrease. The economy has become more dependent on foreign countries.

The government has taken certain steps to solve the country's problems. It has built over 1,000 houses into which refugees have moved from tents. Another 6,000 houses for 40,000 people are to go up in 1976 and the first half of 1977. If this plan materializes the plight of the hardest hit will be appreciably eased. However, for all the efforts made to provide refugees with housing, tens of thousands are still living in tents and wooden barracks with no sanitation.

Steps have also been taken to combat the unemployment. To prevent its growth caused by the Turkish invasion, an emergency law enacted by Parliament prohibits dismissals in the unoccupied zone. Joblessness has been cut to 50,000 by stepping up economic activity, with emphasis on industrial and other projects requiring additional labor, and by securing temporary jobs, mostly for building workers, in Arab countries and Bulgaria. This year Cypriot workers will also have the opportunity to take jobs in Czechoslovakia. Nevertheless, the problem is likely to remain crucial for a long time to come.

Even this brief review of the social and economic situation in Cyprus should give an idea of the diversity and complexity of the problems facing the country. Obviously, the cannot be solved without a well-considered social and economic policy.

AKEL is determined to make a tangible contribution to the effort to ease the effects of the tragedy that has struck our people. Throughout the past period the Communists have joined with other progressives to overcome these difficulties, and they have worked out programs of emergency measures. Having made an in-depth study of the situation, AKEL presented to the government a memorandum setting out the main economic policy lines and proposing specific measures. These deal with the problems of refugees and housing, relief, the food situation, health and other conditions of the people driven out of their homes, proper use of available labor power, reviving production, promoting exports, improving the balance of trade and payments, and lastly, distributing the burden of economic difficulties and the national income more equitably to give the working people a bigger share.

The key to solving the social and economic problems of today is an optimum revival of the economy in the unoccupied zone by making full use of production capacities. In the present situation we should begin with construction, both in view of the acute housing shortage and because this industry has always meant jobs for at least 18,000. Growth in this sector will gradually benefit other sectors.

As we see it, in the manufacturing, priority should be given to consumer goods and raw materials to improve the position on the home market; more manufactured goods and farm produce for export will help reduce the trade and, hence, the balance of payments deficit.

What is particularly important now is to make proper use of such strategic instruments of economic development as goal-oriented trade, a proper financial policy and active state 'intervention' in the economy.

The country needs changes in the character of foreign trade to improve the balance of trade and payments and keep the currency stable. This will necessitate a maximum increase in industrial and agricultural exports, which can only be brought about by building new enterprises geared to export and expanding trade with countries which grant Cyprus more favorable export terms, first of all with countries of the socialist community, especially the Soviet Union. We must cut imports to a minimum, prohibit the import of luxuries, take steps to recover the Cypriot capital invested abroad and prevent a new outflow of capital. We could also ensure the inflow of foreign exchange and remittances from abroad by offering the tourist industry various incentives.

As to financial policy, it should be adjusted to current needs, with emphasis on aid to the refugees and unemployed, who must be provided with normal living conditions, and on equitable distribution of the national income. To raise the funds needed for these purposes, we should shift the greater part of the burden of economic difficulties onto the more affluent strata by levying higher taxes on big profits and unproductive capital. We should also take drastic measures against tax and rent dodgers and all who sabotage price stabilization.

The role of the state in promoting the economy is particularly important now. Until recently, it was restricted almost exclusively to granting various benefits and stimulating economic activity through tax policy, that is, by supporting private initiative. This line could be carried on. However, there is no discounting the fact that in view of the political instability, private capital has taken a wait-and-see stand and refuses to make investments. Hence the need of more direct state intervention to speed the readjustment of the economy, enhance the prestige of the state in the eyes of private business and stimulate the latter's activity in the right direction. The state can gain a decisive role in production as industrial and other production units (state, state-private, cooperative) are brought into being.

A policy of increasing state economic intervention would call for the following measures: putting the oil refinery and the sale of oil products under state control; nationalizing and reorganizing the Development Bank by converting it into a center financing and pro-

moting industry and tourism; passing a law under which foreign banks in Cyprus will be obliged to use their capital in Cyprus; forming a commission that would work out additional measures for control over mines, banks and insurance companies and consider the possibility of nationalizing them.

The problem of funds for economic revival is probably the most difficult problem of all, but it can be solved. There are resources that can be drawn on to finance development. They are the passive assets of banks and individual manufacturers, internal loans, international financial aid, foreign loans granted on easy terms and without political or other strings, Cypriot investments abroad — on their return to the country — and, within reasonable bounds, using our foreign exchange reserves.

The time has come to revise the policy toward foreign loans, usually granted by the Bank for International Reconstruction and Development, which is controlled by major world monopolies. It grants loans at 7.5 per cent interest for specific projects, but with the proviso that they will be carried out by capitalist firms chosen by the bank. The government has never tried to solicit credits from elsewhere and has done nothing to explore the possibilities of securing loans from other countries. It is well known that the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community have granted a number of countries long-term credits on very easy terms — at 2 to 3.5 per cent annual interest, without any strings attached. We call the attention of those who doubt this to the case of the Cypriot mining firm which the Soviet Union has granted a long-term credit at three per cent interest to organize sulphuric acid production.

Ideological preconceptions and a biased orientation are particularly out of place now that the country is in crisis. To advance the economy and improve the standard of living, we must seek aid from countries which offer us the most favorable terms without imposing any political or other obligations. We hope the government has satisfied itself of the need to adopt this policy. It has already taken certain steps in this direction and we trust that more will follow.

Last September the government announced its emergency economic plans for 1976-77. AKEL supported the plan because it includes the main proposals of our Party put before the government in May 1975. The Communists feel that implementation of these measures will substantially strengthen the economy and improve the condition of refugees, reduce unemployment, raise earnings, give the people confidence in a better future and inspire them to continue their struggle. Through these emergency measures, the Cypriots can eliminate in a short time the more acute problems that cropped up after the rebellion and invasion. As regards a comprehensive solution

to the economic problems of the island for the good of all Cypriots, it will become possible when political issues have been settled within the framework of an independent, sovereign and territorially integral state, with the Greeks and Turks living in it like brothers.

Venezuela: problems unsolved by nationalization

Jeronimo Carrera
CC member, CP Venezuela

New Year's Day brought Venezuelans long-awaited good news: the entry into force of the oil nationalization law.[1] And the people ardently hope that if its patriotic character is retained, it may prove just as important for the country's destinies as was the battle of Carabobo in 1821 which put an end to Spanish domination.

But the 'if' is a big one. The nationalization law has become the subject of heated political controversy. The leaders of the ruling Democratic Action Party have hastened to proclaim it our 'second independence charter' and have started a wide propaganda campaign to instill the idea that the country has attained what, objectively, is but a possibility of the near future, namely, genuine economic independence. The opposition, notably the Social Christian Party (COPEI) argues that nationalization will markedly worsen Venezuela's oil position. The ultra-lefts, with their 'all or nothing' slogan, and even some representatives of the left have denounced it as a compact between imperialism and the government. Nationalization, they maintain, is no more than a sham, inasmuch as neither North American nor British oil monopolies made any serious attempt to prevent it.[2]

These contradictory judgments have caused a good deal of confusion. What the people want to know is whether or not Venezuela has broken, or at least weakened, the economic dependence dating back to the foreign monopoly penetration of the early 1900s. We Communists are working to explain the real position and our own policy in this national debate. That is all the more important since a correct understanding of the problems facing the country after nationalization[3] will have an important bearing on the character and orientation of the mass struggle.

Oil nationalization in Venezuela has international, notably Latin American, implications. We are dealing with a highly complex problem closely tied in with external and internal factors. And to understand it in all its ramifications, one must review the role oil plays in the country's economy, and also the role of the foreign monopolies.

Venezuela's oil industry is one of the world's biggest industrial complexes. Its equipment alone is estimated at more than $5 billion and annual output at about $10 billion. Actually, Venezuela could extract more than 3 million barrels[4] a day, though the present figure is about 2.2 million because of the decline in demand, and not because the government is anxious to husband the country's oil reserves. Venezuela has the biggest refining capacity of all the OPEC countries. Oil accounts for 90 per cent of national revenue and for 92 per cent of exports. To this should be added the enormous deposits of heavy crude oil in the Orinoco river basin, on which the imperialist monopolies are casting covetous eyes.

Prior to nationalization, the oil industry was controlled by 16 North American and 4 other foreign companies, and according to some experts their profits ranged from 30-40 per cent of invested capital.[5]

In short, Venezuela was a veritable bonanza for foreign interests. Why, then, was it possible to nationalize oil and iron-ore without 'firing a single shot'? For we all remember the fate of the Allende government in Chile, where nationalization of copper was a factor in the reactionary coup engineered by the CIA.

The objective and subjective conditions in the early 1970s favored nationalization — in fact, it had been prepared by the country's economic and political development.

With its considerable economic potential and heavy investments in industry over the past years, Venezuela has been able gradually to cast off neo-colonial dependence. The bourgeoisie itself was interested in winning a position in the world imperialist system similar to that of its counterparts in such countries with different political regimes as South Africa, Australia, Spain, Brazil or Mexico. Lenin's remarks in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism:* 'The export of capital influences and greatly accelerates the development of capitalism in those countries to which it is exported' and further: 'capitalism is growing with the greatest rapidity in the colonies and in overseas countries' *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 22, pp. 243 and 274), fully apply to Venezuela.

As for the subjective factor, nationalization, in the final analysis, was the result of a long and hard struggle by the people, above all the Communists, against the stranglehold of the foreign oil companies. And to say that nationalization was accomplished without 'firing a single shot' is deliberately to disregard the facts of history. For many

Venezuelans paid with their lives for their determination to put an end to imperialist domination. Patriots were persecuted, jailed, deported, and in the oil areas there were mass clashes and powerful strikes. It was in the crucible of this struggle that the revolutionary spirit of the working class matured. Intellectuals, students — the majority of the population in fact — have always given expression to their anti-imperialist sentiments.

We Communists can be justly proud of the fact that 45 years ago, in our appeal to the people of May 10, 1931, we were the first to urge 'non-recognition of the concessions and privileges accorded the imperialists' and call for 'nationalization of all factories, mills, mines and transport facilities.' In the early 60s, when the country was ruled by the puppet Betancourt government, this long and persistent struggle of our Party and all Venezuelan patriots developed into armed clashes. And it was in the course of this struggle that the demand for oil nationalization gripped the public mind.

In a certain sense nationalization was prepared also by the fact that all the oil reserves were state property and the imperialist consortiums were only concessionaires. Our people owe this to the political wisdom of their liberator, Simon Bolivar, who 150 years ago decreed that all natural resources remain the property of the state. In 1943, at the height of the Second World War, the Venezuelan parliament enacted a law providing for the eventual abrogation of all oil concessions. This was the legal prerequisite for future nationalization. In time, the Communists and the Democratic Action Party were joined by other political organizations in campaigning against new concessions or prolongation of existing ones. This patriotic demand met with a ready response from the entire population, and in 1971 parliament had no choice but to pass another law, providing that when the present concessions ended (in 1983) all their plant and fixed assets would pass to the state.

Lastly, the nationalization process was strongly influenced by the fundamental changes in the international situation resulting from the immense and uninterrupted growth of the power, influence and authority of world socialism. The remarkable progress of the USSR and the other socialist countries in every realm of human endeavor has helped to popularize socialism and enhance its attraction. Détente is having a positive effect in Latin America as everywhere else in the world. The success of the CPSU Peace Program has helped our peoples' fight for repossession of their natural resources and unhampered national sovereignty.

The weakening of world imperialism, the deep economic crisis of the capitalist system, America's shattering defeat in Vietnam and decline of the dollar, have all brightened the hopes of the Venezuelan

bourgeoisie of revising their hitherto unequal relationship with their imperialist partners. Two of the cardinal external factors that enabled Venezuela to defy Yankee imperialist blackmail and threats and nationalize oil, were the wave of nationalization (full or partial) that has swept the developing countries, notably the Arab states, and the strengthening of OPEC.[6]

What is the Communist Party's position vis-à-vis this crucial development in Venezuela? At this point we cannot give a simple, and still less final, answer. For it is one thing to adopt a law and quite another consistently to put it into practice. The Communists have carefully followed the nationalization process from its very start and have supported all its progressive aspects and criticized its defeats. The Party program adopted at our Fifth Congress in 1974 contains this passage: 'Apart from all other considerations, the working class is interested in nationalization of the basic economic branches because this will make it easier, when the time comes, to lay the economic foundations of socialism. In iron-ore and oil, there are now concrete ways of ridding the country of foreign monopoly domination. Of course, the character of nationalization will depend on how effective it is in abolishing monopoly omnipotence.[7] Later, when the nature of oil nationalization stood out more clearly, our attitude was expressed in the declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean held in Havana in June 1975; 'For Venezuela, the discovery of new vast oil-bearing areas means that it must choose between placing the nation's riches at the service of U.S. companies and taking them into its own hands . . . Oil nationalization will — in spite of the limitations of the relevant legislation now under discussion in parliament — constitute an important step toward taking the people's most important riches back from foreign monopolies.'

We Communists supported the nationalization law because it abolishes the concession regime established by the multinational corporations. But it is not only the economic aspect that counts. It might well be that for some time nationalization will prove less profitable. The main thing is that it will stimulate the struggle for our independence and sovereignty, the struggle to enable Venezualans to dispose of their national wealth and decide how much oil should be sold and to whom. Doubtlessly, this is a progressive action by the government, for by eliminating the neo-colonial system of oil concessions the country has taken a significant step toward genuine independence.

Another Communist Party statement, in February 1976, stressed that oil nationalization proved that the state was in a position to take over administration of the major imperialist-controlled industries, and that Venezuela is part of the struggle being waged by OPEC and other

developing countries for control over their natural resources. Besides, nationalization is bound to stimulate the national independence movement in other areas.

However, it has to be said that the nationalization process is anything but a revolutionary measure, as was the case in Chile and is the case now in Peru. For Venezuelan nationalization is essentially the result of long negotiations and agreements between the bourgeoisie and the foreign monopolies. This is attributable to the nature of the present political regime, which we Communists consider democratic in form and oligarchic in substance.[8] Its policy is to safeguard the foundations of capitalism and strengthen the position of the big bourgeoisie. This has made for considerable concessions to the oil companies: they are being paid more than a billion dollars in compensation (the only parliamentary opposition to this came from the Communists and the Revolutionary Left Movement). They also retain the right to market the oil and the exclusive right to its transport and the supply of technology. Article 5 of the nationalization law holds out a very special danger, for it envisages foreign investment in mixed companies.

For all these reasons the Communist Party believes that nationalization has, so far, only weakened, not destroyed, the country's economic dependence on the international oil consortiums. That has been admitted by President Perez himself. He told a congressional delegation in March: 'Nationalization is not of itself enough to assure our economic independence. Dependence still remains and, I might add, we now face a bigger danger than before. I say this because it is my duty as head of state to draw the people's attention to the complexity and urgency of the problems, the solution of which will enable us to extend oil nationalization and make it an effective weapon of liberation, and not of perpetuating dependence. Though we control the oil industry, there has been no change whatever in the marketing of oil. Here we are still dependent on the multinationals.'

We cannot at this point forecast how the nationalization process will develop.

The democratic forces are gravely concerned over the government's decision to appoint men closely associated with foreign companies to direct the nationalized enterprises, men who have been trained to serve the imperialists and idolize the 'northern Colossus.' Another grave danger the government has to reckon with is that the foreign companies are openly violating their agreements and cutting back oil purchases.

The imperialists have a close knowledge of the thinking and sentiments of the men who speak for the Venezuelan bourgeoisie: our people say they 'are afraid of the skin of the tiger they themselves

killed.' Aided by local reactionaries, the imperialists are again bringing pressure to bear on the government, on the plea that the marketing of oil can efficiently be organized only by foreign companies and that nationalization should not, therefore, go beyond bounds acceptable to these companies. Kissinger visited Caracas in February, the Communist Politbureau statement says, to sow intrigue against socialist Cuba and strengthen the position of those in Venezuela prepared to surrender to U.S. threats, but his chief purpose was to pressure Venezuela into making more concessions to the imperialist consortiums, including the right to exploit the Orinoco oil deposits. If the foreign monopolies were given that right, the London *Economist* (December 27, 1975) wrote, they would be able to extract much more than the 32 billion barrels they extracted in the past 60 years.

The future struggle of the working class and people of Venezuela must aim at accentuating the patriotic character of nationalization, make it irreversible, prevent all attempts to hamper administration of nationalized industries. The aim should be repeal of Article 5, that loophole for the organization of mixed enterprises. It will take years of struggle to achieve nationalization also of transport and foreign trade, still controlled by foreign companies, but this has to be done in the interests of the people and of Venezuela's national independence.

1. Signed by President Perez on August 29, 1975, the law provides for transfer to the state of the entire oil industry, including prospecting, development, refining and transporting of oil and all other fuels, and the establishment of a state oil company, Petroven.

2. Actually, things took a different turn. Venezuela's announcement of plans to nationalize its natural resources greatly complicated its relations with the USA. Washington threatened economic reprisals and when Venezuela and other OPEC countries raised oil prices, the then U.S. Secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger, threatened armed intervention. A while ago the Speaker of the Venezuelan Congress, Gonzalo Barrios, said that Washington regarded oil nationalization as 'outright robbery.'

3. In addition to oil, iron ore was nationalized on January 1, 1975. Though of lesser economic importance than oil, ore exports averaged 20 million tons a year over the past quarter century.

4. One barrel = 135.1 kilograms. — *Ed.*

5. There is no way of establishing the precise amount of net profits of the foreign companies since 1917, when they began large-scale operations. After nationalization these companies concluded cooperation agreements with Petroven on very advantageous terms. But considering that up to quite recently the companies were paying Venezuela from $1 to $2 a barrel and that the price was raised to $14 after the oil crisis, net profits over this period can be conservatively estimated at $50 billion.

6. The OPEC 'revolt' is proof that relations between the foreign monopolies and the developing countries have entered a new stage characterized by rejection of the old colonial or neo-colonial concession system. The omnipotence of the imperialist monopolies is becoming a thing of the past.

7. Programa del Partido Comunista de Venezeula. Caracas, 1974, p. 11.

8. The regime of liberal-bourgeois democracy in Venezuela is unique in Latin America. After a series of tyrannical dictatorships, the country now presents a model

of the 'representative democracy' so assiduously advertised by imperialist propaganda. The present system is now in its 18th year and President Perez is the fourth president elected by popular vote, under the two-party system, Democratic Action and COPEI. This system is opposed by various revolutionary organizations who cannot agree with each other and are still inhibited by the negative consequences of the abortive armed struggles of the 60s. Besides, there are renegade and opportunist groups and a small group of anti-Soviet and anti-communist ultra-lefts. The Communist Party has to work in a very complex situation. Nonetheless, beginning with 1971, it has been gaining strength and it can be said that it has overcome crisis developments within its ranks.

The crux of the Middle East crisis

Our correspondent has interviewed *Farouk Kaddoumi* and *Abdel Mohsen Abu Maizar,* Executive Committee members of the PLO. Following is a transcript of their statements.

F. Kaddoumi. The struggle which the Palestine Liberation Organization is carrying on is a political, military diplomatic one.

To begin with, I would like to stress the role of socialist countries in supporting the PLO and its fight for the restoration of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. The Soviet Union, which has officially recognized our organization, uses its tremendous prestige to that end. A PLO mission has been opened in Mosocw. Non-aligned countries, Arab and other Islamic states invariably identify themselves with our struggle. They have recognized the PLO as the only lawful representative of the Palestinian people.

International support for our just cause found expression in the UN General Assembly resolutions on Palestine[1] and on the definition of Zionism as a variety of racism.

The PLO is engaged in military and political activities in the occupied areas of Palestine. Military operations are the responsibility of fedayeen guerrillas. Political work is in the hands of the Palestine National Front (PNF), whose basic assumption is that the masses need a political education and must gain political consciousness and that all patriots must unite in a broad front.

The democratic forces and fedayeen organizations have set up a front of their own precisely because they want to achieve closer unity of the masses in the occupied territories and to lead their struggle for the withdrawal of Israeli troops and restoration of the Palestinians' national rights. It is safe to say that this unity, essential to the struggle for the PLO's intermediate objectives, i.e., the establishment of na-

tional rule in every part of Palestinian territory that may be freed or from which Israeli troops may pull out, is now a reality. The population of the occupied areas has given repeated proof of its support of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.[2]

A. Maizar. Progressive and national forces in the occupied areas agreed on the PNF program on August 15, 1973. The Front unites all who are opposed to the occupation: the Communists, Al Fatah, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the trade unions, the General Union of Palestinian Women and other organizations. It also includes independent national patriotic leaders.

The PNF has led the masses of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip ever since it was founded. It holds demonstrations against the invaders' unlawful acts and in support of the PLO. It organizes protests and condemns repressive measures against fighters imprisoned in Israel and in the occupied areas, where prisoners are treated in a way that challenges all standards of civilization and law.[3]

Numerous Palestinian fighters are tortured by the police and military investigators. Some of them have died in jail, others have been driven mad. The jailers and interrogators torture even women fighters of the National Front. Archbishop Capucci, head of the Greek Catholic community of Jerusalem, is in jail. A sick old man, he is serving a term of 12 years.

Between 1967 and 1975, Israel banished over 2,000 people from the occupied area, including leaders of the liberation movement, politicians, religious leaders, engineers, workers, teachers, students. I was one of the victims of that arbitrary policy.[4]

The National Front subscribes to the PLO political program. It is not a separate organization, but a political and popular branch of the PLO in the occupied areas. Three of its members are on the PLO Executive Committee and another 10, on the National Council.

All patriotic forces cooperate in the Front. We are fighting shoulder to shoulder like brothers and we speak one language, the language of struggle against occupation, for the liberation and unity of the Arab people of Palestine. Our people — all who have had to live in tents and refugee camps for 28 years now — must return to their homeland. Palestinians have found refuge in Arab countries, they speak one language and have common customs, yet they continue to live in tents because they want to go home, even if it means going to an occupied area. For 18 years we have continued our peaceful efforts and have been calling for international solidarity. We demonstrated goodwill and a desire for peace. Not until we saw that there was no alternative to taking up arms and beginning a revolutionary struggle did we launch armed operations (on January 1, 1965).

What we have achieved in past years is that the UN is showing a concern for our affairs, and this helps the Arab people of Palestine in their everyday struggle in occupied areas. There have been continuous demonstrations there since January 1976, when the Security Council held a meeting on Palestine which the PLO regards as a milestone in its diplomatic effort. Why?

First of all, because in spite of objections from the United States, the PLO was invited to attend the meeting as a member state and not as a witness.[5] (I attended together with Farouk Kaddoumi.) For the first time ever, the Palestinian problem was examined by the Security Council thoroughly and that, too, was a big gain, for international opinion is beginning to realize that the problem endangers peace because it is still unsolved. Furthermore, the debate itself and the outcome of the vote were a reflection of the increasingly widespread view that Security Council Resolution 242 needs to be extended as a basis for settling the Palestinian problem, for it does not consider the problem a national and political issue.[6]

During the two weeks of the Security Council debate, the world saw that the Palestinian question was the crux of the Middle East crisis. Peace in the region can be achieved only if the Arab people of Palestine exercise their right to self-determination and to establishing a national state in Palestine and if the refugees are allowed to return home. The debate was an international demonstration of the justice of the Palestinian cause and had repercussions even in the United States. The U.S. and Israel found themselves in complete isolation as enemies of a fair and genuine peace in the Middle East. The debate demonstrated once again the sincere solidarity of the Soviet Union with the Arab cause, in particular with the cause of the Palestinian people.

The Security Council debate confirmed that the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, the non-aligned countries and Islamic states, support the legitimate struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their rights.

After the Security Council meeting, UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim told us that in spite of the U.S. veto, he considered the draft resolution a moral guideline for himself as UN Secretary General and that no one could ignore or disregard the provisions contained in the draft.

F. Kaddoumi. In submitting their draft resolution, the non-aligned states wanted to stress the Palestinians' national rights. The opinion is gaining ground in the world that Resolution 242 is not an adequate basis for settling the problem. The Security Council could have complemented it with a resolution on the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, national statehood and the repatria-

tion of refugees as a binding precondition for any Middle East settlement. If accepted, in particular by the great powers, these principles would open the door to a fair solution. But this solution was blocked by the U.S. veto, which showed again that the U.S. government refuses to recognize the rights of our people, just as it refuses to recognize the PLO.

It is well known that we made reservations on some provisions of the draft resolution. How can the PLO recognize the right of Israel to existence 'within secure boundaries' if its rulers deny our right to statehood? The issue of recognition relates to state sovereignty and no one has the right to compel one state to recognize another. The PLO stand on this matter is prompted by political reality.

The same is true of our attitude to the Geneva Conference. It is the duty of the PLO to represent our people's interests everywhere, meaning also the United Nations and its various agencies. We are often asked what the PLO position would be at the Geneva Conference. But we have not been invited to Geneva. Nor can we discuss the question of what would happen if we were invited because we know that the United States, a loyal ally of Israel, is positively against inviting us. This question can be answered only if we are invited and when the PLO sees on what basis and what terms it is being invited. Only then will it discuss the matter on its merits and take a stand in keeping with the interests of our struggle and our people.

The Arab people of Palestine are resolved to step up their heroic fight.

1. On November 22, 1974, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution confirming the indisputable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination. For details, see Yassir Arafat, 'The way to restoring the violated rights of the Palestinian people,' in *WMR*, February 1975., p. 123. — *Ed.*

2. On April 12, 1976, on instructions from the occupation authorities, municipal elections were held among the Arab population on the West Bank seized by Israel. The elections were won by the candidates of patriotic, progressive and left-wing forces, many of whom openly came out in support of the PLO. — *Ed.*

3. See F. Langer, 'Israeli violation of human rights' in *WMR*, June 1976, p. 118. — *Ed.*

4. We were banished on September 10, 1973. One group comprised three Communists and there independents, including a mayor, a doctor and a judge. We were seized at night, blindfolded and six hours later found ourselves in the desert south of the Dead Sea. Brandishing their weapons the soldiers forced us to cross over into Jordan. We spent several hours in the desert without food and water until a Jordanian military patrol came across us by chance. Afterwards we tried to cross the bridge back to the West Bank. We wanted to return to our homeland by way of a peaceful demonstration and so we invited the press. But we were forcibly prevented from going back. That was on December 10, the day when the world marks the anniversary of the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Our case is a further illustration of all the false talk about 'democracy' in Israel.

5. In March 1976, PLO representatives again attended a Security Council meeting convened urgently to discuss the arbitrary acts and violence of the Israeli military in

the occupied areas. Fourteen votes were cast in favor of the draft resolution condemning those acts but the United States vetoed it. — *Ed.*

6. The draft resolution submitted by six states on January 26, 1976, says, among other things, that the Security Council confirms: '(a) that the Palestinian people should be allowed to exercise their inalienable national right to self-determination, including the right to establish an independent state in Palestine in accordance with the United Nations Charter;

'(b) the right of the Palestinian refugees who wish to return to their homes and to live in peace with their neighbors to do so, and the right of those who prefer not to return to receive compensation for their property;

'(c) that Israel shall withdraw from all the Arab territories it has occupied since June 1967;

'(d) that appropriate measures shall be adopted to guarantee, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all states in the region and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.' — *Ed.*

The racist-Zionist alliance

Zahi Karkabi
Secretary of CC,
CP of Israel

Birds of a feather flock together. The saying neatly fits the rapprochement between Israel and South Africa, culminating in Prime Minister Vorster's April visit to Israel.[1]

This visit by the head of a racist regime that has earned increasing condemnation throughout the world did not come as any great surprise. In fact, it is regarded as natural and logical.

The South African regime has shown itself to be the sworn enemy of the national-liberation movement throughout Africa. The Israeli Zionist leadership has shown itself to be the inveterate enemy of the revolutionary liberation processes in the Middle East, it is pursuing a racist policy toward the Arab Palestinian people and the Arabs living in Israel, continues occupation of the Arab territories captured in June 1967, and faithfully upholds the political, economic and military interests of the U.S. in the Middle East. Little surprise, then, that the Israeli government, which claims to be defending the interests of the Jewish people who had gone through the tragedy of the nazi terror, did not for a moment hesitate to form an alliance with a regime whose leaders openly sympathized with nazi fascism during the Second World War (incidentally, Vorster was considered one of the most outspoken pro-nazis), and, having come to power, installed a system

in many ways similar to the nazi 'new order.' What has brought the two together is identity of basic political and ideological positions, the affinity of Zionist concepts with apartheid — two varieties of racism denounced by the United Nations — the profound and all-embracing crisis and the stifling international isolation of both regimes. Furthermore, the material basis for such an alliance already exists.

Trade and economic ties between Israel and South Africa are long standing.[2] Their official political rapprochement began in 1973 when the vast majority of tropical African countries (29 out of 33) broke off diplomatic relations with Israel in protest against its Middle East aggression. The rapprochement was consolidated in 1975 with the exchange of ambassadors and was carried forward by the official visit of South African Interior Minister Mulder.

Significantly, relations between Israel and South Africa became closer with the rise of the national-liberation movement of the African and Arab peoples. Vorster's visit coincided in time with, first, the mounting wave of actions by the Arab Palestinian people in the occupied West Bank against the Israeli invader, and, second, with the continued expansion of the liberation struggle of the indigenous African population against the South African racist regime. In this unfavorable situation the leaders of the two regimes are anxious to encourage each other, support each other morally and materially in order to continue their old policies.

Their closer relations are not merely in response to the will of their governments. Behind the scenes are powerful international forces, notably U.S. imperialism.

The victory of the Angolan people was a defeat not only for South Africa. It played havoc with Washington's imperialist plans in Africa as a whole. The alignment of world forces, the sharp American public opposition to military interference in Angola's affairs, the fear of encountering an energetic rebuff from the African states, prevented the U.S. imperialists from launching military intervention in Angola and giving direct support to the South African aggression against that country. (Exposure of CIA activities abroad revealed its direct participation in organizing the carrying out plots against the MPLA and then against the independent People's Republic of Angola. The *New York Times* considered this the biggest U.S.-organized secret operation after Indochina.) And now, too, the U.S. has refrained from openly supporting the South African racist regime, which has been condemned both by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. Instead, Washington wants the Zionist leadership of Israel to take part in protecting U.S. interests not only in the Middle East, but also in Africa. Hence America's heightened interest in the alliance of Israel and South Africa as a means of pressure and diktat

against the liberation movement both in the Arab world and in Africa.

As a result of the Rabin-Vorster negotiations the 'alliance against communism' and against the African and Arab national-liberation movements has become a practical proposition. Its founders have declared it is open to membership by other countries too.

Vorster was greatly encouraged by the visit. The Israeli government agreed to closer cooperation in military and other areas. Now South Africa's plans to modernize its army, pronounced obsolete after its defeat in Angola, have acquired a concrete material basis. The Pretoria government intends to purchase a variety of military hardware in Israel — tanks, planes, missile boats.[3] Besides, South Africa has shown a keen interest in Israeli anti-guerrilla operations. And the South African racists want not only weapons, but also advisers.

Reports of possible cooperation between the two countries in developing nuclear weapons have caused grave concern.[4] For it is generally known that Israel has the technology to produce nuclear bombs, and if it receives enriched uranium from South Africa it can actually produce them for both countries.

Our Party Central Committee resolution (April 1976), protesting against the emergence of an Israeli-South African alliance, says that it is 'threatening the Middle East and Africa with the introduction of atomic weapons, which would imperil the lives of their peoples.'

The negotiations and agreement with Vorster confirm anew the racist character of the policy pursued by the Zionist ruling circles. And we especially stress that this unholy racist-Zionist alliance is fraught wtih a grave peril to international security, the liberation struggle of the Arab and African peoples and their social progress. We are convinced that the forces of peace and national liberation will correctly assess the sinister plots of the racists and Zionists and will administer a suitable rebuff.

1. Vorster was a special guest of Israeli Prime Minister Rabin. But the Israeli Foreign Ministry tried to present his visit as purely 'private,' as something in the nature of an Easter pilgrimage to the holy places. But during this 'piligrimage,' Vorster spent most of his time visiting military installations, Israeli bases in occupied Arab territories and met and talked with high-placed Israeli politicians and officers. — *Ed.*

2. Israel is one of South Africa's chief trade and economic partners. Their trade, according to *Time* magazine (April 26, 1976) increased from $3m. in 1961 to $120m. at the present time. There is also a far-reaching technical assistance program. — *Ed.*

3. The *International Herald Tribune* (April 19, 1976) said that South Africa was shopping for more Israeli weapons in exchange for a commitment to finance war production in Israel.

4. There was also speculation that South Africa had agreed to provide Israel with supplies of uranium as part of the exchange agreement (*International Herald Tribune*, April 19, 1976).

comment

What causes inflation?

S. Nikitin, S. Pronin
Soviet economists

Inflationary processes in developed capitalist countries have shown a sharp upturn in the past decade, especially in the 70s. Of the many causes of inflation, we will deal here chiefly with monopoly pricing policy and the excessive issuing of money necessitated by the capitalist countries' enormous expenditures, above all military.

Monopoly pricing nowadays consists primarily in setting relatively uniform and stable prices for kindred products. 'Price leadership' is a common practice, with all major corporations in the monopolized industries following the prices determined by the 'leader,' or the most powerful corporation. And since the latter's purpose in fixing prices is to make high and stable profits, all companies in the industry concerned expect 'price leadership' to produce similar profits for them.[1] As a rule, the decisve factor in pricing is the setting of a 'target' profit rate, seen by the given company as a requisite of its long-range development. The actual pricing consists in adding to production costs (with the plant operating at standard, usually 80 per cent, capacity) an increase to ensure the 'target' profit rate over the entire output.

Significantly, the 'target' rate is, as a rule, set much higher (15 to 150 per cent) than the industrial average, and, secondly, it is always after tax deduction. This means that big companies do not regard tax on profits as part of the 'target' rate, but as a kind of indirect tax included in the price to pass the tax burden, fully or in part, on to the consumer. To secure a 'target' profit rate means making superprofit, that is, a surplus over and above 'normal' average profit. For leading companies in industries with highly concentrated production and capital, the higher 'target' rate becomes, in the end, the average annual profit rate. Thus, whereas the average annual profit rate (before taxes) throughout the U.S. manufacturing industry in the 1960-70 period stood at 12.5 per cent, it amounted to 17.1 per cent in twenty major companies, General Motors registering 30.7 per cent, General Electric 21.8, Dupont de Nemours 19.6, Eastman Kodak 34.7, Caterpiller Tractor 28.7 and Boeing 20.8 per cent.

Monopoly pricing techniques inevitably push up prices and breed

inflation. Price growth is steepest on goods sold to the capitalist state. In the United States, in the 70s, it was from 50 to 100 per cent greater than in the case of other goods and services. This is primarily the result of the monopolies' outright overpricing of military supplies. Increases in energy prices in developed capitalist countries are largely due to the big oil companies using their secret cartel arrangements during the energy crisis to secure exceptionally high profits.

Price increases are also caused by a tremendous growth of distribution costs. Indeed, competition today is less a matter of undercutting, than of frequent changes in variety and quality of output that entail enormous marketing and advertising expenses. This means much greater outlays, particularly for distribution.[2] According to estimates, half of every dollar spent by the American consumer is earmarked for meeting distribution costs. Three to four per cent of the U.S. national income is spent on advertising.

An additional factor in raising the general price level is that, with demand falling off, companies often prefer to cut production rather than prices to keep up their profits.

State consumption is a powerful catalyst of inflation in developed capitalist countries and one of the main levers of continuous pressure on prices. Extension of economic regulation by capitalist states, attempts to ease certain socio -economic difficulties and contradictions of capitalism by means of budget appropriations, and also the high rate of military spending, leave these states permanently short of financial resources. (Government expenditures in the main capitalist countries claim from 25 to 40 per cent of the national income.) In the United States, revenue slightly exceeded expenditure only seven times in more than 25 years (1946-1973). In all other years, its budget showed a substantial deficit. Britain from 1960 to 1973 had a deficit-free budget only twice. The situation is no better in other capitalist countries. Budget deficits are caused largely by excessive military spending, which 1974 climbed to a total of $132,000m, in the NATO countries.

Government consumption on an immense scale is financed by issuing more money, which makes price growth all the greater and more persistent. The aggregate gross national product of developed capitalist countries in the 1966-70 period increased by an annual average of five per cent and the money supply (cash and demand deposits), by 9.5 per cent, or almost twice as fast. In 1971-73, with the overall GNP growing at an average annual rate of 5.2 per cent, the total amount of money in these countries increased by an annual average of 13.7 per cent, or 2.6 times faster. Added to this was a considerable acceleration of money turnover. In 1964-73, turnover on bank accounts in major U.S. financial centers increased by 180 per

cent. This is equivalent to thousands of millions of newly-issued dollars.

In a number of developed capitalist countries, price growth quickened due to 'inflation export,' which, in turn, stems from the United States' enormous military spending. These expenditures, in particular direct military aid to puppet regimes and maintenance of U.S. military bases and forces abroad, total half as much again as the positive effect achieved on all other balance-of-payments items. The U.S. meets the greater part of its balance-of-payments deficit through increased accumulation of dollars by other countries. As a result, U.S. commitments abroad in the early 70s were several times greater than the total amount of the country's gold and foreign exchange reserves. The growing instability of the dollar as an international currency is also understandable because a continuous outflow of gold has almost halved the U.S. gold reserve compared with the 50s. In addition, continuous inflation, which intensified in the late 60s, has been depreciating the dollar in comparison with other capitalist currencies, reducing the competitive capacity of American goods on the world market, hampering exports and increasing imports. This has tended to diminish U.S. foreign-trade earnings, thereby undermining the dollar still more.

The pound sterling has been losing stability for similar reasons. At the same time, vast amounts of depreciated dollars have gone on accumulating in West European countries and Japan. From 1971 to 1973, the massive influx of dollars to these countries was increased by profiteering in short-term capital, primarily by U.S. multinational companies. To keep the exchange rate of various currencies in relation to the dollar within established bounds, as laid down by the International Monetary Fund, the central banks of West European countries and Japan bought up dollar surpluses on the foreign-exchange market and put corresponding amounts of national currency into circulation. The result was a marked intensification of inflationary processes outside the U.S. To counter these processes, some currencies were allowed to float. But this measure did not eliminate the need of government interference in the foreign exchange market. Inflationary pressure through these channels persists.

Bourgeois politicians and economists have a different explanation for increased inflation. The usual argument is that the developing countries put up the price of oil and other raw materials, and that the employers in developed capitalist countries are compelled to give in to the workers' demands for higher nominal wages. But these propaganda arguments do not hold water.

The developing countries did raise the price of oil and other raw materials in the 70s, especially in 1973 and 1974. But the increase

came after more than two decades of relatively stable world prices for raw materials and an almost continuous increase in the prices of manufactured goods. Taking the 1950 price level as 100, world export prices of all raw materials in 1970 rose to 105 per cent while those of manufactured goods shot up to 147 per cent. In the 70s, the oil-producing countries used OPEC, their international organization, to raise oil prices so as to safeguard their economic interests against the monopolies and the imperialist countries. World prices of other raw materials went up too. However, the effect of the increase in world raw material prices was soon wiped out. The 1974-75 world economic crisis forced down world prices of most raw materials, whereas the prices of manufactured goods tended to rise with continuing inflation in the imperialist countries. As a result the ratio between world prices of raw materials and manufactured goods, which in 1974 stood at 122 (1950 = 100) dropped to 98 in the second quarter of 1975 and continues to fall. But in spite of the lower world level of raw material prices, inflationary price growth in developed capitalist countries in 1975 went on almost unabated.

To this should be added that the developed capitalist countries themselves have been jacking up the prices of fuel and other raw materials. In late 1974, the United States sold Japan coking coal at $90.70 per ton, compared with $27.60 in 1971, and last year there were cases of the price going as high as $140 and $150.

Thus, when it is in monopoly interests the United States is prepared to raise the world prices of the energy resources it possesses. For instance, Washington is concerned with keeping high the profits of the corporations engaged in coal mining and atomic energy. To protect these corporations from the competition of the oil companies, the U.S. administration seeks to establish a high minimum level of world market prices on oil, it has introduced tariffs on imported oil, etc.[3]

The same is done by other developed capitalist countries. They have no compunction about pushing up the world prices of any raw materials of which they have large deposits. But they raise hue and cry in the world press when the emergent exporting countries take steps to protect their own interests by reducing the price gap between raw materials and manufactured products.

It is also argued, just as lamely, that mounting inflation is due to nominal wage increases, which are said to increase production costs and force companies into raising the prices of their output. This sort of argument is behind widespread feeling in bourgeois quarters that pressure on the working class, above all through greater unemployment, is a decisive means of combating inflation.

Yet the growth of nominal wages does not cause either price

increases by big monopolies or inflation. To begin with, wage rises are brought about by mounting prices for necessities. In other words, the workers' demand for higher wages is a protective reaction to attacks on their standard of living. Secondly, anyone who assesses the ratio between wage and price increases should remember that since wages are only part of production costs and goods prices a wage rise cannot cause an equal price increase. According to the latest statistics, the share of wages and salaries in the production costs of the U.S. manufacturing industry is about 24 per cent and the share of wages alone, about 15 per cent. It follows that to evoke a one per cent price increase, wages would have to go up by severn per cent (other price elements and labor productivity remaining unchanged) and wages and salaries as a whole, by roughly four per cent.

This means that the actual ratio between rising wages and prices can best be established in comparing changes in wages per unit of output with changes in wholesale (producers') prices. The average annual increase in wages per industrial output unit in the U.S. between 1939 and 1970 was 3.1 per cent and the average annual increase in wholesale prices, 3.2 per cent. But when inflation intensified — from 1966 to 1974 — the respective figures were 3.2 and 5.4 per cent, and in 1973 and 1974 they were 1.5 and 13.1, and 7.2 and 18.9 per cent respectively. The situation is much the same in other developed capitalist countries. It shows that growing inflation in the capitalist world is caused by anything but wage increases.

The big monopolies' pricing policy is not merely a result of changes in wages or other production costs. It is independent and plays a definite role in price trends. A comparison of wage and profit trends in the main capitalist country, the United States, is revealing in this respect. In 1967-73, real wages in industry went up by 9.7 per cent while monopoly profits grew from $46,400 million to $74,200 million, or by 60 per cent. The policy of making big profits, which is at the root of monopoly pricing is one of the main causes of the rising cost of living and mounting inflation.

The boards of major companies have devised an ingenious secret mechanism to prevent nominal and hence real wage rises that would bring down profits. The operation of this mechanism is seen in the ratio between wages and profits during cyclical fluctuations in production and inflationary price growth. It was investigated by S. Morley, an American economist, who shows in his book[4] how inflationary price growth during a cyclical pick up imperceptibly reduces the growth rate of real wages and in some cases the absolute amount of wages. The reduction goes unnoticed for a time and is therefore not opposed by the trade unions. As for the employers, they use the favorable situation to expand production and increase employment

(by taking on low-paid workers — women, youth, jobless people). The result is a further drop in real wage rates. With prices going up, this means an increase in profit and, in many cases, the rate of profit. The unions then begin to fight for higher nominal wages. The employers are forced to yield to this pressure, but the concessions they make merely restore the original balance between wages and profits. In other words, so long as the cyclical crisis or inflation persists, the employers have the opportunity over a definite period — from three to 10 months as a rule — to exploit a greater number of workers while cutting wages.

The same author makes a more detailed study of the operation of the mechanism during a complete industrial cycle. He comes to the conclusion that where there is inflationary price growth, the operation of the mechanism makes profit growth entirely independent of wage increases in almost every phase of the cycle. Price growth becomes a requisite for the monopolies to secure a high amount and rate of profit during the industrial cycle, both by stepping up exploitation and nullifying a substantial part, or even all, of the workers' gains in real wages. In 1974 growing retail prices swallowed 95 per cent of the increase in nominal wages in Britain and Japan, 87 in West Germany and Italy and 77 in France.

It will be seen that inflation and growing prices are a means of exerting pressure on the working class and redistributing its incomes in favor of monopoly capital. Inflation hits hardest the low and average income groups, especially those with a fixed income, such as pensioners and students. And it benefits the basic forms of wealth concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie — securities, particularly shares, real estate and other immovables — by sharply raising their value.[5] The facts of today show that Lenin was right in saying that the rapid depreciation of money 'most of all affects the conditions of the workers, of the poorest section of the population,' and that inflation encourages profiteering and enables the capitalists to make millions from it (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 25, pp. 353-354).

The attention focussed by fraternal delegates attending the 25th CPSU Congress on the social consequences of the crisis of modern capitalism is very indicative. 'This crisis, and there is no need to stress its depth, is hitting hard the working class, other strata of working people and a great part of the middle section of the population in our country,' said Belgian Communist Party Chairman Louis Van Geyt, 'the more so that the capitalist monopolies and the government obedient to them are doing their best to keep up and multiply their capital and profits in this situation by placing the burden of the crisis onto others, mainly the working people.' William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada,

described the present road of capitalist development as one of stagnation, inflation, unemployment and the falling standard of living in the domains of state-monopoly capitalism.

The working people suffer not only from unemployment but also from the rising cost of living. The General Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, Gordon McLennan, cited figures for the latter half of 1975 showing that the biggest drop in living standards had occurred in his country in the past 20 years. And Aarne Saarinen, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Finland, pointed out that in his country '. . . the cost of living is rising annually by about 20 per cent.'

There is no strong government resistance to the monopoly policy of exploiting and even stimulating inflation to maintain and increase profits. Every variety of the so-called anti-inflation policy shows an explicit class tendency. Its purpose is to cope with inflation primarily at the expense of the working class.

A so-called policy of deflation, designed to restrict demand for money through the credit and tax machinery (by levying higher taxes on the population, raising interest rates, reducing certain government expenditures, etc.), is the method most commonly used. The end result of such measures is a lower growth rate and more unemployment, which affects primarily the working class. In cutting budget appropriations, capitalist states generally whittle down expenditure for social purposes while leaving immense military expenditure intact.

The capitalist countries' deflation policy largely predetermined the situation in 1974-75, when inflation combined with economic stagnation and high unemployment, or stagflation to use the current term. It aggravated the world economic crisis and sent the unemployment curve soaring but did little to check price growth since it hardly affected the main sources of contemporary inflation — monopoly pricing and enormous government spending, above all for military purposes. Although the unemployed in the U.S. numbered as many as 8.5 million by mid-1975, prices went on rising. This is also typical of other developed capitalist countries. The hopes of bourgeois politicians and economists, who had expected high unemployment to sharply reduce inflation, were dashed. On the other hand, the combination of inflation and high unemployment sharpened the socio-economic contradictions of capitalism, which prompted many bourgeois economists to compare the 1974-75 situation with the 1929-33 crisis.

There is an anti-labor bias to yet another set of the capitalist countries' measures against inflation. It is known as 'incomes policy' and consists in simultaneous control over prices and wages (it provides for a complete wage freeze or only slight increases). But under monopoly capitalism it is impossible to operate effective price con-

trol. Besides, government agencies responsible for control usually neglect their duty. On the other hand there are ample opportunities of establishing effective control over wages, since the employers are only too eager to cooperate with the government agencies concerned. In practice, 'incomes policy' greatly slows down wage growth while doing very little to curb increases. This explains the workers' adamant opposition to this policy and the bourgeoisie is reluctant to apply it in countries where this opposition is particularly strong.

The only way for the working class to maintain and improve its standard of living in the climate of acute inflation is to step up its fight against the monopolies and their backer, the capitalist state. This is, in fact, the road taken by the workers and other working people, and it provides a basis for a united anti-monopoly front.

1. Monopolies often go beyond 'price leadership' to make confidential price deals, to the point of founding secret cartels.
2. In the United States, 25 per cent of the selling-price of cars goes for frequent remodelling, often unjustified.
3. Naturally, the U.S. oil monopolies are protected and their profits continue to grow. It is not accidental that even during the energy crisis, Exxon, the biggest oil monopoly, surged to first place in profits, overtaking the former leader, General Motors.
4. S. Morley, *The Economics of Inflation*, Hinsdall, 1971.
5. The following figures speak of the concentration of securities, first of all shares, in the hands of the upper stratum of the monopoly bourgeoisie and of its interest in precisely this form of wealth: a mere 1.6 per cent of the adult population of the U.S. owns 82.2 per cent of all shares in the country.

Class alliances and the strategy of change

Alberto Kohen
Argentine journalist

THE WORKING CLASS AND ITS ALLIES

The problems raised in the discussion are relevant to the revolutionary working-class struggle. They call for scientific analysis of the changes in the economic and social structures of various countries and in the class struggle going on there, an analysis that takes in the new conditions arising from the October 1917 Revolution and the massive influence that existing socialism now exerts on world development.

A further contribution to the discussion. See *WMR*, July, September, October, November and December 1975 and January, February and May 1976.

The problem of the worker-peasant alliance is a strategic one and cannot be treated abstractly, without studying the economic relations that are taking shape in rural areas. It has already been noted in the discussion that analysis based merely on the size of the agrarian population is becoming less significant than analysis of the economic basis of alliances and the place each social force holds in the production process.[1]

Lenin's analysis of the peasants' economic condition advanced the Marxist agrarian theory and Marxist tenets concerning the allies of the working class. On this basis, he drew a conclusion which in our opinion is as germane today as it ever was: 'The scattered small producers, the peasants, are economically *and politically* united either by the bourgeoisie ... or by the proletariat ...' *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 32, p. 360).

When stressing the need for an economic approach to analysis of the agrarian question one must remember that to make an absolute of it, 'to isolate facts and figures, major and minor, from the general context of politico-economic relations' (Vol. 22, p. 18), means toning down or disregarding the sharp class contradictions in the countryside. We agree with the opinion expressed by a participant in the discussion who said that economic analysis of the peasants' objective condition should always be complemented by a description of the alignment of class forces in rural areas and throughout the country.[2] It is equally necessary to make one's analysis concrete, because conditions differ from country to country and in one and the same country — from region to region.

Now let us take a look at some of the problems of the worker-peasant alliance which we think were not adequately dealt with in the discussion, and which stem from analysis of capitalist development in conditions of dependence on imperialism and the existence of latifundism. Is the slogan 'Land for those who till it' still valid? Is it right to separate the struggle for land from the struggle against monopoly capital? Can we assume that the bourgeoisie of developing countries is still capable of implementing structural changes, putting an end to latifundism and going on from there to accomplish anti-imperialist tasks?

Polarization in the countryside

Argentina is no longer a crop and livestock farming country; it has become an agrarian-industrial country. The share of crop and stock farming in the gross national product continues to decline and so does the share of workers employed in this sector (agriculture's share in the GNP dropped from 18.6 per cent in 1950 to 15.2 in 1970, and the proportion of workers employed in agriculture, from 19.9 to 17.2 per

cent).[3] The relative and absolute decrease in the rural population and in the number of agricultural workers, and the low level of investment, production and productivity[4] suggest that it is not merely a matter of slower development that leans heavily on imperialism, but also of fundamental structural faults (due to the preservation of the latifundist regime) that have revealed themselves in a chronic agrarian crisis.

At one pole are 3,044 latifundia (0.6 of the total number of farms), each with more than 10,000 ha, controlling 33.9 per cent of the land.[5] At the other pole are 278,000 farms (53.2 per cent of all farms), each with less than 50 ha, owning only 2.1 per cent of the land. A similar process of concentration is going on in stock-farming: 74.7 per cent of the farms own 15.3 per cent of the total herd, while 2.1 per cent of them own 38.5 per cent. But even these figures do not reveal the actual situation because one and the same owner may have several farms.[6] According to official estimates for 1975, the number of landless peasants was 142,000 and that of minifundists, 136,500.

Extensive agriculture persists, with steady expansion of stock farming, mainly as a result of bringing more land under pasture.

Argentina has had no agrarian reform. In fact, there has been a kind of 'preventive counter-reform.' As a result a gradual 'defreezing' of tenant farming since 1956 and the massive eviction of tenant farmers and sharecroppers by the military dictatorship since 1967, the land has been concentrated in even fewer hands. In the 60s, big private holdings gobbled up more than 25,000,000 ha, and the last five years, too, have seen an even bigger takeover due, in particular, to speculation. The result is that a small minority has become big landowners or capitalist tenant farmers while the vast majority has gone under, often finishing up in the category of minifundists or landless peasants.

Tenant farmers who leased land for decades and were at one time the principal grain producers have now been replaced by tenants who cannot afford to lease land for more than one year or even one farming season or by 'contract workers,' mostly peasants driven from their land, who move about with their machines working farms belonging to big landowners or rich peasants (which the official census classes as 'owner-farmed land'). Growing at the same time is a thick layer of rich peasants, an agrarian big bourgeoisie, of whom Victorio Codovilla once remarked that 'their primary concern is to sell their produce at a high price and pay as little as possible for the machines, implements and labor power they use.'[7]

Foreign monopoly penetration

Foreign monopoly capital is making dangerous inroads into Argentina's agriculture. Imperialist enterprises become big latifundium own-

ers, as, for instance, Deltec (King Ranch, Swift, etc.), whose possessions have reached out from Brazil via Paraguay and Uruguay to La Pampa Province in Argentina; Coney, which has more than two million ha on the border with Chile, and others. Foreign monopoly capital is closely associated with the traditional oligarchic groups, such as Braun-Menendez, which owns 6.5 million ha.

A group of imperialist monopolies controls the production of tractors, farm machinery, fertilizer, seed, etc., thereby widening the technological gap between the big farms held by a tight little bunch of landowners and the agrarian bourgeoisie and the holdings of the small and middle producers.

Such, in the main, is the pattern of economic and social relations in rural Argentina.

The situation is much the same in most Latin American countries. Less than eight per cent of landowners hold 85 per cent of the lands and forests of the continent, where 'the system of land tenure is characterized, with a few exceptions, by the same inequality as existed in the early years of the struggle for independence.'[8] Despite the uneven and contradictory capitalist development in various Latin American countries, their economies remain basically agrarian; vast numbers of peasants are not in a position to use the modern farming methods, introduced mostly by imperialist corporations, and this, in turn, has chained Latin American countries still more firmly to U.S. monopoly capital.

Capitalist development, which leaves the latifundist leverage intact, has led to a backward and lopsided economy, with more minifundia becoming still more dependent on the latifundia, millions of rural working people subjected to intense exploitation or unemployment and millions of peasants being ruined and deprived of their land. It has brought on poverty, illiteracy and a high rate of child mortality.

Analysis of the main economic trends underlying the latifundist structure and making for increasing economic and financial dependence, with numerous landless or land-hungry peasants and rural youth denied all social rights, tells us quite plainly that the fight for 'land for those who till it' (and for those who want to till it), far from being out of line with the struggle against monopoly capital, is dead on that line. The anti-latifundist marks that the working class and its allies must aim for are in the same target ring as the anti-imperialist marks.

To exaggerate the extent to which capitalism has developed in the countryside, to deny or minimize the importance of the fight against latifundism and treat the latifundia as large-scale capitalist farms would mean depriving the working class of allies at the democratic stage of the revolution. In this context anyone who aims his blow

against the bourgeoisie 'in general' takes the punch out of the fight against the big landowners. On the other hand, to ignore or underrate the development attained by capitalism would mean belittling the role of the working class. Disregard of the problems arising from the capitalist development of the countryside on 'Prussian' lines, with all its grave consequences, primarily the ruining of farmers and deepening class differences, could result in our losing sight of the social forces closest to the working class.

Lastly, to overlook the ever more marked interlocking of the interests of the foreign monopolies and those of the landed oligarchy and big comprador capital could lead to a mechanical separating of the anti-monopoly and anti-latifundist tasks of the revolution. The chief enemy in our country is, now as before, imperialism and its agents within our borders — the landed oligarchy and big capital, who are working together more and more closely.

Allies and enemies

Analysis of the social and economic processes going on in the countryside reveals the nature of the revolution and tells us who is the chief enemy and who are the allies of the working class. The exploited rural masses led by the proletariat, whose number exceeds 50 million, or 60 per cent of the economically active population of Latin America, are one of the driving forces of the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution that can make the far-reaching changes needed to clear the road for socialism.

While stressing the leading role of the working class as the decisive factor in the liberation struggle, the Havana Meeting of the Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean (June 10-13, 1975) pointed out that 'the working peasants are its natural ally.'[9]

The growing penetration of monopolies and financial capital into every sphere of agriculture and the development of capitalist forms of production on top of diehard semi-feudal forms of ownership provide new opportunities for strengthening the ties between the working class and the peasants, who are exploited doubly, as we have seen, by the latifundium owners and the imperialist monopolies.

As the struggle to abolish big landownership goes on it reveals the community of interests between the working class and its main ally at the democratic stage of the revolution. The growing differentiation among the peasants and the deepening crisis aggravate the class struggle. It is a key task for the working class to win over the small and middle peasants so as to ensure continuity in the advance to future socialist goals.

The Communists' support of progressive measures of a bourgeois reformist nature affecting the interests of latifundium holders helps to

sharpen the contradictions between the peasants and imperialism and the landed oligarchy. Nevertheless, the Communists maintain that only working-class leadership of the peasants' struggle, which must be given an anti-imperialist revolutionary content, will satisfy the peasants' most pressing demand, the demand for land.

The Communist Party has its own agrarian program. However, on specific program issues it may find common ground with other progressive forces. Does the CPA agrarian program envisage the abolition of all private landownership? No, it does not. A policy of nationalizing the land would be wrong in Argentina, where there is a developed agrarian bourgeoisie and fairly numerous middle strata, and where attachment to the land is traditionally strong.

This program helps to intensify the fight for the expropriation of big latifundia without compensation and for the free transfer of land to landless and land-hungry peasants. To achieve higher productivity, it proposes setting up state or cooperative farms on latifundia which it would be inadvisable to break up into small holdings. The Party favors every form of voluntary cooperation and collective work on the land.

The actual course of events will largely depend on the attitude of the rich peasants and the agrarian bourgeoisie. The latter's interests will not be infringed at the democratic stage of the revolutionary process provided it uses the land properly, respects the laws of the new, democratic state and guarantees the working people a decent standard of life.

The Eighth National Conference of the CPA (November 1975) specified the Party's main tasks in the struggle for alliances in the countryside with due regard to the need of 'a differentiated approach aimed at unification and coordination, concentrating the blow against the real chief enemy.'[10] In the countryside the working class is supported by agricultural workers and small and middle peasants. They make up the bulk of the rural population. This, of course, does not rule out participation in broad alliances and in the struggle for both particular and general demands by other sections of the rural population, including the rich peasants, who usually vacillate.

The landed oligarchy is at the other pole. It is a pillar of political reaction making common cause with imperialism in its plans for 'destabilizing' the domestic situation and setting up a fascist dictatorship. The stock farmers' strikes in late 1975 and the February 1976 'lock-out' are only two of recent attempts by the oligarchy to involve other sections, above all the rich and middle peasants, in its policy. (Note that numerous poor and middle peasants took no part in these actions.) Strengthening the worker-peasant alliance will make it

possible to win over or neutralize the rural middle strata and rid them of landowner influence.[11]

Organizing the class forces grouped around the industrial working class is an additional stimulus to the alliance. Unionized rural workers fight for their class interests and set an example for peasants, with whom they have much in common. They make the fight against the landowners more consistent. Besides weakening the positions of the constantly migrating farm hands who are still widely employed in some branches of agriculture, capitalist development tends to concentrate the permanent work force on large modern farms, many of which are owned by foreign monopoly capital.

A high degree of organization in federations, producers' unions, leagues, cooperatives and youth clubs is typical of the poor peasants, who include semi-proletarian, landless and land-hungry peasants, small tenants, sharecroppers, people working by contract and all those who cannot make a living for themselves or their families on the land. The middle peasants — proprietors or tenants who occasionally use wage labor and make profit — are also well organized. Increasing the share and representation of these strata in the rural organizations is essential to prevent them from being controlled by landowners and the big bourgeoisie, which are inclined to compromise. It is safe to say that the Union of Agricultural Producers of Argentina is showing itself more and more as a peasant organization with a clear-cut program and striving for unity.

New forms of struggle

The worker-peasant alliance is being forged in battle. Vast numbers of peasants have joined in important economic and social struggles. Their campaigns are characterized by new forms of unity and coordination as well as by advanced fighting methods, including processions by farmers on tractors or other machines, the blocking of roads, the occupation of central city squares, rallies and strikes. These actions have been widely backed by the workers and other progressive forces of the towns and have, in turn, influenced the strikes and other struggles of the industrial working class. In fighting for their most urgent needs the peasants rise to political struggle for social freedom and civil rights.

In view of the crisis, runaway inflation, a relative reduction of farm prices in comparison with the prices of capital goods needed for agriculture, and mounting interest on credit, it is important to combine the fight for compensatory and differentiated prices in favor of small and medium producers with efforts to solve the fundamental problem, the problem of land.

The Communists' role in developing peasant militancy and united

action has grown, but despite considerable achievements in work among the rural masses and ample experience showing that the Party can rapidly increase its membership, the peasant problem is still a weak spot in the struggle for a national democratic front and the building of a mass Communist Party. Still valid is Engels' idea that 'in order to conquer political power, this party (the party of the working class — *A.K.)* must first go from the towns to the country, must become a power in the countryside.'[12] With the ideological struggle rising to a new pitch various forces strive to take over the leadership of the rural masses.

Importance of the class approach

Latin America has not produced a single case of dynamic social and economic evolution on capitalist lines. This shows that the bourgeoisie can no longer lead the process of revolutionary change, not even at the democratic stage of the revolution. Yet in Cuba the worker-peasant alliance, led by the Marxist-Leninist vanguard, launched a far-reaching anti-latifundist and anti-imperialist agrarian reform, the first on the continent.

The favorable experience of the revolutionary democratic changes being effected in Peru and Panama indicates that it is possible to eliminate the latifundia and backward forms of landownership and cultivation while at the same time hitting foreign monopoly capital where it hurts most. This is why the struggle for a democratic agrarian reform is a task of the whole revolutionary and progressive movement and a key element in the worker-peasant alliance.

The class approach to the agrarian question makes the solution of the problem of alliances conditional on the strategic goal of the working class at each particular stage, at each particular moment, in each particular country. It is the working class that vanguards the revolutionary process at every stage of the struggle for power and the building of a classless society. With an abstract approach, the fundamental problem of the revolution, that of power, loses its strongest foundation. On the other hand, the class point of view uncovers the real possibilities of the peasant movement, its place and role in socio-political movements at every stage of the revolutionary process. A correct definition of the allies of the working class in the countryside, and political and ideological work to draw these allies into the struggle under the leadership of the working class guarantee maximum utilization of their revolutionary potential.

The class approach lays the groundwork for the continued development of the alliance in the right direction in struggle for a new type of power both at the stage of democratic, anti-latifundist and

anti-imperialist changes and during the transition to the socialist stage.

1. The working class and its allies: theses of the Institute of the International Working Class Movement.' *WMR*, July 1975, p. 67. Indradip Sinha, 'The condition and revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry.' *WMR*, November 1975, p. 48.
2. See Satijajaya Sudiman, 'The power structure and the alliance problem.' *WMR*, January 1976, p. 55.
3. *Argentina economica y social.* Oficina de Estudios para la Colaboracion Economica Internacional. Buenos Aires, 1974, pp. 98-99.
4. According to official data for 1952 and 1969, the number of farms dropped from 564,891 to 522,796. The 1947-70 period saw a decrease in the self-supporting rural population from 1,617,000 to 1,331,000, the number of rural wage workers going down from 1,152,000 to 707,000. Since 1930 the population of Argentina has more than doubled but per capita wheat production has dropped from 598 to 261 kg. Investments in agriculture in 1969 were up 8.87 per cent over 1968 and in 1970 the increase was 15 per cent, but the value of farm output in 1970 went up only 3.8 per cent and in 1971 it was down 7.3 per cent.
5. Farms with more than 1,000 ha of arable, which are classed as big holdings and number only 32,500 (6.2 per cent of the total), account for 156 million ha, or 74.3 per cent of the total arable registered by the latest census.
6. In 1974, there were 8,000 big absentee landowners, each of them owning an average of four farms. They accounted for 52 per cent of the total amount of tax on land and other agricultural immovables included in the state register and subject to tax.
7. Victorio Codovilla, *Una trayectoria consecuente*. Trabajos escogidos. Tomo IV. Buenos Aires, 1964, p. 30.
8. Declaration of the Conference of the Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Unidad para afianzar la democracia y avanzar hacia la patria liberada!* Informe rendido por G. Alvarez ante la VIII Conferencia Nacional del PCA. Suplemento de *Nuestra Palabra*, 3 de diciembre de 1975, p. 12.
11. The economic program announced by the new military government after the coup on March 24, 1976 benefits big rural proprietors and the monopolies. It is aimed at reducing the share of the state in meat and grain exports and at increasing output by 'modernizing agricultural enterprises' and 'extending agricultural boundaries' through the 'settlement' of public lands by private companies. This policy, inspired by the ideas of 'free enterprise' and 'desarrollism,' envisages measures to encourage foreign investments and allows scope for the implementation of plans made by Deltec and other multinationals to appropriate the immense riches of the Argentine pampas. It imperils national independence and runs counter to the objectives announced by the military junta in regard to independent decision-making and control over industries assuring the country's progress and defense. Joining peasant actions with the efforts of patriotic civilians and military men would help to shape the new situation.
12. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 458.

the press

Book reviews

IN THE NAME OF PEACE AND COMMUNISM

L.I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course.* Speeches and Articles. Vol. 5. Moscow, Politizdat, 1976. 590 p.

The ability to approach questions 'not only in the sense of explaining the past, but also in the sense of a bold forecast of the future and of bold practical action for its achievement' is how Lenin defined the unity of scientific approach and practical purpose of revolutionary theory and policy (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 72). This remarkable quality, which is organic to the multifaceted activity of the Soviet Communist Party, distinguishes the works of its General Secretary, Leonid Brezhnev, including this recently published new volume.

It contains Comrade Brezhnev's reports and speeches in 1974-76, a period of significant developments in the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community and of major positive changes in all parts of the world. Comrade Brezhnev's Central Committee report to the 25th Party Congress, included in this volume, presents an impressive panorama of communist construction, convincingly shows the growing strength and attractive power of socialism, and explains the essence and implications of the steadily developing world revolutionary process. It scientifically substantiates the policy of the Communist Party and Soviet state, emphasizes its continuity and the organic link with earlier stages of building socialism and communism. 'Each of our five-year plans,' Comrade Brezhnev says, 'is an important landmark in our country's history. Each is noteworthy in its own way and bears the inimitable features of its time, and each is indelibly engraved in the people's memory. But they are inseparable — splendid chapters of a great book recounting the heroic labor effort of our people in the name of socialism and communism' (p. 174).

There is a comprehensive in-depth analysis of the results of the ninth five-year plan (1971-75), with its record growth of industrial output and investment and its unparalled social program aimed at raising prosperity standards.

Comrade Brezhnev's speeches reveal the inspiring perspectives of communist construction and outline the new frontiers the Soviet Union will reach in the 10th five-year plan period. Economic strategy is based on dynamic and balanced development of social production, its higher effectivenss, accelerated scientific and technical progress, uninterrupted growth of productivity and maximum improvement of quality in all branches of the economy. The overall aim of economic development is higher prosperity standards for the Soviet people, better working and living conditions and appreciable progress in public health, education and culture — in all the things that contribute to the all-round development of the personality and promote the socialist way of life.

What distinguishes Comrade Brezhnev's speeches and articles is their profound and comprehensive approach and, at the same time, their treatment of concrete problems reflecting reality in all its manifestations. The ambitious goals set for economic development are based on a close analysis of the ways and means of securing stable expansion of heavy industry, that foundation of our entire economy, and continued development of agriculture, construction and transport. Consistent implementation of these plans, Comrade Brezhnev emphasizes, will make possible a further rise in material and cultural standards.

The Soviet Union has a vast economic potential and tremendous material resources, and this imposes greater responsibility for their efficient use. Hence, the decisive factor is 'organization, that is, continued improvement of every aspect of economic management' (p. 154). With communist self-criticism, Comrade Brezhnev examines the difficulties and shortcomings and unsolved problems in this sphere. Recalling the unparalleled droughts of 1972 and 1975, he says that they could not but affect agricultural output, increased production of certain consumer goods and the growth rate of national income. He also draws attention to delays in commissioning new production capacities and the lag in introducing new technology in a number of industries. But this is constructive criticism which reveals not only shortcomings, but also indicates concrete measures for their removal. 'Yes, we know that not all problems have yet been solved,' Comrade Brezhnev says. 'We know our shortcomings and we see our difficulties better than our critics do, and we are successfully overcoming them. We know that path we have to follow to further develop and perfect our society' (p. 549).

The book synthesizes the accumulated experience of communist construction and contains important political and theoretical conclusions. This refers, above all, to the main features and specifices of developed socialist society, first built in the USSR, its pattern of

economic and social relations. In demonstrating the democracy and humanism of socialism's political system, Comrade Brezhnev notes the continued consolidation of the alliance of workers, collective farmers, and intellectuals, in which the working class, the main productive and socio-political force, the bearer of revolutionary ideas and traditions, plays the leading role.

Comrade Brezhnev convincingly reveals the sources of the strength and authority of the Communist Party as the accepted vanguard and political leader of the Soviet people. He makes the fundamental point also that, under developed socialism, the CPSU has become a party of the whole people, but has not in any way lost its class character and remains, by its very nature, a party of the working class.

The problems of foreign policy and the promotion of world peace play a very important part in the manifold activities of the CPSU. And here, too, we have a scientifically-grounded analysis of the present international situation and a broad, impressive picture of the crucial social and political changes taking place in the world. They convincingly testify that the main direction of social progress is now determined by the socialist community, which exerts an ever stronger influence on world affairs. Comrade Brezhnev describes the socialist community as one of the most significant developments of our era, as an absolutely new type of alliance. 'The pulse of the socialist countries,' he says, 'beats in unison. Socialism brings the peoples close together, unites them in a single family governed by the laws and standards of socialist internationalism' (p. 415). In relations with the socialist countries, the CPSU abides by this tried and tested rule: genuine equality, interest in the successes of each country, and maximum promotion of their all-round cooperation.

United action by the socialist countries and the national-liberation movement is now of immense importance. The Soviet Union is consistently broadening and strengthening its ties with ex-colonial countries. Most of them share with the USSR devotion to the cause of peace and freedom, rejection of all forms of aggression, domination and exploitation of one country by another.

The materials in this volume leave no doubt that Soviet policy vis-à-vis developed capitalist countries in firmly based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and materialization of détente. The CPSU and the Soviet government are consistently and perseveringly working for new ways and means of promoting peaceful and mutually advantageous cooperation of states with differing social systems. In his address to the 25th CPSU Congress, Comrade Brezhnev emphasized the Soviet Union's resolve to redouble its efforts in behalf of peace, disarmament, the prevention of war and aggression, and securing the rights of all nations to freedom, independence and social

progress. The program he set out of further efforts for peace continues and elaborates the Peace Program adopted at the 24th CPSU Congress.

Much attention is devoted to exposing the subversive maneuvers of the cold warriors and the danger to all nations of the provocatory Maoist policy, which directly merges with that of the most reactionary elements, from the militarists and enemies of détente in the developed capitalist countries to the South African racists and the fascist rulers of Chile.

Comrade Brezhnev calls for vigilance against world reaction, but at the same time points to the objectives and law-governed nature of social progress. The advance to socialism is expressive of the people's will and accords with the requirements of social development, and cannot be stopped. The Soviet Communists and people are boundlessly loyal to the revolutionary ideas of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They will continue to discharge their internationalist duty by upholding the unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement.

This fifth volume of *Following Lenin's Course* reflects the multifold activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet people. But it also clearly brings out the immense personal contribution made by L.I. Brezhnev, a true Leninist, outstanding leader of the CPSU and Soviet state, of the socialist community and the world Communist movement, a sterling champion of peace and the happiness of all working people. The materials in this volume are illustrative of the CPSU's creative attitude to revolutionary theory and enrich the ideological arsenal of Marxism-Leninism.

Ivan Vorozheikin
Deputy Editor-in-Chief of *Pravda*

NEW STRATEGY OF DEVELOPMENT

Edward Gierek, *Selected Articles and Speeches*. Moscow, Politizdat, 1975, 280 pp.

The volume includes articles written by Edward Gierek, First Secretary, CC Polish United Workers' Party, and speeches he made between 1971 and 1974 at the Sixth PUWP Congress, CC plenums and during meetings with workers, farmers, researchers, the youth and veterans of the liberation movement.

In this period the Party drew up and carried out a new strategy for socio-economic development, which ensuing events proved to be timely and correct. And this collection gives a clear picture of the measures taken by the Party to ensure further progress, they describe

the activities of its organizations and the PUWP stand on cardinal issues of the social development of Polish society and the international communist movement.

Party strategy for the accelerated building of socialism in Poland is outlined particularly well in two of the documents in this collection, the speech delivered by Edward Gierek at the Eighth CC PUWP Plenum (February 1971) and the CC Politbureau program report made at the Sixth Party Congress in December 1971. In the first document Edward Gierek analyzes the reasons for and the nature of the crisis events that were building up from the middle of the 60s and that erupted in December 1970, and outlines the immediate and long-range tasks. The Eighth CC PUWP Plenum met soon after the changes in the Party leadership. These followed the measures in economic and social policy to restore the weakened ties between the Party leadership and the working class and other segments of the population and help to establish an atmosphere of solidarity in the country and ensure support for the policy of the new leadership.

The socio-economic strategy outlined by the CC plenums and discussed in detail at the Sixth PUWP Congress was founded on the achievements and experience of 25 years of building socialism, on the revolutionary, patriotic and internationalist traditions of the Polish people. It was designed to bring out all the advantages of socialism, its ability to provide for the material and cultural needs of the people. Reviewing the situation, Gierek said: 'The reasons and sources of the recent events, which we so sharply appraised, narrow down to deviations from the Party's correct political line and the Leninist norms of carrying it out. The general line for the building of socialism in Poland under the Party's leadership evaluated from the historical perspective of the fate of our people, remains correct and unshakable' (p. 11).

The First Secretary of the PUWP also noted that the new socio-economic strategy envisages significant improvements of workers' living standards, i.e., raising wages, speeding up housing construction, improving medical and cultural facilities and conditions for working women and for mothers. Plans were likewise outlined for a gradual reduction of the work week. The Party also drew up measures to greatly increase agricultural production, extend socialist transformations in the rural areas and improve working and living conditions for the farmers.

Together with the draft of the new five-year plan, these documents outlined a program for the development of Polish society up to 1980 and forecasts to the end of the century. The main task for the foreseeable future is modernization of the economy, notably key industries. The new program is truly comprehensive, for it provides not only for development of the economy and improved economic

management, but also economic zoning, urban development and environmental protection.

The speeches made by Gierek at Central Committee plenums and the Sixth Party Congress which, having adopted a well-planned socio-economic strategy, laid the foundations for a new and higher stage of socialist up-building, provide a good picture of the Party's daring and all-encompassing activities, which inspired the people and set Poland on a dynamic course.

One of the most important aspects of the speeches and articles written by E. Gierek is the fact that all of them deal with the realities of a concrete period while looking far into the future. That is why they focus so much attention on the younger generation. In these years about two million young people began work in industry — a consequence of the postwar demographic explosion, and the Party turned to these young people with the slogan of doubling the country's strength, calling upon them to work with greater energy and sharing responsibility for socialist development. The Party laid particular stress on the education of the younger generation and on raising its ideological and professional level.

Edward Gierek's speeches addressed to the young people have strong emotional impact. He underscores their role and responsibilities, stressing that they should always be proud of the heroism of the older generations who fought and worked to build the new Poland. 'A characteristic trait of our society,' he said, 'are the unbreakable ties binding the generations ... We must build such relations at enterprises and in each collective that the energy, ability and initiative of the younger generation would be balanced by the experience and knowledge of the older generation' (p. 257).

The Party has done much to promote young specialists to executive positions, and bring more young people into representative bodies, People's Councils and other organizations. The rural schools were also remodelled in this period, the system of scholarship and bonuses, probation and student training periods were improved, construction of boarding schools was enlarged and a start made on secondary education. And, the youth responded to the Party's trust with greater energy and initiative at work, and by taking an active part in national construction projects. There was also a noticeable strengthening of the ideological, political and organizational process in the youth movement, as seen in the Polish National Youth Conference in February 1973, which was addressed by E. Gierek, and the formation of the Federation of Polish Youth Socialist Unions.

The materials authored by E. Gierek reflect the Party's course in deepening socialist democracy, so necessary for the country's rapid progress in all spheres of endeavor. This factor in the building of

socialism was seen in the greater role played by the working class. The role of the trade unions likewise increased. Consultations with collectives at large industrial enterprises and groups representing the working people became an integral part of political practice, particularly on major decisions. Speaking on this question, E. Gierek said: 'We shall continue improving such activities . . . We shall decide on important social problems only after hearing the opinions of those whom they concern' (p. 24).

The PUWP attaches signal importance, as evidenced by Gierek's speeches, to improving the operational efficiency and initiative of organs of management, the style and methods of Party leadership and ideological training.

A large portion of this volume deals with questions of strengthening the socialist community and cooperation and friendship between the PUWP and the CPSU. Gierek speaks highly of the historical achievements and wealth of experience of the CPSU and the role of the USSR — the pioneer of the new world — and points out that from its very foundation the Soviet Union has been the main bastion of the forces of peace and progress. Solidarity and coordination with the USSR, he stresses, have always been and remain a criterion of fidelity to proletarian internationalism.

This collection of speeches and articles by Edward Gierek reflects a detailed analysis of Soviet experience, which is such a help in dealing with socialist Poland's problems. The materials stress the great significance of socialism's international experience, further consolidation of the socialist community and the need to accelerate economic integration of the CMEA countries in the interests of each country and the community as a whole, in the interests of strengthening the forces of peace and progress in the world.

In his many speeches, and particularly in the CC report to the Sixth PUWP Congress, Edward Gierek outlines Poland's foreign policy course in which ' . . . the main role is played by the fraternal relations with the Soviet Union . . .' (p. 123). PUWP policy, he stresses, aims at the triumph of peace and cooperation among nations and 'consolidation of the unity of the socialist community' (p. 124). 'Our Party, which consistently works for unity of the socialist forces,' says E. Gierek, 'opposes all splitting tendencies and especially the dangerous instigation of anti-Soviet nationalism and chauvinism . . . The splitting course of the Chinese leadership which is in direct contradiction to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, is inflicting harm upon the socialist cause' (p. 125).

Urgent and important PUWP tasks were outlined by E. Gierek when he was awarded the Order of Lenin in 1973. 'Our Party,' he said then, 'is following the Leninist road in its domestic and foreign policy.

Our great obligation before the Polish working class and people is to strengthen socialism in our country and consistently carry out the principles of internationalism. Of primary importance to our Party, its Central Committee and the entire membership, is consolidation of the alliance between Poland and the Soviet Union, deepening of our friendship and developing cooperation' (p. 194).

Speaking in the Polish Sejm on the 30th anniversary of the People's Republic of Poland, E. Gierek pointed out that the foundations had been laid for building a developed socialist society and said: 'For 30 years our Party has been leading the country and dealing with its problems. We took this difficult mission upon ourselves at a period crucial for Poland. We shall continue fulfilling this mission, guided by the best interests of the Polish people, by the universal and time-tested laws of socialist development and by the Marxist-Leninist social ideology' (p. 278).

This collection will acquaint the reader with an important stage in the history of socialist Poland.

Stanislaw Wronski
Member, CC PUWP

NINE BRAVE DAYS

The General Strike 1926, Edited by J. Skelley, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1976. 412 pp.

In the midst of the serious economic and political crisis facing Britain today, British workers observed the 50th anniversary of the 1926 general strike. It began on May 3, and lasted only for nine days, but the lessons arising from it still exist for the struggle ahead in Britain. It was an expression of solidarity with the miners against a savage attack on their already low wages and bad working conditions.

In bourgeois circles the government strategy at that time is praised. Within the working class movement, and especially among Marxists, a new and deeper study of these events is taking place.

Among the best books on the subject is one with the simple title *The General Strike 1926.* Edited by Jeffrey Skelley, a Communist.

The early part of the book gives a historical background written by two Communists, John Foster and James Klugmann, and describes the international solidarity with the miners. It also contains several separate studies giving an account of the general strike in different regions of Britain. There are also personal recollections of participants and many documents. The final section on the 'consequences of the general strike' is written by Martin Jacques, a member of the National Executive of the Communist Party.

In my early days I was a miner in South Wales (1914-26) and for me this book recalls many struggles waged by the miners during those years. When only a boy of 15, I took part in my first miners' strike. It lasted only five days, and we won. Hard-fought struggles in later years won the miners a seven-hour day and a slight increase in wages to partially compensate for rising prices.

But in June 1925 the coal owners demanded acceptance of big wage-cuts, a return to the eight-hour day, and district agreements instead of a national agreement which the miners had won. This would have cancelled out all our earlier gains. However, by this time the miners had won the support of the TUC. This was a Friday and it has been enshrined in British working class history as *Red Friday*. Next day the government announced it would continue the subsidy for another nine months, until the end of April 1926.

Red Friday was the outcome of a vigorous campaign waged by the Communist Party throughout Britian, and by the 'Minority Movement,' which had been formed by militant workers to transform the trade unions from within and to replace reactionary leaders with progressive and militant leaders.

The government and the forces of reaction, however, were not idle. There were no Communists in key TUC positions nor in the miners' union, but the government knew full well they would be the main driving force in the campaign toward a general strike. So, in October 1925 it arrested 12 leaders of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the Minority Movement and the National Unemployed Movement.

The evidence cited in this book shows that in practice the government and right-wing Labour leaders were harnessed together to divide and weaken the ranks of the workers before the strike.

The TUC General Council, despite the conference decision of July 1925 to stand by the miners against wage-cuts, followed a policy of compromise.

On April 30, all of Britain's 800,000 miners were locked out.

Before the strike was called the Communist Party gave serious warnings of the danger of betrayal by the TUC, which was urging the miners to consider the need for wage-cuts, and stressed this danger even more after May 4. It called for the formation of Councils of Action everywhere (as it did in the 'Hands off Russia' campaign in 1920) and urged the need to go over to the offensive and demand nationalization of the mines. There was an enormous response to the call for action. No national newspapers, only four trains running in every hundred, 15 out of 315 on London's underground and nine London tramcars out of 2,000, and 300 buses in a total of 4,400.

However, just as the strike was gathering momentum and becom-

ing bigger each day, on May 12 the TUC informed the miners' leaders they were calling off the strike, and the did so on the ninth day. There was both confusion and anger among the workers, but the dirty work had been done. The miners were left to battle alone for another six months until starvation drove them back to work.

I was an active member of the Council of Action in my native Maesteg mining valley, and was conscious of the fighting spirit of the miners by first-hand experience.

The international working class set an example of proletarian solidarity. From the Soviet trade unions came a mighty donation of 1,250,000 pounds.

The defeat of the strike was followed by a wave of repressive measures, with Communists the chief target.

Communists were in the forefront before, during and after the general strike. More than 1,200 were arrested, many of them sent to prison. Many Communists suffered from victimization by employers. I was never again able to get work in the coal mines. Unemployment increased rapidly and for seven years British workers were on the defensive against new attacks on their living standards until the late 1930s, when they went over to the offensive.

So many political lessons can be learned from the experience of 1926. As then, the workers' movement in the 1970s is on the defensive. It is not only a matter of direct wage-cuts, but also of lower living standards due to inflation and the offensive of gigantic monopoly interests which affect the policy even of Labour governments in Britain. The gains won in the past are being eroded. Fifty years after 1926 the main conditions for advance still remain — working class unity in action, building a united front, a fighting leadership in the labor and trade union movement, international solidarity, a bigger and stronger Communist Party.

This is the way forward in Britain.

Idris Cox

LOYALTY TO REVOLUTIONARY IDEALS

Rodolfo Ghioldi, *Escritos* (Writings). Vol. I. Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1975. 254 pp.

The appearance of Volume 1 of Rodolfo Ghioldi's writings is an event in Argentine political life. A co-founder of the Communist Party and a member of its leadership ever since (1918), the author has been in the forefront of the ideological struggle and has given all his energy to educating the people in a revolutionary spirit. At present he heads the Party's Center for Marxist Studies. Ghioldi has been as staunch in

upholding Marxist-Leninist theory and proletarian internationalism as in combating reformist notions and chauvinism. The collection under review is evidence of his political consistency and loyalty to Lenin's ideas.

Ghioldi has repeatedly said that proletarian internationalism and the attitude to the Soviet Union, which are inseparable, is the touchstone of every revolutionary and that to depart from internationalism is to give in to the class enemy. 'To be effective and, above all, socialist,' he writes, 'tactics must unfailingly respect principles, the substance of our theory, from which no departure is permissible. For when tactics ignore principles on any account, or when they conceal their aims, make concessions and adopt new criteria they cease to be socialist and stop serving the ultimate goal of the working-class movement . . .' (pp. 32-33).

Philosophical articles hold a prominent place in the collection. They maintain the principles of partisanship in philosophy and stress that the issue of partisanship is by no means theoretical only. In relations with allies of the revolutionary working class, ideological consistency and fidelity to principle do not alienate the masses, but on the contrary help to win them over.

Many of the works in the collection were written in illegal or semi-legal conditions. They stress the importance of the ideological basis of political activity in any conditions, uphold dialectical and historical materialism, and challenge idealism and metaphysics in their newfangled and 'national' forms. Using forceful arguments, they refute, in particular, the Falangist variety of theology, existentialism, positivism and other irrationalist philosophical trends. Ghioldi shows that the historic contest between the two opposed social systems leaves its imprint on every sphere of life. 'Nothing can avoid that, not even products of the mind, such as art or philosophy' (p. 46). As the author sees it, the principle of class struggle is always a criterion of the position of diverse currents and schools of philosophy.

Ghioldi's philosophical writings, like his work as a whole, are focussed on Argentine reality and examine every problem in the context of the domestic political, social and economic situation. In laying bare the petty-bourgeois nature of reformism and both right-wing and ultra-leftist revisionism, he points out that their epistemological roots lie in disregard of materialism, and supplanting dialectics with metaphysics. Looking into problems of the basis and superstructure, of freedom and necessity, he joins issue with the advocates of 'democratic socialism' and with some 'Argentine socialists,' who distort or doctor the facts to counterpose 'the Soviet social system to freedom.' He demonstrates that 'freedom never exists as an abstraction but has social prerequisites and is historically conditioned' and

that 'harmony between the individual and society is only possible under socialism' (pp. 127-128).

Many of the writings reveal the class function of fascism as a lackey of monopoly. 'Anti-communism is inseparable from the tendencies to impose fascism,' Ghioldi notes (p. 139).

The book includes some writings on the Communists' attitude to the armed forces. The problem of the armed forces and of their role have always been important to Latin America. Argentine army officers have for decades been trained in keeping with reactionary military doctrines, first those of the Prussian military and then those of the U.S. imperialists. The Communist Party has invariably seen one of its important tasks in exposing the anti-popular and anti-national nature of imperialist military concepts. Considering the problem of armed forces from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint, the author explodes the myth of the superiority of the U.S. military doctrine and shows up the degradation and corruption of the imperialist military machine and the unprecedented barbarity demonstrated during the aggression in Vietnam. He describes the 'security zone' established under the Rio pact (inter-American mutual aid treaty) as a replica of the 'pan-region,' that inglorious brain-child of German fascism.

The publication of Rodolfo Ghioldi's works in Argentina comes after the appearance of a collection of his selected articles and speeches in the Soviet Union. The writings in the volume under review are those of a revolutionary internationalist. They help to inspire in generations of Communists unshakable loyalty to Marxism-Leninism.

A.K.

U.S. FARM WORKERS AGAINST THE MONOPOLIES

Sam Kushner, *Long Road to Delano*, New York, International Publishers, 1975, 224 pp.

Sam Kushner's *Long Road to Delano* holds a special place among publications dealing with the struggle of farm workers in the USA. The author is a participant in the events he describes and has the historian's ability to trace the roots of today's phenomena. He intimately knows the day-to-day life of grape, cotton and vegetable pickers, and for nine years depicted, in the Communist paper *People's World*, their hard lot and every battle they fought for their rights. It is on these portrayals that his book is based.

In the 1960s Delano, a small town in southwest USA, became a symbol of the signal victories of the American working people. It was

there that in 1962 the National Farm Workers Association was set up so as to organize this particularly oppressed section of American workers. It was there that grape pickers staged a powerful strike in 1965. The strike lasted eight months and drew the attention of the country's progressives to the plight of farm workers. Trade unions and student and other democratic organizations collected funds for the strikers. And the solidarity of toiling America helped the grape pickers to win.

Kushner notes that the grape strike was 'the activization of socially conscious forces within the ranks of organized labor. The campaign brought forth forces in the union movement who had long been dormant. For many of the old-timers it was a return to the militant past of labor unionism, and a time for the completion of one of the major unfulfilled responsibilities of labor — organization of workers in the fields' (p. XXI).

The growth of the social consciousness and militancy of the strikers, and the new organizational forms that arose during the struggle speeded up the solution of that task. In 1973 the United Farm Workers of America was established; it is the USA's youngest trade union and today has in Delano its headquarters, hospital, homes for the aged, etc. But the farm workers' struggle, far from being over, has entered a new stage. It now concentrates on broader economic and pòlitical demands and on combating the power of the monopolies and the state institutions that serve them.

Reminding readers that the 10 million Chicanos (Americans of Mexican origin) constitute the backbone of the agricultural work force in the southwestern states, the author points out that racial discrimination against them and other national minorities remains an instrument for preserving the class domination of the bourgeoisie, and that racism and chauvinism are serious obstacles to the development of the trade union movement.

The book cites concrete examples showing that many trade unions still maintain racial barriers. The U.S. bourgeoisie, which, as Lenin said, is 'unequalled anywhere in the world in the art of deceiving, corrupting and bribing the workers,' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*. Vol. 12, p. 373) adroitly exploits conflicts between the nationalities. Its aim is to split the working class by setting one group of working people against another.

The Communist Party of the USA, Kushner emphasizes, is the most consistent fighter against racism and chauvinism. And, significantly, the organized movement of the Chicanos and other farm workers has rejected the anti-communist moves of the big farm owners. It was pointed out at the 21st Convention of the CP USA that

the farm workers are becoming increasingly aware that their fight is part of the nationwide class battle.

Nothing less than a united front of progressive forces from among both the white and non-white population, including the Communists, will enable the farm workers to score fresh victories — this is the principal conclusion drawn in the book.

In his preface to the book, Prof. Bert Corona of the California State University at Los Angeles writes: 'All those who stand for freedom for oppressed people, for peace and socialism and for the final victory of the workers, can be indebted to Sam Kushner for writing this book' (p. IX).

V. Zvyagin

NEW BOOKS

Twenty Years of Bandung and Problems of Peace and Security in Asia. Sh. Bhushan (ed). New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1975, 151 pp.

The collection comprises articles on the problems of establishing a collective security system in Asia. Its authors include S.R. Rashidov, alternate member of the CPSU Political Bureau and First Secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, N.K. Krishnan, secretary of the National Council of the Communist Party of India, Academician B.G. Gafurov, director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, K.D. Malaviya, member of the Indian Parliament, and other public figures and scholars of the Soviet Union and India.

H.-O. Dill. *El ideario literario y estetico de Jose Marti* (The Literary and Aesthetic Ideas of Jose Marti). Havana, Casa de las Americas, 1975, 206 pp.

Jose Marti, a Cuban revolutionary, writer, ideologue and organizer of the liberation struggle against Spanish domination and founder of the Cuban revolutionary party, has left a rich ideological legacy. The book, which won the 1975 prize of the Casa de las Americas publishers, deals with his views on such problems as the revolutionary struggle for national independence and culture, decolonization and Latin American literature and art, the kinship of art with the people, anti-imperialism and culture, the aesthetic ties of the artist with society.

Istoria vneshnei politiki SSSR. 1917-1975 (History of the Foreign Policy of the USSR). Edited by A.A. Gromyko and B.N. Ponomaryov. Moscow, Nauka publishers, 1976. In two volumes.

This monograph by a group of authors reviews the growing influence of Soviet foreign policy on world affairs. It elucidates each stage of the international activity of the CPSU and the Soviet government and the profound changes that have occurred in the world over the past half century. The first volume deals with the period from 1917 to 1945; the second, with the three postwar decades. An analysis of the events of the past five years clearly shows that realization of the Peace Program has made possible a turn from the cold war to peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

J. Kossak. *Egzystencjalizm w filozofii i literaturze* (Existentialism in Philosophy and Literature). Warsaw, 1976, 277 pp.

The book of this Polish philosopher, put out jointly by publishers of the countries of the socialist community in the series 'Criticism of Bourgeois Ideology and Revisionism,' examines the origin and social aims of existentialism, shows the link between the world outlook and aesthetic stand of this trend in bourgeois philosophy, criticizes the concept of existentialism from the Marxist standpoint, particularly with respect to such problems as freedom and necessity, alienation and the individual's duty to society.

G. Chiarante, G. Napolitano. *La democrazia nella scuola* (Democracy in the School). Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1975, 180 pp. M.A. Manacorda. *Per la riforma dell scuola secondaria* (For a Reform of the secondary School), Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1976, 134 pp.

Both books deal with the point of view of the Italian Communists on the reform of higher and secondary education in the country, demanding its democratization, accessibility, more up-to-date programs and strengthening of their material and scientific base. The authors also touch on the role and tasks of the elected bodies recently set up in secondary schools which could become an important instrument for carrying out reforms in the secondary and technical schools.

L juventud va a la revolucion. Relatos, cartas, paginas de diarios. (The Youth Joins the Revolution. Short stories, diaries and letters). Buenos Aires, Ediciones Cultura, 1975. 204 pp.

The compilation consists of two works by V.I. Lenin: speech at the Third Congress of the Komsomol in 1920 and an article devoted to the memory of the Russian reolutionary I.V. Babushkin, as well as the memoirs of A.M. Gorky about Lenin, F.E. Dzerzhinski's letters to relatives and other materials about the heroes of revolutionary struggle.

J. Mahon. *Harry Pollitt.* London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1976, 576 pp.

This biography of an outstanding personality of the British and world communist movement, a founder of the Communist Party of Great Britain, its General Secretary (1929-1956) and Chairman of its Executive Committee (1956-1960), was written by a British Marxist historian.

A. Petersen, M.E. Jensen. *Trommehvirveler og kanonslag* (Drumbeats and Gunshots). Copenhagen, Tiden, 1975, 164 pp.

The publishing house of the Communist Party of Denmark printed the memoirs of a former leader of the Danish trade union movement A. Petersen, compiled by M.E. Jensen, a journalist. Written from the positions of class struggle, the book calls for working-class unity. *Land og Folk,* the paper of the Danish Communists, positively assessed the memoirs of A. Petersen, noting his contribution to the country's trade union movement.

Rabochy klass SSSR i yego vedushchaya rol v stroitelstve kummunisma (The Working Class of the USSR and its Leading Role in Communist Construction.) Editorial Board headed by Ts.A. Stepanyan. Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 568 pp.

The work of an authors' team of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences deals wtih the leading role of the working class in the political system of Soviet society, in implementing the cultural revolution and establishing socialist national relations, in forming the new historic community of people — the Soviet people; it shows how in conditions of developed socialism the working class, under the guidance of the CPSU, actively facilitates the transfer to the complete social homogeneity of society. The book criticizes the bourgeois and revisionist concepts which reject the vanguard role of the working class in revolutionary transformations.

C. Sandu, C. Popescu. *Politica Partidului Communist Roman de Dezvoltare Optima a Economiei Nationale* (The Policy of the Rumanian Communist Party in the Optimal Development of the National Economy). Bucharest, Editura politica, 1976, 94 pp.

In dealing with the economic policy of the RCP, the authors examine such aspects of national economic development as optimal relations between the funds of consumption and those of accumulation, effective structure of the national economy and rational distribution of productive forces.

E. Thaelmann. *Ausgewahlte Reden und Schriften* (Selected articles and speeches). In two volumes. Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Marxistische Blätter, 1976.

The two volumes consist of Ernst Thaelmann's works devoted to the struggle for a revolutionary mass party, for the creation of a united workers' front against fascism, for the militant solidarity of the working people on the basis of proletarian internationalism. Many of the writings have not been widely known before. The first volume opens with an item on the life and activity of Ernst Thaelmann.

New Soviet journal

ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY

$3.00 for 6 issues a year.

Will include analyses and reports on
all aspects in the life of the
Asian and African countries
as well as their role
in world developments.

Order from:
PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

facts and figures

The proletariat in developing countries

The last few years have seen the accelerated development of the proletariat in Asian, African and Latin American countries, the growth of its numbers and role in public life. Of tremendous importance in promoting the process was the winning of independence and the embarkation of many countries on the road of progressive socio-economic transformations (overcoming feudal domination, consolidation of the state sector of the economy and building up national industries on its base, etc.). At the same time there still remain structures inherited from colonialism which tend to retard the whole process of class formation.

Alongside a proletariat of the modern type, numbering more than 50 million persons, the developing countries have a great mass of people evolving toward the proletariat — sections, strata, groups, elements acquiring characteristics of the working class but not yet severed completely from the peasant, artisan or poor urban strata that spawned them. They are workers employed in small undertakings: artisan shops, handicrafts, small-scale industries. Also in this group are farm laborers, seasonal workers and other rural and poor urban proletarian and semi-proletarian elements.

For all its diversities the proletariat in developing countries share common features, notably, a high rate of manpower turnover, low concentration and a predominance of unskilled labor. Religious, national-ethnic and caste prejudices are still strong and mentality is substantially influenced by the traditional environment. The newly-independent states, especially those oriented on socialism, devote their efforts to overcoming the retarding factors and combating survivals of colonialism.

The proletariat is made up mainly of workers in agriculture and industry. Other branches — trade, civil service, etc. — account for only from five to 10 per cent of total employment. The structure and development of the proletariat can be traced in the official statistics. In agriculture, proletarian elements make up practically the entire

Much of the data has been supplied by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Working-Class Movement.

Hired labor in industry and agriculture of developing countries (millions)

	Agriculture			Industry (including construction and transport)			Total		
	1960	1970	1975	1960	1970	1975	1960	1970	1975
All developing countries	67.0-73.0	89.3-89.5	105.0	38.3	54.9-55.4	62.6	105.3-111.3	144.2-144.9	167.6
Latin America	11.0	12.0	12.0	11.9	16.0	18.7	22.9	28.0	30.7
Middle East	1.9	2.0-2.2		3.1	4.0-4.2		5.0	6.0-6.4	
South and Southeast Asia, Far East	47.3-54.0	66.6	83.2	16.7	26.6	33.4	64.0-70.7	93.2	116.6
North Africa	2.8	4.4	5.3	1.7	2.7-3.0	3.4	4.5	7.1-7.4	8.7
Tropical Africa	2.5-2.6	3.1	3.3	3.0-3.1	3.6	4.6	5.5-5.7	6.7	7.9
Southern Africa	0.8-0.9	1.2	1.2	1.8	2.0	2.5	2.6-2.7	3.2	3.7

work force. In the industrial work force the share of the proletariat is somewhat less, for the 'hired labor' category included also clerks, technicians, etc.

The largest single group is agricultural workers, numbering as much as 105 million persons; 83 million in South and Southeast Asia and the Far East, 12 million in Latin America and about 10 million in Africa. However, the agricultural proletariat is extremely fragmented and scattered among countless primitive-type farms.

In recent years the proportion of workers at large plantations and farms, who constitute the most concentrated, organized and militant section of the rural proletariat, has been increasing and they now number more than 15 million. They include an entirely new stratum of tractor drivers, harvester combine operators, irrigation workers, repairmen, already numbering at least five million. All of this is indicative of changes in the proletarianization of the population engaged in agriculture, one of the most backward sectors of the former colonies and dependent countries.

The industrial proletariat has been expanding at an especially high rate, increasing more than 50 per cent — from 38 million to 63 million persons between 1060 and 1975, with its proportion in the active population rising from 7.7 to 9.6 per cent in those 15 years. The growth rate of industrial employment in ex-colonial and semi-colonial countries is twice that of developed capitalist countries.

The relative numbers of the proletariat vary widely, of course, in different areas and countries. In most countries of tropical Africa and the more backward countries of Asia the proletariat constitutes no more than 5-8 per cent of the population. In other countries, such as Mexico, the 'southern cone' of South America and India, it occupies a significant place in the class structure, accounting for 20 or more per cent of the active population. But common to all areas is the steady growth of the proletariat.

Proportion of industrial workers in the active population (percentages)

	1960	1970	1975
All developing countries	7.7	9.0-9.1	9.6
Latin America	17.5	18.8	19.1
North Africa	10.6	11.3-12.5	12.6
Middle East	13.6	14.7-15.4	
South and Southeast Asia, Far East	5.1	7.3	8.2
Tropical Africa	3.4-3.6	3.6	4.1
Southern Africa	26.4	25.0	27.8

The quantitative growth of the industrial proletariat is accompanied by changes in structure and features. The expansion of national industries and the appearance of new factories and whole industries based on modern technology have contributed to the growth in the numbers of skilled workers and the higher general and professional standards of the working class as a whole.

Considerable changes are taking place in the breakdown of the factory proletariat by industry.

The impact of the working class on social development in the newly liberated countries is steadily rising, and it is playing an ever more prominent part as an anti-imperialist force.

The proletariat in Asia, Africa and Latin America has militant trade union organizations which perform the task of political education. In some countries these trade unions appeared in the period between the two world wars, in some immediately after World War II, in some in the last 10 to 15 years. The organization of the working class in unions is a tangible expression of the growth of the class consciousness of workers in newly-free countries.

Mass action by the proletariat has expanded markedly, with more than 80 million people involved in the five years between 1971 and 1975. Strike struggles help unify the workers on the factory, industry and even national scale, facilitating the realization of common class interests and the working class' role as an independent political force.

The political role of the working class in the developing countries has also been increasing over the last few years. In some countries of Latin America the proletariat is already the acknowledged vanguard of the anti-imperialist struggle or heads the revolutionary process. The proletariat plays an important political role in such countries as India, Sri Lanka, Syria, Algeria and certain others. Proletarian interests are represented more broadly than before in political parties. Marxist-Leninist ideas are spreading rapidly among the working class in all developing countries.

Thus, the working class of Asia, Africa and Latin America is increasingly becoming a political force and acquiring the qualities inherent in a class capable not only of spontaneous rebellions, but also of organizing the revolutionary struggle for the transformation of society.

Lest We Forget

Michael Hanusiak

The history of collaboration with fascism during the Nazi occupation of the Ukraine in World War II.

Irrefutable eyewitness accounts, signed documents and records of the infamous "Jewish Actions," the concentration camps, the war crimes by the nationalist Ukrainian police who carried out Hitler's orders against their own people.

Lest We Forget proves that these crimes are not forgotten, monstrous war criminals and their organisations are leading "respectable" lives in Canada, the U.S. and elsewhere today.

Lest We Forget reminds us that we cannot afford to forget.

Paperback $3.95

Available from:

Progress Books
487 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5V 1T4

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WCIX 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 Nouvelles Frontières, 96 ouest, rue Sherbrooke, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

AL-Thakafah Al-Jadidah, Al-Saadoon St., Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, 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.

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.

MALAYALAM EDITION:
5 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 55, India.

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbatar Mongol Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I. Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715, Oslo 1, Norway.

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

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.

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

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Aereo 1253, Bogotà, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A. Filosofia y Letras 34, Copilco Universidad, Mexico 20, D.F. Mexico.

Ideologia y Politica, Fr Rufino Torrico N° 671-Of. 401, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracás, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Editorial 'Anteo,' Entre Rios 103³, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panamá, Rep. de Panamá.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

TURKISH EDITION: 1 Berlin 10, Postfach 100 229, West Berlin.

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp khâu Sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi, Democratic Republic of Vietnam.