WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Dec. 1976, Vol. 19, No. 12 75¢

Denmark / 117
Multinational corporations / 15
Unemlpoyment in the 'free' world / 99
Communists on the shop floor / 42
Latin America panorama / 68
Middle East / 25

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

December 1976, Vol. 19, No. 12

Features

3 Year of peace, year of struggle
T. Zhivkov

15 The 'supranational' mask of monopoly capitalism
E. Pastorino

25 For an overall settlement in the Middle East
N. Ashhab

Party experience

32 Party of the class, party of the people
N. Petrovichev

42 Communists on the shopfloor
Round table discussion

51 Toward social homogeneity
S. Mocuta

Comment

60 Toward the Europe of tomorrow
A. Vavrus

68 Argentina: light and shade in the South Atlantic
A. Kohen

79 Does fascism exist in Latin America?
J. Soares

86 International aspects of the Uruguayan drama
S. Sierra

94 Results of junta rule
H. Fazio

97 Justified apprehensions. Letter from Honduras

99 Redundant people in the 'free' world
G. Kwiatowski

Viewpoints

106 The development logic of theoretical knowledge
V. Lektorsky, H. Safari

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

117 Democracy and the class struggle in Denmark
I. Nørlund

The press

125 In the cause of communism
Y. Solodukhin

127 The hawks reveal themselves
J. Pittman

129 The causes of capitalist instability
V.S.

Facts and figures

131 USSR and USA: competition in the economy and way of life

135 In brief

137 **Contents for 1976**

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. ISSN 0043-8642

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.



Year of peace, year of struggle

Todor Zhivkov
First Secretary,
Bulgarian CP, Chairman
of the State Council

The world has witnessed deep-going changes in the past few years, especially since the historic 24th CPSU Congress. It has become possible to solve a historic problem of extreme complexity and magnitude, the shift to détente and to assurance of durable peace to Europe and the world. Despite inpediments and difficulties created by definite circles in the capitalist West, the spirit of Helsinki is steadily taking hold in relations between states with different social systems. And we have every reason to say: the outstanding characteristic of the present international situation is that we are living in a climate of political détente; more, in a climate in which détente is becoming a permanently operating factor.

This improvement in international relations fully accords with the strivings of the Communists, the working class and working people, the national-liberation movement, the progressive forces, all the peace-loving peoples of the world. We do not regard détente as a temporary, transitory phenomenon, nor as a 'tactical ploy.' Its substance is the assertion of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence as the accepted norm of international intercourse, and restructuring of the entire system of international relations on these principles.

At the same time, détente is not something given for all time. We see it as a dynamic process, as mankind's advance to security and guaranteed peace, which accord with the aspirations of all the peoples. That is why the Bulgarian Communist Party fully shares the view of the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties on the need to extend and deepen political détente, give it a more concrete material content and complement it with military détente. International developments have made it plain that an end to the arms race is today the main link in the battle to deepen détente.

Détente is the result of fundamental changes in the world balance of forces. These changes, in favor of peace, democracy, national libera-

tion, independence and socialism, were achieved through activization of the mass struggle.

The world of today differs radically from that of yesterday. We can more clearly see the superiority of the forces working against war — the socialist community, the Communist and Workers' Parties, the international working class and the national-liberation movement.

In discussing the essence of détente, what made it possible, and the factors that tend to promote or hold back détente, one cannot but emphasize the crucial role of the Soviet Union in bringing about positive changes in world affairs. This does not mean, of course, that we in any way minimize the role of other socialist countries. As the Berlin Conference emphasized, 'the socialist countries are playing an outstanding role in preventing a new world war, in strengthening international security and in continuing the process of détente.' One cannot, of course, overestimate also the role of other peace-seeking states or the political and social forces involved in the broad popular movement against war.

Just as détente did not come of itself, so the continued development of this process cannot be and will not be spontaneous. Experience before and after Helsinki suggests that every step toward durable peace will encounter resistance from the reactionary forces and will require coordinated action by the socialist community, numerous foreign-policy initiatives, and active struggle by the masses and by democratic organizations.

There is the time-tested Marxist-Leninist proposition that the masses not only make history, but also bring to the fore leaders capable of leading them on the road of peace and progress. The problems now awaiting solution are complex and difficult and their solution in the interests of the masses calls for cool-headedness, realistic thinking and statesmanship. But most of all, there must be concern for this and succeeding generations.

The worldwide struggle for peace, security and social progress has brought to the fore a galaxy of leaders keenly conscious of their responsibility to history and persevering in their pursuit of great aims. Among these principled and dedicated leaders brought to the fore by the popular masses, there stands out the winning personality of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

I wish to avail myself of his 70th birthday to express the sincere admiration and affection of the Bulgarian Communists and of the entire Bulgarian people for this supreme Party and state leader of the great fraternal Soviet Union. On behalf of all of us I wish Comrade L. I. Brezhnev long years of good health for the benefit and happiness

of the Soviet people, the international working class, all laboring mankind.

We have had other occasions to note that the international communist and workers' movement is fortunate in having at the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union such a worthy representative of the Leninist school of Communists-internationalists as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. We Bulgarian Communists are convinced that, in these difficult times of local wars and conflicts, overt and covert actions against the freedom and independence of a number of countries, the stockpiling of weapons capable of wiping out all life on the planet, it is the good fortune of mankind that at the head of the powerful Soviet Union stands this firm and irreconcilable opponent of war, this consistent, shrewd, realistic, patient and persevering architect and builder of the new international relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The policy carried out by L. I. Brezhnev is the policy of the CPSU, the Soviet people, the Soviet state. Behind every action of the CPSU General Secretary is the authority, prestige and strength of the Party of Lenin, of the world's first socialist state which has repeatedly, in the most crucial moments of history, given its unstinted support to peoples fighting for peace, freedom and progress. But since intercourse between parties and between states is conducted by their leaders, their personal qualities play an enormous role in party-to-party and state-to-state relations.

For many years it has been my good fortune to meet, talk and work with Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. And I have always admired his principled stand, his unshakable faith in our Marxist-Leninist ideals, his optimism and remarkable energy, his vision and sense of purpose. For us Bulgarian Communists and for our faithful allies in the fight against fascism and in the building of socialism — members of the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union — and for all Bulgarian working people, L. I. Brezhnev is a worthy son of the great Soviet people, the epitome of the modern Soviet Communist, the successor and continuer of Lenin's cause, a great humanist, a consistent champion of international peace and friendship. His name is inseparable from the stupendous achievements of the Soviet people in building communism, achievements that have made the land of Soviets a strong world power. His name is inseparable from the strengthening unity and might of the socialist world community. His name is inseparable from the struggle for the unity and cohesion of the international communist and workers' movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. His name is inseparable from the struggle and victories of the national-liberation movement

and the strengthening political and economic independence of the liberated countries that have chosen the non-capitalist path. His name is inseparable from the shift of international relations from cold war to détente, from the victories in the fight for peace and security, for a world without war. An outstanding representative of the working class and its vanguard, the communist movement, Comrade Brezhnev symbolizes the unity of the fight for peace, with the fight for freedom and democracy and for socialism and communism.

We Bulgarians are deeply grateful to Comrade Brezhnev — a true and sincere friend of our people, Hero of the People's Republic of Bulgaria — for the understanding he has always shown of our problems, for his inestimable contribution to the development and strengthening of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship, for his concern for the growth of socialist Bulgaria.

The historic change continues

On the eve of the New Year, Communists, democrats, right-minded men and women the world over, can look back on the past with pride and satisfaction. What has 1976 meant for the Bulgarian Communists and the Bulgarian people? What were its outstanding political and ideological developments, and what tendencies deserve our special attention in the light of our experience?

For Bulgaria and the socialist community as a whole, 1976 was a good, fruitful year, a year of peaceful labor and struggle. Our country holds a top place in the world in rate of economic growth. In the past five years (1971-75) national income increased by 46 per cent and labor productivity by more than 44 per cent. Starting from these gains, and in conformity with decisions of the 11th BCP Congress, we are working steeply to raise efficiency and quality standards throughout the economy. We are doing this by maximizing use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and consistent application of the Leninist principles of economic management, encouraging better discipline and laying more stress on material and moral incentives, raising the socialist consciousness of the people and making optimal use of the advantages latent in the socialist system. All that is central to the Party's policy of building a developed socialist society in the People's Republic of Bulgaria. We have made significant headway also in the fields of socialist culture, art and science, in asserting the socialist way of life and in extending socialist democracy. The elections to the National Assembly held a few months ago demonstrated anew the unshakable unity of our people around the Bulgarian Communist Party and its Central Committee.

In short, we have every reason to say that the economic, cultural and socio-political potential of our society is growing in strength and

scope, that prosperity standards are steadily improving, and that we are confidently advancing on the socialist road. This is a law operative in all countries of the socialist community.

Another important tendency manifested in 1976 is closer cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries, and undeviating promotion of a closer coming together with the USSR. As the 11th Party Congress re-emphasized this is the main direction of our Party's and government's international activity. Its objective basis is our Marxist-Leninist ideology, identical social systems and unity of national and international interests.

Fulfillment of the Comprehensive Program of socialist economic integration has become a cardinal factor in our countries' dynamic economic progress. It has economically strengthened the socialist community and enhanced the international prestige of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. In the past year its members began implementing their first coordinated plan of multilateral integration measures covering the period 1976-80. The history of international economic relations provides no parallel for such a plan. And together with the long-range (up to 1990) cooperation program in key industries, it guarantees stable and dynamic economic development of the socialist countries. Our high economic growth rates and crisis-free economic development are exerting a significant influence on world economic processes and on the entire complex of international relations.

Our experience in building the new type of relations between countries of the socialist community is acquiring more and more importance for nations fighting for equal and mutually-advantageous international economic intercourse free of all discrimination.

Foreign-policy coordination designed to extend and deepen détente and support peoples battling for freedom and independence, is a characteristic political feature of our development. The Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress represents a common foreign-policy platform for the fraternal parties and countries and the basis of their coordinated efforts. We are deeply convinced that its implementation is today the realistic way of assuring durable peace. Together with the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community, the People's Republic of Bulgaria is contributing to the realization of this program, which will consolidate and extend the successes achieved over the past few years in pursuing our foreign policy in the Balkans, Europe and the world.

Progress in building developed socialist and communist society and our peace policy add to the attraction of existing socialism. As Com-

rade Brezhnev declared at the 25th CPSU Congress, 'already today socialism exercises a tremendous influence on the thinking and sentiment of hundreds of millions of people all over the world. It assures working people freedom, truly democratic rights, well-being, the broadest possible access to knowledge, and a firm sense of security. It brings peace, respect for the sovereignty of all countries and equal interstate cooperation, and is a pillar of support to peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. And the immediate future is sure to provide new evidence of socialism's boundless possibilities, of its historical superiority over capitalism.' To this could be added that Bulgaria's experience, which is part and parcel of the common theoretical and practical experience of all the socialist countries, reaffirms that these features of socialism, its superiority over capitalism, are evident in each of our countries, big and small.

What determines Bulgaria's place and role in the positive changes on the world scene? First and foremost, the fact that we are a socialist country belonging to the family of fraternal states and consistently strengthening and extending its fraternal and indestructible friendship with the Soviet Union. Bulgaria's achievements in the economic, scientific and cultural fields and in raising prosperity standards, which have made it a developed socialist state, have had an exceedingly beneficial effect on its foreign-policy activity and have enhanced its international prestige. This has been facilitated also by the fact that our country has, to the best of its ability, helped the national-liberation movement, followed an active policy, and fostered friendly relations with other states and peoples, based on mutual trust and mutual understanding, on equal and mutually-advantageous cooperation. In the 32 years since the victory over fascism, Bulgaria, in common with other European countries, has enjoyed the blessings of international peace. At no other time in our history have we enjoyed so long a period of peace. And in this too, much of the credit must go to world socialism.

Bulgaria's place and role in international relations is determined also by the fact that its ruling party, the BCP, faithfully safeguards the purity of Marxism-Leninism and has been loyal to the internationalism given us by Marx, Engels and Lenin, carrying forward and developing its traditions, the beginnings of which in Bulgaria were laid by Dimitr Blagoyev and Georgi Dimitrov. As an organic part of the international communist and workers' movement, the BCP has steadfastly promoted closer unity of its ranks on a principled, Marxist-Leninist basis.

Such are the main guidelines in our home and foreign policy. The BCP believes that the earnest of continued success of this policy of peace and socialism lies in the close cohesion of the socialist com-

munity countries, in the unity and united action of the fraternal parties and the progressive forces of the world.

Internationalism and détente

In the past year, the Bulgarian Communist Party has been giving special attention to elaborating and strengthening the principles of proletarian internationalism. This is perfectly logical, for life itself has confronted the communist movement with problems of proletarian internationalism and the need to specify its content and forms according to the nature of world development and, above all, to the new realities brought about by détente.

We consider that efforts to strengthen proletarian internationalism, far from running counter to international processes arising from détente, operate as an essential factor for their expansion and deepening. Our ideological opponents interpret peaceful coexistence as something incompatible with proletarian internationalism. They allege that the Communists' international solidarity breaks the 'rules of the international game' established in the process of détente. As they see it, détente means almost sanctioning imperialist attempts to block progressive changes in the capitalist countries' social and political status quo. Certain of our opponents claim that the communist movement has 'reoriented itself' toward narrow national interests and is abandoning internationalist class positions.

In common with other fraternal parties, the BCP maintains that international détente and the class struggle are inseparable and are two aspects of one historical process, the transition from capitalism to socialism.

In the nuclear age, peaceful coexistence is the only way to ensure the future development of mankind. This is not to say, however, that the class struggle is dampened by the climate of détente or confined to national boundaries. Being the principal motor of social progress now as in the past, this struggle remains an international phenomenon implying the development of relations of solidarity and mutual support between national contingents of the international working class in capitalist countries, as well as between them and the socialist countries. Furthermore, the atmosphere of détente vastly extends the area of solidarity action by the Communists and other democrats for peace and social progress. Today proletarian solidarity is inseparable from anti-fascist solidarity, from democratic and anti-imperialist solidarity, from solidarity in the struggle for peace, security and cooperation.

The peace policy of the socialist countries, like the international policy of the communist movement generally, is also and necessarily a class, internationalist policy. The experience of the socialist com-

munity has shown that growing contacts and cooperation between countries with opposite social systems to safeguard peace and stave off nuclear war are no obstacle to rendering all-round support to polular forces fighting for democracy, national liberation and socialism. Nor is firm resistance to attempts by reactionary imperialist circles to interfere in the affairs of other nations at variance with the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Our people know full well that Bulgaria has enjoyed effective political and economic independence ever since it linked its destiny with that of the Soviet Union. Our state has guarantees of its sovereignty. But surely it is clear that precisely the defense power of the Warsaw Treaty organization, primarily that of the Soviet Union, has compelled imperialism to desist from attempting, in particular by using force, to abolish our people's socialist gains. The Bulgarian people take pride in the fact that our country has become an industrial state and is doing everything to advance the socialist economy. At the 11th BCP Congress, we set ourselves big and inspiring tasks: building developed socialism and paving the way for the gradual transition to communism. But it should be clear that all this was made possible by Bulgaria's being an equal member of the socialist community, taking an active part in the international socialist division of labor and in the activity of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. And it should be equally clear that all this was made possible by the existence of the Soviet Union, with which Bulgaria is linked by past history, the present and the future.

The unfolding of socialist integration processes in recent years in the economy and in defense, in ideology and politics, in science and culture, has deepened the unity and strengthened the cohesion of the CMEA and Warsaw Treaty countries and led to substantial changes in our people's patriotic and internationalist thinking. This manifests itself in the gradual interpenetration and fusion of socialist patriotism and socialist internationalism.

Our Party considers that the definition formulated by Georgi Dimitrov, who called fraternal solidarity with the Soviet Union the 'touchstone' of internationalism, is as true and valid as ever, for the Soviet Union is the core around which the socialist community, that historic achievement of the international working class, has crystallized. The definition is true and valid because the more rapid expansion and deepening of the world revolutionary process today are based on the might of existing socialism, on the growing beneficial impact of the international policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It is as true and valid as ever because the class enemy, who actively coordinates his anti-communist actions at international level, wants to undermine our international solidarity primar-

ily by means of anti-Sovietism. The BCP holds that all tolerance or neutrality in regard to anti-Sovietism is, in effect, a departure from proletarian internationalism.

A short time ago, bourgeois propaganda put in circulation a new concept inspired by anti-Sovietism. This concept, known as 'Eurocommunism' betrays the reactionaries' desire to raise a wall between the brother parties of the socialist community and those of the West European capitalist countries, between ruling and non-ruling Communist Parties. This is now one of the main lines of ideological subversion against proletarian internationalism and we realize the danger it presents. The ideological principles and objectives of 'Eurocommunism' include negation of the main laws of revolutionary struggle on the plea that they are 'not confirmed' by the experience of the West European working-class movement, substituting national peculiarities for these general laws and universally valid aspects of revolutionary experience, trying to mislead Communists and urging them to integrate into the political system of contemporary capitalism. Its proponents speculate on the parties' effort freely to choose a path of struggle for progressive social changes and for socialism in keeping with present-day conditions. We Bulgarian Communists appreciate wuch effort and see nothing wrong in it.

In its years-long struggle against capitalism and fascism, and then in building the new society, the BCP decided sovereignly and independently on the path to be taken by our country according to the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism, which it creatively applied in our conditions. It is well known, however, that our path revealed the same fundamental laws as in other countries which arrived at socialism: the leading role of the Communist Party, the alliance of popular forces headed by the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat over the overthrown bourgeoisie, socialist democracy for the people, proletarian internationalism. Our experience shows that freedom to choose the path leading to socialism does not mean 'disposing' of objective laws but taking them and their exigencies into account with due regard to the given situation.

In the CC Report to the 11th Congress of our Party and in the columns of this authoritative publication, we have stated that proletarian internationalism undergoes qualitative changes in the course of history. Thus, the fraternal solidarity of the peoples of the socialist countries and the cooperation of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties in struggle find expression in socialist internationalism. There is no reason at all, as far as we can see, to represent this fundamentally new phenomenon as a concession to the regional approach to problems of international solidarity. Socialist internationalism is the prototype of future world relations. More and more peoples who choose the

socialist road rise and will rise to this qualitatively new stage in the development of internationalism.

Our epoch gives rise to a vast variety of forms of international solidarity. The great diversity of objective conditions for activity and of the subjective experiences of the national contingents of the international working class make for diversity in manifestations of solidarity. There is nothing unnatural in this. Not so when proletarian internationalism is construed in such a way as to rob it of its class essence. We can by no means accept this.

We consider that the discussions of problems of internationalism held during the recent Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe were useful beyond doubt. They helped us to find and work out forms of communist solidarity corresponding to the present state of our movement, to specify in a common platform the goals of our common struggle for extended détente and for social progress.

Growing activity of the forces of peace and progress

A most important aspect of the struggle to deepen détente is that détente provides international conditions for preventing a nuclear world war and for promoting the social progress of mankind. This is why both Communists and the masses have a vital stake in this trend of international development. It is not accidental that our ideological adversaries have been at pains to prevent this truth from taking root in the public mind. To this day, reactionary bourgeois commentators and politicians claim that détente only benefits the socialist countries. They are echoed by those who would like to represent détente as a barrier to the development of the working-class and liberation movement. However, both the progressive forces and a number of realistic politicians and statesmen of the capitalist West realize that today détente and the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social and economic systems are the only way to promote international relations.

Marxist-Leninists have never concealed and have, indeed, stressed that socialism is interested in peace. It is precisely the socialist countries' policy of détente that constitutes an effective method of creating favorable conditions for the ascent and all-round success of socialism. This is an axiom. On the other hand, it is hardly necessary to demonstrate that no changes whatever in international relations can remove the profound contradictions of the contemporary capitalist system, and this means that the system's general crisis will go deeper. What the Communists and other progressive and democratic forces of the world are striving for is to create conditions favorable to the social progress of all the peoples of the planet.

Is increasing vindication of the principles of peaceful coexistence in harmony with this common aspiration? This question is answered by life itself. In fact, is it not evident that the atmosphere of détente is far more favorable to movements for democratic and social changes in the capitalist world? Is it not evident that the struggle against remnants of colonialism, against neo-colonialism and racism, for full independence, has become more fruitful? Surely the historic victories of the Vietnamese people, the people of Laos and Kampuchea, the Angolan people, and a number of other African peoples who have won or are fighting for independence are evidence of this. And surely it is also seen in the increased influence of the Communists in a number of West European countries and in numerous other gains of the revolutionary, democratic and national-liberation forces.

It is unquestionable that the precise and explicit position on this issue worked out by our movement and recorded in the final document of the Berlin meeting of European Communists helps correctly to orientate the masses and encourages their initiative and activity in the struggle against the enemies of peace and against reaction. At the same time, the European Communists' estimation of the policy of détente as a factor beneficial to social progress is an acknowledgement of the outstanding role of socialism in today's world.

Events of the past year have shown that the current stage is characterized by the all-round intensification of the struggle for peace, which is going on primarily at the level of state-to-state relations. In assessing the state of our relations with capitalist countries, we proceed from the fact that in spite of appreciable headway in fostering contacts and cooperation between countries with different social systems, world peace has yet to be guaranteed. This makes it a matter of the first importance to reach understanding on serious and specific disarmament measures as a guarantee of peace. Our delegation to the 31st UN General Assembly supported the Soviet initiatives toward ending the arms race and concluding a world treaty on non-use of force in international relations. Our country takes an active part in the work of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament, as well as in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

While giving principled and sustained support to every initiative in favor of peace and détente on a global scale, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, contributes to this process in the Balkans. In view of the complicated and contradictory situation in the Balkans, we took a series of steps last year that, in our opinion, provided conditions for the further progress of our good-neighbor relations. This policy does something more than furthering peace and security in the area; it is

inseparable from the effort to deepen détente in Europe and the world.

The struggle for peace and social progress is also developing in the form of growing support from large segments of the public for peace initiatives. We see this fact as one of exceptional value. Lasting peace cannot be brought about by the efforts fo governments alone; action by the masses, by all democratic forces and movements, plays a unique role in this respect.

We draw no dividing line between actions in defense of peace and the working people's fight against the hardships stemming from the effects of the economic crisis, for democracy, against reaction. The struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to eliminate seats of war danger, achieve national liberation and consolidate independence, and their struggle against racist and fascist regimes, against imperialism, contribute in growing measure to peace and social progress. The movement of non-aligned countries and its anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and anti-racist trend play an important part in deepening détente. The Colombo conference of heads of state or government of non-aligned countries reaffirmed the resolve of the movement as a whole to go on fighting against imperialism, war and aggression, against colonialism and neo-colonialism, to work for greater cohesion of the forces championing peace, national independence and social progress.

To develop party-to-party contacts, too, is a task of fundamental importance in stepping up the struggle for peace and social progress. Our most sincere comradely and fraternal relations with the ruling parties of countries of the socialist community are the pivot of close, inherently friendly relations between our socialist peoples, relations which gain steadily in content.

We attach tremendous importance to deepening contacts with the Communist and Workers' Parties of capitalist countries and with revolutionary democratic parties. In 1976, our country was visited by Communists and members of other revolutionary parties from more than 90 countries of the non-socialist world, and Bulgarian Communists met abroad with Communists of over 60 countries of the non-socialist world. Discussion during those visits centered on problems of the world revolutionary process and of political and ideological cooperation in the struggle for peace and social progress on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

We regard developing interaction between the Communists of the socialist community and the Communists of the capitalist world and growing relations with anti-capitalist and revolutionary democratic parties, with the widest possible range of political and social forces and currents as a decisive factor in uniting the three fundamental

revolutionary forces of our time: world socialism, the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement.

The historic shift in the world balance in favor of socialism is continuing. In spite of bitter resistance from reaction, there are growing opportunities for mankind's advance along the road of peace and social progress. These are the main results of the year 1976, results we note at the threshold of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It is for this reason that we look ahead with well-founded optimism as we work confidently on a difficult but great historic task, the task of furthering world peace and making new gains in the struggle for freedom, independence, democracy and socialism.

The 'supranational' mask of monopoly capitalism

Enrique Pastorino
President, World
Federation of Trade Unions

The international monopolies of our time, whether they are called 'supranational,' 'international,' 'transnational' or 'multinational,'[1] retain (and this should never be forgotten) their essence of monopoly as the main economic tool of big capital at its imperialist stage. Multinational corporations, or simply multinationals, are simultaneously a product of, and decisive factor in, the internationalization of finance capital and expansion of the process of material production on the scale of the capitalist world economy. That is why their actions deserve special scrutiny by the international working-class movement in general and the trade unions in particular.

The rapid development of the multinationals, the growth of their investments in foreign countries and their dominant positions in trade and world capitalist production, their decisive say in decision-making concerning capitalism's economic strategy in international division of labor as to where, when and how to set up industrial structures, infrastructures and markets, and in what countries, when and how to stimulate employment or unemployment — all this makes it incumbent on the labor movement to work out a corresponding counter-strategy.

First of all, we should clarify one question that sometimes arises in

connection with the multinationals and their 'supranational' character. Are these companies really giants refusing to recognize existing frontiers, robots that have got out of the control of national states?

It goes without saying that the tremendous concentration of capital and ramification of the multinationals have raised the internationalization of production and accumulation to a higher level. Nevertheless, every such company relies on the state machinery at home. It uses the services of a whole system of national government institutions, ministries, departments, banks, economic and marketing research centers, which help their 'own' multinationals to plan, stimulate and accelerate investments so as to be in a position not only to compete with similar companies in other countries, but to gain the upper hand in such competition.

Thus, multinationals are big monopolies striving to maximize profits and extend their activities over several countries. Such activities, coordinated from one center, with decisions taken at the highest level, may cover the most diverse spheres, but their characteristic feature is the close intertwining of production, trade and financial activities.

Expansion of the multinationals

The multinationals have expanded tremendously over the last few years and now occupy dominant positions in different economic spheres.

The United States played a leading role in the establishment of multinational companies after the Second World War. Two-thirds of the North American multinationals appeared between 1946 and 1965. By contrast, the multinationals based in West European countries and Japan began to expand only in the latter 60s, with their most rapid growth coming after 1972.[2]

Significant shifts in the proportions of foreign investments of the main capitalist countries have taken place in the last few years. As a result, the sum-total of private investments of West European capital in the U.S. has caught up with that of the United States in Western Europe or even surpassed it.[3] This is a fact of historic significance, for such parity has been achieved for the first time since the war.

The overall increase of direct investments by multinationals is indicative of the scale of their expansion in recent years. Between 1967 and 1971 the growth of investment was especially great: 8-9 per cent per annum for the United States and Great Britain; 12.5 per cent for France, Switzerland, Canada, Holland, Belgium and Italy. Truly fabulous growth rates of 25 and 33 per cent respectively, were achieved by the multinational corporations of the FRG and Japan, newcomers out to catch up with their rivals.[4]

The mutual penetration of capital accompanying this expansion

makes the multinationals a powerful weapon of world imperialism. Their growing participation has substantially changed the pattern of world trade, production of raw materials and manufactured goods, and international division of labor. They now handle more than two-thirds of world trade, with 25 per cent of those two-thirds accounting for intra-company exchanges between enterprises in the home country and their foreign subsidiaries, as well as directly between subsidiaries.[5]

The consequences of this are obvious: the bulk of world capitalist commerce is now controlled by a handful of major multinational corporations. Their intra-company exchanges are a web of financial machinations resulting in low prices for imports from dependent countries and high prices for exports to those countries.[6] That is one of the essential factors in the 'worsening conditions of international trade.' From 1946 to 1975 prices of goods coming from Latin America, Asia and Africa have been consistently going down, while prices of finished products manufactured in the United States, Western Europe and Japan are just as consistently going up.

The multinationals have left a deep imprint on the entire economy of developed capitalist countries, where they invest the bulk of their capital. Thanks to their economic strength and ability to use the achievements of scientific and technological progress, they have gained enormous influence over the policies of whole states, over their economic policies and even social relations.

Their speculative dealings have in recent years been the cause of acute monetary crises, the decline of stock and share prices, devaluations of a number of currencies, rising prices and runaway inflation. In their drive for profits, they make extensive use of the predatory tactic of transferring capital from one industry to another, draining away the life blood of less profitable industries, thereby causing acute disproportions in the economies of individual countries, the ruin of thousands of small and middle businesses, and the growth of mass unemployment. Even bourgeois economists blame the multinationals' greed for the extent of the latest economic crisis.

At the same time, and for the same purposes, a 'geographic' transfer of capital is directed to countries rich in raw materials and cheap manpower, even if this entails the shutdown of enterprises in the home country. Thus, West Germany's Volkswagen dismissed 25,000 workers from its factories in the FRG in 1973, coincident with major investments in Mexico, Brazil and South Africa. Of course, such things have happened before, but only with the rise of the multinationals, and by virtue of their 'supranational' characteristics, has it become possible for the monopolies to carry out such mass transfers of capital and production on a truly unprecedented scale.

Finally, the multinationals have become a battering ram with which the monopolies hope to deal a crushing blow at the working people's gains. Here, too, the multinationals' ability to manipulate their resources on an international scale, the possibility of transferring production from one country to another in case of need (e.g., a threatened strike) provides them with additional trumps and makes them the shock force of big capital in the struggle against the trade unions and their rights.

And yet, it seems to us, the real essence of the multinationals displays itself most vividly when they penetrate the economies of dependent countries as agents of international finance capital.

Multinationals in developing countries: myth and reality

When a multinational decides upon expanding or protecting its positions in an industry it has several ways of doing so: increasing exports, selling patents or licences to local enterprises, and setting up a subsidiary so as to get directly into the market and capture it. The third option is the most favored: the multinationals prefer, in direct proportion to their strength, to capture markets directly, develop or restructure them to their own advantage by setting up subsidiaries and manufacturing on the spot all or part of the produce formerly exported from their base enterprises.

Bourgeois propaganda in the service of multinational corporations claims that thanks to their expansion, the developing countries acquire modern technoligical knowhow, increase employment, modernize and build up new production structures.

The facts prove the contrary.

Let us first consider the question of the so-called influx of capital, illustrated with examples from the experience of Latin America, which receives 60 per cent of all foreign investments in the developing countries.

Between 1946 and 1975, anywhere from 45 to 54 per cent of 'new investments by multinationals represented simply reinvestment of profit obtained through the exploitation of the Latin American working class. In Brazil and Mexico, which account for the lion's share of investments of imperialist monopolies in the 70s, development capital comes as a rule not from external sources, i.e., multinationals and international financial agencies, but from domestic sources. For example, in 1965-66, Mexican multinational subsidiaries financed 52 per cent of their development from their own accumulations; in 1969-70, the figure had increased to 61 per cent.

We have similar data for Brazil where, out of the $130 million invested by 115 multinationals in 1974, $44 million were reinvest-

ments and the remaining $86 million were obtained on the local money market. That same year Brazilian subsidiaries transferred $125 million in profit to their base enterprises in the home country. In Brazil it is generally believed that overall, multinationals were responsible for $2,100 million of Brazil's balance-of-payment deficit in 1974.[7]

The monopolies, however, have found a way of camouflaging their plunder and misleading the compilers of international economic statistics. Instead of investing in their own subsidiaries they now issue them 'loans,' so that the subsidiaries transfer relatively 'small' profits to their owners, but pay interest on the 'loans.'

As for the much-vaunted 'transfer of technological knowhow,' it has become just another factor in increasing the dependence of developing countries and, at the same time, a new form of monopoly enrichment and an additional source of high profits for the multinationals. In the last ten years another trend has increasingly been in evidence: instead of setting up subsidiaries, the multinationals now prefer to buy up existing local enterprises, and at present more than two-thirds of their subsidiaries are in fact local acquisitions. Really new subsidiaries are now set up only in rare cases, when there is a need for applying new technologies or building enterprises requiring heavy investment.

Payment to the monopolies for technological knowhow means, in effect, double payment: once as a direct reimbursement of the cost of the means of production and services, and then as concealed payment of a special rent, which is, furthermore, absolutely arbitrary, since more than 85 per cent of it represents payments of the subsidiary to the parent company. In many cases this is done to inflate overheads, evade taxes and fix monopoly prices on the markets of the respective countries. Monopoly profits from 'transfer of technological knowhow' are truly enormous and, by 1980, are estimated to reach $20,000 million.[8]

In their efforts to prove the beneficial effects of the expansion of multinationals in developing countries, monopoly apologists claim that they pay higher wages than local national enterprises. That impression is created by the fact that official statistics include under the general heading of wages and salaries the immeasurably higher salaries of directors, managers and engineers. An analysis of wages paid to comparable skill categories of personnel at other enterprises would reveal a very high degree of similarity in pay levels. Differences in pay that do exist are due not to the generosity of the multinationals, but either to geographic factors, to the greater possibilities of workers at large enterprises for collective bargaining, or to the employment of predominantly high-skilled labor in some industries. That applies to local enterprises, too.

Plunder of national wealth

The multinational companies are gradually gaining control not only of the markets, but also of the economic structures of many developing countries, and are thus enabled to shape their development pattern.

In Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, Latin America's three major countries, enterprises owned by multinationals are more developed than their domestic counterparts. They use 2.5 times more capital per employee, productivity is twice as high on the average, especially in consumer goods production, and the enterprises are more profitable by roughly one-third. It should also be borne in mind that profitableness is only computed on the basis of declared profits while sums transferred from the country in disguised form cannot be recorded. Furthermore, multinational subsidiaries expand production much faster than domestic firms, chiefly by drawing on internal sources of financing.

The rate of monopoly expansion, confined to highly profitable fields and industries, militates against the development of a balanced economy in dependent countries. Owing to the activity of the multinational economic octopuses, these countries cannot effectively plan their economic development. Spontaneous expansion by multinationals leads to the excessive growth of some industries, which upsets the development of the national economy, deforms its structure and increases dependence on foreign capital. A gigantic sector dominated by multinationals comes into being while the sector controlled by domestic capital is reduced to a rickety state.

Lastly, monopoly policy makes for an enormous increase in the developing countries' imports, which is mainly responsible for their soaring balance of payments deficits. In Brazil, the multinationals are responsible for 50 or more per cent of the annual balance of payments deficit, and in Mexico, for 50 to 54 per cent.

It follows that expansion by multinationals has the following consequences:

— growing plunder of national wealth;
— increasing instability on a world, regional and national level;
— dictating prices;
— mounting inflationary trends and recurrent monetary upheavals;
— a growing foreign debt, especially in the case of dependent and developing countries;
— growing inequality in trade;
— a rapid rise in full and partial unemployment;
— declining utilization of production capacities and shortage of jobs against a background of continued population growth;

— disregard of the people's historical, cultural and religious traditions;

— environmental pollution and irreparable ecological damage;

— the establishment of neo-colonialist relations as successor of the old colonial policy;

— interference in the internal affairs of nations, widespread corruption and bribery;

— mounting international tensions and distortion of the peaceful trends and objectives of development;

— attacks on the policy of détente and peace.

Counter-measures by the trade union movement

Naturally, the workers and their unions counter this dangerous policy by stepping up their actions to safeguard working conditions and wages, by carrying on an ever more markedly anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggle. Capitalist propaganda has been unable to mislead he working people and check their fight by talking about the 'fatal' inevitability and 'universal' character of the current crisis, or by calling on the workers to tighten their belts in the 'national interest.'

According to our estimates, based on data of the International Labor Office, the number of work days lost through strikes in 60 capitalist countries in 1974 was 35 per cent greater than in in 1973. And even incomplete data for 1975 and 1976 suggest that strike action has lost none of its intensity.

The working people couple immediate economic demands with the demand for democratic changes in society. They want their actions to lead to unity of the peoples against the social consequences of the crisis in the capitalist world. Politically, this expresses itself in gains by the left in many capitalist countries and in intensifying struggles against imperialism in the developing countries, and in both cases the movement is spreading to ever larger social sectors.

The multinationals' plunder of developing countries, whose dimensions we have illustrated by citing the case of Latin America, logically leads to growing contradictions between imperialism and the most diverse social groups, including the national bourgeoisie. This is seen in the anti-imperialist stance of a number of Latin American governments. Objectively, this situation makes for the formation of broad anti-imperialist fronts to further the revolutionary process. The declaration of the Havana Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean points this out.

Besides, the movement for peace, against imperialist aggression, paves the way for resistance to the offensive of the monopolies, including the multinationals. The working people's actions assume

diverse forms according to the development level of the trade union movement and local conditions. However, they have a common denominator — a trend toward greater unity to jointly beat off the attack of the monopolies, imperialism, and the governments in their service. Unifying processes in the trade union movement are deepening, the alliance of the progressive forces of various countries is going from strength to strength, and international unity of action is gaining ground. That united action has yet to attain the level desired by the class trade unions, and that it falls short of possibilities is due to diverse factors, first among which are the continuing disunity of the international trade union movement and the monopoly bourgeoisie's ideological influence on certain contingents of the working class.

It was admittedly reactionary forces, using cold-war methods, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, that caused the split in the international trade union movement, with the result that several national organizations withdrew from the WFTU in 1949. At present there are three major trade union centers: World Federation of Trade Unions, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and World Confederation of Labor. And while notable progress has been made toward cooperation between them in the struggle against the more telling effects of the capitalist crisis, the effort to achieve broader unity of action still encounters difficulties due to the anti-communist prejudices of the ICFTU and WCL.

The disunity of the international trade union movement makes for division at the national level in many countries. Yet experience shows that where the unions succeeded in ending fragmentation and combining their forces, their fight for immediate demands becomes more active and produces better results. On the other hand, the split in the trade union movement makes the ideas of class collaboration more persistent, while prejudice against working-class unity often deforms the thinking of some contingents of working people, thereby limiting the possibilities of the effective resistance to the multinationals.

Powerful joint actions by the working class in a number of countries show that the only way to offset the effects of the capitalist crisis and counter the activity of the imperialist monopolies is to achieve united action of the whole trade union movement and mobilize the working people to support solutions leading to far-reaching structural changes in the capitalist countries. A united trade union front is also required for the struggle against the threat of a new war, for disarmament, for eliminating dangerous seats of tension, notably in the Middle East, and consolidating détente.

The WFTU has repeatedly made specific proposals to the ICFTU and WCL to coordinate action in advancing the working-class struggle in defense of its interests, specifically against the multinationals'

arbitrary practices. Regrettably, our proposals have so far not met with the desired response, and progress has been very slow. There is no doubt that the more class-conscious forces of the trade union movement will press for such coordination, because unity is absolutely indispensable for the success of the struggle facing the working people of the capitalist world. The prerequisites of this exist: the action programs worked out by the three currents of the world trade union movement coincide on many points, particularly in regard to the fight against the multinationals.

Unity, a top priority

It is fair to say that the joint struggle of the working people of the developed capitalist and dependent or developing countries, and their alliance with their class brothers in the socialist countries, constitute a genuine school of proletarian internationalism. The solidarity actions carried out lately by the working people of the countries where the multinationals have their headquarters with the working people of the countries where these companies have subsidiaries, and militant coordinated action by the workers of multinational enterprises situated on both sides of national frontiers underline the identity of the goals of the working class and make for closer bonds of international solidarity.

Unquestionably, the workers' struggle for immediate demands and the peoples' actions against imperialism at present benefit from the new world balance of forces, which is more favorable than before to peace, social progress and socialism. I wish to re-emphasize the role which the countries of the socialist community, with the Soviet Union at their head, have played in this respect through their consistent policy of détente and peace, as well as through their steady progress in the economic, political and diplomatic spheres. The power and influence of the socialist countries have helped both to avert a world war which would otherwise have been inevitable, and to curb imperialist arbitrariness as far as possible, in particular, the multinationals' domination in developing countries. Besides, the socialist countries are a powerful source of solidarity with the struggle for national independence, prosperity and social progress.

It is on this basis that the prestige of socialism is growing among the working people of the world, who come to realize in the course of their struggle what reliable friends and allies they have in the socialist countries. The fact that the economy of socialist countries, unlike that of capitalist countries, develops harmoniously, without crises, and that socialism gives people a sense of security, opens the eyes of many in capitalist countries misled by hostile capitalist propaganda and wins new supporters for the cause of social progress.

In conditions of the new balance of world forces, the militant spirit of the peoples resisting imperialism and plunder by the multinationals also manifests itself in international organizations (such as the UN and its specialized agencies, in particular the International Labor Organization), which are now playing a positive role by helping to curb the greed of the monopolies and upholding the nations' sovereign right to control their natural resources.

A number of initiatives have lately been taken in this direction. They include the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States approved by the UN General Assembly, as well as discussions on a 'code of behavior' for the multinational companies. As for us, we have no illusions on this score. We think these measures can in the main have a moral and mobilizing effect on international opinion. Only joint action of the socialist world, the working people of the capitalist countries and the newly free nations can, in the last analysis, curb the appetites of the insatiable imperialist monopolies but also put an end to their domination. However, we do not underrate the political importance of the indictment of these economic octopuses by international organizations. We maintain that this indictment can become a means of uniting the peoples in the struggle for independence and social progress.

Millions of trade unionists still consider that the broadest possible unity of action is the workers' principal weapon against exploitation by the monopolies, including the multinationals. At a special meeting in Berlin in January 1975, the WFTU Bureau discussed an action plan in view of the deepening crisis of world capitalism and a program of struggle against the multinationals, which are more responsible than anyone else for the worsening of the crisis. The meeting adopted an important document which is entirely valid to this day. Its concluding section contains an action platform on which it is possible to unite all trade union currents irrespective of political orientation, including the three international trade union centers.

True to the principles of unity on which it was founded, and steadfastly championing peace, détente and peaceful coexistence, the WFTU coordinates the actions of national trade union centers in the struggle for effective solidarity of the working people of all countries and for the democratization of international economic relations. It does its utmost to bring about international working-class unity as a decisive condition for success in the struggle for the working people's social and economic demands, against encroachments on their interests and rights by the imperialist monopolies, and above all against the disastrous activity of the multinational companies.

1. Leaving aside the question of the scientific validity of these terms, we shall use

in this article the expression 'multinational corporations' accepted in international organizations.

2. J.N Vaupel, J.P. Curhan. *The World's Multinational Enterprises. A Source Book of Tables*. Harvard University, Boston, 1973.

3. *Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy*. International Labor Office. Geneva, 1973, p. 6.

4. Calculated on the basis of data published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

5. *Yearbook of International Trade Statistics*. UNO, 1973.

6. Because of the increased prices of intermediate products, the sum of disguised payments to foreign companies in Colombia's pharmaceutical industry exceeded 24-fold their declared profits. In the same industry, in Chile, prices were increased 500 per cent. — *Ed.*

7. *Opiniao*, July 11, 1976.

8. *Le Monde diplomatique*, March 1975, p. 35.

For an overall settlement in the Middle East

Naim Ashhab
Member of CC,
CP of Jordan,
Member of *WMR*
Editorial Council

COMMENTARY

World opinion is deeply concerned about the explosive situation in the Middle East. The trend of development there is extremely contradictory and the region may well be described as one of the most perilous seats of war on our planet. The bloodshed in Lebanon is particularly alarming.

The Lebanese crisis, which has been going on for more than 18 months, is an intricate tangle of diverse conflicts. Socio-political contradictions have aggravated the communal-religious structure and a clash has broken out between reaction, on the one hand, and the national patriotic forces and the Palestinian Resistance Movement (PRM), on the other. The explosion of these contradiction should be seen as the result of an imperialist-Israeli conspiracy in which Arab reaction has a hand.

The obvious aims of the conspiracy are:

— to deal a blow to the PRM and eliminate it as an anti-imperialist force and an independent factor in the fight against Israeli aggression;

— to prevent the consolidation of the national patriotic forces in Lebanon and provoke a partition of the country;

— to aggravate the division of the Arab countries and divert their attention from the urgent task of resisting Israeli aggression and imperialist intrigue in the area;

— to undermine the unity of the progressive patriotic forces of the Arab East and help reaction to consolidate its positions there.

Some time ago it seemed clear that the crisis could be resolved by all progressive and patriotic forces of the Arab world jointly resisting the conspiracy. A resistance front began actually to shape up and score successes. We wrote about this earlier.[1]

Afterwards, however, the situation became seriously complicated. Cooperation and coordinated action by the Arab patriotic and anti-imperialist forces were disrupted owing to the events in Lebanon. This became only too evident in the summer of 1976, when the Syrian army launched a massive intervention in Lebanon in spite of the warnings of friends in Arab countries and elsewhere, who emphasized that the only way of resolving the Lebanese crisis was for the Lebanese to achieve a political settlement by themselves, without pressure from any quarter.

At this writing, the world press was widely commenting on the proposals worked out at a limited summit meeting in the Saudi Arabian capital, Riyadh. The meeting passed a decision on ending hostilities throughout Lebanon and discussed measures to normalize the situation there, taking account of the necessity to preserve the country's territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, as well as solidarity between the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.[2]

It should be noted, of course, that the Riyadh meeting was held under strong pressure from the Arab peoples and their friends all over the world, who demanded an end to the bloodshed. Should the result be an effective ceasefire, this could play an important part by paving the way for constructive political dialogue.[3] And it is essential that any settlement that is reached should be brought about without detriment to the national patriotic forces and the legitimate interests of the Arab people of Palestine.

It is difficult to say what turn developments in Lebanon will take in the near future. It is clear, however, who helped, and how, to create in the Middle East a situation that turned the Lebanese crisis into a major armed conflict; it is also clear how these forces would like to channel further developments in the area. For the conspiracy against Lebanon is but one, if the most tragic, manifestations of the policy that imperialism, especially that of the USA, has been pursuing in the Middle East ever since October 1973.

In the October 1973 war, the imperialist-Zionist alliance met with

the joint resistance of the Arabs, who were supported by the socialist countries with the Soviet Union at their head and by progressive world opinion. It was forced to retreat. What is more, the Arab armies dispelled the myth of Israel's absolute military superiority.

Under those circumstances, U.S. diplomacy pursued two major goals. One goal was to weaken and split the Arabs' anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist alliance by establishing as many secondary fronts as possible and by fomenting internecine strife. The idea was to set the Arabs against each other so as to weaken the Arab national liberation movement as a whole and exhaust its revolutionary energy. The other goal was to undermine Arab-Soviet friendship and cooperation so as to alienate and isolate the Arabs from their loyal ally, whose support has always been a powerful obstacle to enemy intrigues, as all the ordeals the Arabs had to live through have shown.

This U.S. strategy gambled on the political and social heterogeneity of the Arab world and on the growing class differentiation within the Arab countries. The tactical weapon used was the policy of partial, or 'step-by-step,' settlement.

Contrary to the assertions of those enmeshed in that policy, it was by no means directed toward a stage-by-stage achievement of a lasting and comprehensive peaceful settlement. The facts of the last three years have shown that its aim was to consolidate the results of the 1967 Israeli aggression by continuously striking at various sectors and units of the Arab front. At the same time, the myth was persistently spread that the USA alone held the key to a Middle East solution.[4] The USA is clearly out to win over the states opposing Israel.

The first blow was inflicted by means of the Washington-devised Sinai agreement between Egypt and Israel. A practical result of that agreement was, in our view, Egypt's withdrawal from the front of struggle against Israeli occupation. This development created favorable conditions for striking at other sectors (and, we might add, for promoting the rapid growth of capitalist elements in Egypt).

The second blow was aimed against Syria, on which the USA tried to impose a similar agreement. The attempt failed due to the firm stand taken by the Syrian leadership at the time. However, the U.S. imperialists and their Zionist allies and puppets did not abandon the idea of weakening Syria.

The third blow, aimed against the PRM, was meant to eliminate its main base in Lebanon (after the September 1970 bloodbath in Jordan).

Why was the PRM chosen this time? The movement had grown and gained strength in recent years. It had become more effective and realistic and this won worldwide recognition for the legitimate goals of

the Arab people of Palestine. The PRM holds a rightful place in the front ranks of the anti-imperialist and anti-Israeli struggle. It established a natural alliance with the national patriotic forces of Lebanon. And that is why imperialism and Zionism, as well as Arab reactionaries, aim to undermine the PRM, while at the same time working to weaken other progressive forces in the Middle East.

Who stands to profit from fanning tensions in Lebanon? First of all, undoutbedly, imperialism and Israel's Zionist rulers. Arabs are being used to carry out a long-standing scheme of their enemies. Removing the PRM from the anti-imperialist front in the Middle East would greatly harm the Arab's just cause. In view of an inevitable general weakening of the progressive forces and a split among the natural allies in the anti-imperialist front one is forced to conclude that an effort is being made to undermine the struggle of the Arab countries to abolish the consequences of the Israeli aggression and deal a serious blow to the entire Arab national-liberation movement.

Not surprisingly, the Israeli Zionist rulers and imperialist politicians were elated at this turn of events in Lebanon. Indeed, Israel give direct aid to the rightists in Lebanon by supplying them with modern arms, including tanks and other heavy weapons, and joined in the war like a pirate by virtually blockading Lebanon's coast to prevent supplies from reaching the patriots and then by opening — in conjunction with Lebanon's extreme rightists, a new front in the south of the country against the PRM and the national patriotic forces. All this was done with the tacit consent of Arab reactionaries, particularly in Saudi Arabia, which likewise aided the rightist, fascist and separatist forces in Lebanon.

The process of undermining Arab unity against Israeli aggression — a process started by the Sinai agreement — found expression, directly or indirectly, in several other conflicts: between Egypt and Libya, Libya and Sudan, Morocco and Algeria, Syria and Iraq. In the military sphere, these conflicts led to most Arab troops being transferred from their positions facing the Israeli occupation forces to other sectors. It is an open secret that at one time the main body of Egyptian troops was concentrated along the Libyan border, while the rest were transferred to Sudan to protect the Numeiri regime. As for the Syrian army, one part of it was involved in the Lebanese events and another was massed along the Iraqi border. Revealingly, Saudi Arabia, too, recalled its troops stationed on the Golan Heights since 1973.

It is in this confused situation among the Arabs, caused by the subversive activity of imperialism, Zionism and reaction, that Saudi Arabia whose rulers are U.S. imperialism's main agents in the Arab world is trying to gain the initiative in the region. In fact, they are

trying on Washington's suggestion to pull many strings simultaneously. On the one hand, the Saudi rulers continue supporting Cairo's policy which has led to the Sinai agreement and its consequences, including a weakening of Egypt's positions in the Arab world and a rift in relations with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, they hail the Syrian-Jordanian rapprochement[5] and try to use it as a means of persuading Syria to discontinue its struggle against imperialism and Israeli occupation. At the same time, they would like to isolate the PLO, deprive it of its consistently anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist character and bring avowed rightists to the fore in its leadership, men who would be prepared to dissolve a national Palestinian state in a confederation with certain neighboring Arab states.[6]

Saudi Arabia is also carrying on extensive and varied subversive activities in other regions of the Arab world. It is actively helping to suppress the revolution in Oman and liquidate even the miserly democratic freedoms existing in Bahrain and Kuwait, and is engaged in clandestine operations against the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

In all these activities, Saudi Arabia is backed by the United States and draws on its own huge financial resources. We feel, however, that it is enabled to play a subversive role on such a scale and so actively only because the Arab regimes committed to struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction have not yet agreed on a common realistic course of action and are prevented therefore from becoming centers of attraction and consolidation for all revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East.

The resulting situation in the Arab world makes it possible for the imperialists to assume that the subversive goals they have set themselves by announcing a policy of partial solutions have been attained. They imagine that the Arab world is now ready for a political 'settlement' on U.S. terms, which are far from being fair and are in line with the military strategic interests of imperialism, particularly the oil monopolies. That would seem to be the reason why Henry Kissinger said in September that 'conditions are coming about in which the search for peace (in the Middle East — *N.A.*) can be resumed with energy and conviction' and that the most useful approach now would be a 'comprehensive solution' rather than a step-by-step process (see *IHT*, Sept., 30, 1976).

However, the facts, and clarifications of the U.S. position, show that there is no mention of removing the main cause of the conflict — the continuing Israeli aggression and occupation of Arab lands. Besides, the U.S. government's decision in mid-October to sell Israel super-modern weaponry shows that it wants to force the Arabs to negotiate with Israel under military pressure.

Secondly, U.S. plans do not envisage, any more than they did in the past, a solution of the Palestinian problem, impossible without establishing a national state. The imperialists still refuse to recognize the PLO as the sole lawful representative of the Palestinian people or to agree to its participation in the Geneva Conference.

We would like to point out on the basis of historical experience that any attempt to settle the Middle East crisis disregarding the basic causes of the conflict and excluding any of the principal sides is doomed to fail.

By the same token, a solution of the Lebanese crisis, extremely necessary in itself, cannot bring about a real normalization of the situation in the region. History has shown that eliminating this or that seat of war is not sufficient to restore peace in the Middle East. Although there are direct and specific reasons for the Lebanese crisis, it is one of the complications in the Middle East crisis as a whole and an inseparable part of it. In Lebanon too, a final and lasting solution is possible only if there is a settlement really covering our whole region. The October 1976 meeting of Arab Communists pointed out that 'the struggle unfolding in Lebanon is a component of the struggle of the Arab national-liberation movement against imperialism, Zionism and reaction, in defense of the gains of the Arab peoples, for an end to the Israeli occupation of Arab lands, for the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and to establish an independent national state.'

It is perfectly understandable, therefore, why the proposal made by the Soviet Union at the height of the Lebanese crisis for a settlement in the Middle East and resumption of the Geneva peace conference met with worldwide response. The proposal is, in effect, a confirmation and elaboration of the Soviet position on the Middle East crisis: a comprehensive political solution on a just and lasting basis. But it also contains new, highly important elements, necessary for such a settlement and leaving the Isreali aggressor and his imperialist allies no room for misinterpretation. This is the first time that the case for removing *all* the causes of the Middle East conflict with due regard to the legitimate rights and interests of all sides directly involved — the Arab states, the Arab people of Palestine, and Israel — has been presented so fully and so clearly. The document justly says that 'only those who strive to prepetuate the situation in the Middle East for their own narrow purposes can object to and oppose a far-reaching political settlement.'

The Soviet proposal is premeated with the spirit of the Helsinki decisions, which stress the connection between European security and security in the Mediterranean. The new Soviet initiative also accords with the stipulation of the document approved by the Berlin

Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties demanding a complete and just settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The Soviet proposal is supported by progressives the world over, particularly in the Middle East. In many Arab countries, the Communist Parties, which are invariably in the forefront of the struggle against Israeli aggression and imperialist intrigue in our region, declare for the early materialization of the proposal. They are fully supported by the Communist Party of Israel.

It is important to focus attention on what unites the contingents of the Middle East national-liberation movement. We do not doubt that the difficulties existing in the Arab world can be overcome — the situation that existed on the eve of the October 1973 war shows that this is possible. The unabating struggle of the Arab people of Palestine on Israeli-occupied territory, which has reached unprecedented proportions and maturity in recent months, is another source of optimism to us.

We are convinced that a genuine, just and lasting solution of the Middle East problem is possible only by restoring the unity of the progressive and anti-imperialist forces of the region, reinforcing their ranks, broadening and strengthening cooperation with the socialist countries, first and foremost the Soviet Union, which are their most loyal allies in the struggle against imperialism and aggression. Only a consistent anti-imperialist policy can lead to a comprehensive solution and to peace in the Middle East.

1. See Naim Ashhab, 'The Balance of world forces and the Middle East crisis,' in *WMR*, March 1976.

2. The decisions were confirmed at a subsequent summit meeting of the Arab League (Cairo, October 25-26 1976).

3. The public is concerned about the tendency of the right-wing forces in Lebanon to sabotage the decisions of the Cairo meeting and undermine the effort to settle the crisis. And they have found an ally in the Israeli militarists, who are seeking a radical change in the situation in southern Lebanon (where PRM units were stationed in accordance with the Cairo agreement of 1969).

4. On October 6, 1976, the Paris *Le Monde* carried an article which says in part: 'Inasmuch as the October 1973 war . . . ended in an interrupted "Israeli" victory, it is the Americans, and they alone, who hold the decisive key to the beginning of peace: pressure on Israel. Even at the Geneva conference, this key will remain decisive.'

5. This is seen, among other things, in a statement made by the First Deputy Prime Minister of Saudi Arabia, Crown Prince Fahd ibn Abdel Aziz, quoted by the Iraqi newspaper *Tariq al-Shaab*. July 21, 1976.

6. A similar desire is apparent in Israel's position. In its last issue the American magazine *Foreign Affairs* published a statement by the Israeli Foreign Minister, Yigal Allon, who proposed a significant withdrawal by Israel from Arab territory occupied in the 1967 war and the creation of demilitarized zones on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as part of a joint Palestinian-Jordanian state (see, *IHT*, September 17, 1976).

Party experience

Party of the class, Party of the people

Nikolai Petrovichev
Alternate member, CC CPSU,
First Deputy Head,
Department of Party
Organizational Work, CC CPSU

Theoretical and practical problems of building a mass party have always been prominent in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the revolutionary party and are prominent in the conditions of a growing communist movement. The effort to look deeper into these problems should certainly be welcomed as very useful and necessary.* In the light of the experience of the CPSU, it is particularly important, we believe, to look into the class nature of a mass party, the principles of forming its social composition and its methods of influencing the masses.

The founders of scientific communism held that if the proletariat is to win, it must have a party of its own, one separate from all other parties and aware of being a class party. Engels stressed that a genuinely democratic party is conceivable only as a workers' party; enlightened members of other classes can join it and even represent it in parliament after they have proved their sincerity; 'but no democratic party ... can achieve real successes unless its character is explicitly proletarian. The moment you renounce that you will be left with nothing but sects and deceit.'

Lenin saw in the strictly proletarian character and class independence of the party the fundamental principle and an earnest of the party's revolutionariness, ideological staunchness and ability to resist opportunist disunity. At the same time, he invariably linked the task of being 'the party of the class' with the demand that it remain under all circumstances 'the party of the masses,' 'the vanguard, which in the hardest times will not lose touch with the bulk of the army' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 355).

The deep dialectical interconnection of the qualities of the party as a party of the class and of the whole people — qualities inherent in the nature and activity of the CPSU — was revealed in the Central

*See *WMR*, April, June, July and November 1976.

Committee report to the 25th Congress. 'Under developed socialism, when the Communist Party has become a party of the whole people,' L.I. Brezhnev said, 'it has in no sense lost its class character. The CPSU has been and remains a party of the working class.'

What enables a revolutionary party to be a class party and yet a genuine mass organization?

One of the fundamental issues of building a mass party is that of membership, of the principles and standards of forming its composition. Marx and Engels, who stated their views on these matters in the Rules of the Communist League, pointed out that eligible for League membership were only those whose entire way of life and activity were proof of devotion to communist ideas, who respected discipline and kept party secrets. In creating the party of a new type with due regard to Marx's and Engels' precepts, Lenin not only defined its social basis but evolved and upheld principles of party membership that served as a strong barrier to the infiltration of the party by people prompted by petty-bourgeois individualism and unfit to bear the proud name of Communist. Lenin's advice regarding careful selection, the need for every member to belong to a party organization and the demand that the party be most exacting toward its members and distinguish between working members and sympathizers became a fundamental principle of Bolshevism and has assured the party high efficiency.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks were resolute opponents of both a party of the 'select,' of a narrow elite, and an 'open door' party admitting anyone into its ranks. They maintained that the working class is the main social basis of the party as the class that founds the party, causes it to emerge and nurtures it (Vol. 19, p. 406). It was the working class that constituted the social basis and core of the Bolshevik Party at the stage of struggle for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist revolutions. From 1905 to 1916, workers accounted for 59 per cent of the overall increase in RSDLP membership. However, even the working class is not homogeneous, nor are all its sections equally revolutionary. Hence the need to have a clear idea of the actual level of political consciousness and experience of this or that section of the working class. And this explains why Lenin pointed out that the party must be the vanguard of the working class and that the whole working class 'does not and should not belong to a "party"' (Vol. 6, p. 502.)

A class party by nature, the party of the proletariat rejected and rejects sectarian isolationism. As early as the period of preparations for the three Russian revolutions, it also admitted members of other working strata provided, to quote Lenin, they were 'conscious of their common interests with the proletariat' and were 'seeking salva-

tion . . . by fighting jointly with the working class for the complete overthrow of bourgeois rule' (Vol. 11, p. 33).

Our party has never approached the important question of reinforcing its ranks in general or abstract terms, without taking careful account of the factors of place and time or of the state of the working-class movement. The formation of party ranks is influenced by the given situation, the nature of the tasks facing the party, the trend of the revolution (upward or downward), the forms of party work (legal or illegal) predominating at the moment, changes in the social composition of society — in short, the carefully weighed conditions and political advisability of an influx of new members.

When the party was in the making, Lenin held that in an atmosphere of brutal repression, 'in an autocratic state, the more we *confine* the membership of such an organization . . . the more difficult will it be to unearth the organization' (Vol. 5, p. 464). But when, during the 1905-07 revolution, the political consciousness of the working class made tremendous progress and freedom of association, assembly and the press was won, Lenin launched the call: 'Forward, then, more boldly . . . extend your bases, rally all the workers, Social Democrats, round yourselves, incorporate them in the ranks of the party organizations by hundreds and thousands' (Vol. 10, p. 32). Whereas the party had 8,400 members before the revolution, its membership in 1907 reached 46,000, and if we include the Social Democratic organizations of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and the Bund, which merged with the RSDLP at the Fourth Congress, 150,000.

After the defeat of the 1905-07 revolution, brutal repressive measures were taken against the party and many of its organizations were destroyed. But even in those conditions the party, which had to go underground, did everything to prevent the decline in its numerical strength from diminishing its influence. 'If the minority is unable to lead the masses and establish close links with them,' Lenin wrote later on, 'then it is not a party, and is worthless in general, even if it calls itself a party' (Vol. 31, p. 238). He taught the Bolshevik Party not only to reach the mass working people's organizations but to lead them day after day. The Bolsheviks attached special importance to work in the trade unions operating legally under the leadership of illegal party organizations. They carried on socialist propaganda and agitation among the masses using parliament, cooperatives, mutual insurance societies, sick-benefit funds, congresses of women, doctors, and so on. The party showed itself capable of not only attacking courageously but retreating in organized fashion and mastering the most diverse forms and methods of work to educate the masses in a revolutionary spirit and lead them.

In striving for a mass party, Lenin took a firm stand against admit-

ting alien elements into the party and taught it to keep its composition pure. He regarded the idea of the free operation of factions and various groups, of 'peace' with opportunists — an idea advocated by the Trotskyists and other disorganizers — as particularly harmful. Those who called for this 'freedom' virtually wanted the Communists to stop upholding their revolutionary views, surrender their Marxist positions to reformists and capitulate in the end of the bourgeoisie. Our experience shows that nothing can be more dangerous to the party than admitting into its ranks chance people infected by opportunism, lacking firm revolutionary convictions and wanting in staunchness and discipline. In summing up past experience, Lenin had good reason to say that if the party has reformists among its members 'victory in the proletarian revolution *cannot* be achieved, and that revolution *cannot* be safeguarded' (Vol. 31, p. 383).

At every stage of history, the Bolshevik Party carefully maintained the purity of its ranks and found proper means of preventing an influx of vacillating, chance elements. Our experience indicates that by eliminating the unfit, the party wins greater prestige among the masses. '*Such* a reduction in the party's membership means an *enormous increase* in its strength and weight,' Lenin pointed out (Vol. 29, p. 432). This does not at all mean, as our opponents would have it, that there is no discussion, difference of opinion or analysis of problems from differing points of view. Indeed, it is discussion and regard to different opinions and proposals that have always helped the party to frame the right policy. But after it has collectively analyzed a problem and taken a decision on it, the party proceeds as one unit in carrying out that decision.

Under mature socialism in our country, when the communist ideals of the working class and its party have won universal recognition, the party has become the vanguard of the whole people. The working class remains the leading force of Soviet society. It plays a decisive role in developing production and fostering public life and is the principal co-owner of the property of the people, a mass exponent of scientific and technological progress and the main builder of the material and technical basis of communism. It has such subjective qualities as a consistently revolutionary character, patriotism and internationalism, conscious discipline, organization, socialist collectivism and humanism.

Now as in the past, the working class is the main component of the social basis of the CPSU. It is primarily among the working class that the party, which expresses the communist ideals of the working class and is its vanguard, wins new members. And it is perfectly logical that the share of workers among new party members and in the party as a whole has grown in late years. While workers admitted to candidate

membership between the 19th and 20th congresses made up 27.2 per cent and their share in the party amounted to 32 per cent, between the 24th and 25th congresses workers among new members comprised 57.6 per cent and in the party as a whole, to 41.6 per cent.

The social composition of the CPSU is a reflection of the alliance of the workers, peasants and intellectuals which has come into being in our country, with the working class leading. Among the new party members admitted in recent years, collective farmers make up about 11 per cent. This helps to increase party influence in the countryside and carry out the agrarian policy evolved by the party. The CPSU reinforces itself by admitting noted engineers, scientists, writers and artists, who constitute about 25 per cent of the new candidate members. At present every fourth engineer, agronomist, livestock expert or teacher and every fifth or sixth doctor is a party member.

Our party makes a special point of continuously bringing young people into its ranks, primarily the finest YCL members. It regards this as an expression of the continuity of generations and of its own revolutionary spirit and tradition. More and more young men and women are joining the party. While YCLers admitted to candidate membership in 1966 made up 40.1 per cent, in 1975 their proportion exceeded 70 per cent. Party organizations also strive to bring in working women, whose proportion in the party exceeds 23 per cent now and is close to 30 per cent among the newly admitted members.

In our multinational state, the national composition of our party is important. The CPSU has members of over 100 ethnic groups of the Soviet Union in its ranks today. Needless to say, the party organizations of the constituent republics grow first of all by admitting members of the main nationality. At the same time, the composition of these organizations is becoming increasingly international. These two interconnected trends are evidence of the republics' progressing economy and culture and of ever closer links between nations and ethnic groups.

The immense prestige of the CPSU prompts more and more working people to link their destinies with the party both ideologically and organizationally by joining its ranks. However, the party cannot admit all applicants. It does not press for numerical growth and regulates its composition, above all by making higher demands of prospective members. Due to this more exacting approach, the proportion of newly admitted members has decreased in recent years. The annual average of those admitted to candidate membership was 760,000 between the 22nd and 23rd congresses, and 600,000 between the 23rd and 24th congresses but the figure dropped to 520,000 between the 24th and 25th congresses. The 25th Party Congress pointed to the need to enhance the importance of the probationary period

introduced in Lenin's days and to take a most scrupulous approach to the all-round testing of the political qualities and capabilities of candidate members, to their Marxist-Leninist education.

Regulating the composition of new members and making higher demands on them is not the only way of strengthening the party, enhancing respect for the title of Communist and raising the party's prestige among the people. Likewise important is educating the membership, encouraging their activity and promoting discipline among them on the principle of democratic centralism.

Bourgeois critics of Lenin's doctrine of the party of the new type and various reformists allege that centralism in the party precludes democratic principles in its activity. Yet internal life in the CPSU shows the very opposite. Every Marxist-Leninist mass party is characterized by a deepening content and improving forms of internal democracy, which implies a growing sense of responsibility among the membership and more discipline. The 25th Party Congress stressed that the party values people who combine discipline in fulfilling assignments with initiative and with a creative approach. This attitude and the party's political activity give the lie to bourgeois propagandists and various 'Sovietologists,' who claim that the CPSU demands blind submission to orders given from above and that its cadres have become depersonalized and are indifferent to their work.

To be sure, party membership means devotion to the party, subordination of one's own interests to those of society, of the community, and giving one's all to effort that is often hardly visible and anything but spectacular. But this is not to say that our ideal is discipline based on administrative measures, on fear, and so on. 'Discipline in a party followed by millions is entirely different from discipline in a sect numbering hundreds,' Engels wrote. Discipline in a party based on democratic centralism, the discipline of party comradeship, rests on political consciousness, the members' awareness of their responsibility, devotion to the ideals of the working class, unshakable confidence in the correctness of its theory and policy, and ability to treat the interests of the party and of the masses as their own.

Hence another characteristic of a mass party is active participation by all its members in the affairs of their organization and in the country's everyday life.

An important feature of the CPSU today is that all its organizations and members show much greater initiative and activity. We see this in the overall results of party work over the last five years, specifically in the increased political activity and constructive effort that were manifest at the pre-Congress report and election meetings of party branches and at regional conferences and congresses. Suffice it to say that the pre-congress meetings of party branches were attended by

more than 94 per cent of the membership with one in four of those attending taking part in the debate. The Party rank and file and all working people show exceptional activity in carrying out the plans of every collective and the assignments for the first year of the tenth five-year plan in the spirit of 25th Congress decisions.

The inherent interconnection of the characteristics of the party as a party of the class and of the whole people stands out in formulating and implementing its program and policy. Marxism-Leninism maintains that the mass character of the revolutionary party of the working class is determined, not so much by its numerical strength — even though this is important — as primarily by its influence, by the approval and support its slogans and policies win among the masses.

Principled policy is the most correct policy. And since the Marxist-Leninist party adheres to class principles and cherishes its political honor, it treats its program provisions with a keen sense of responsibility, never manipulating program principles, never discarding them like outmoded clothes. Our experience suggests that Communists achieve solid unity only on the basis of a principled class policy.

The very first program of our party, adopted by the Second Congress of the RSDLP, reflected the community of the interests of the working class and other working people in the struggle against tsarism, the landowners and capitalists. It formulated both the class, socialist goal of the proletariat — establishing its dictatorship — and the working people's general democratic demands — overthrow of the monarchy, a democratic republic, an eight-hour working day, the abolition of landlord property rights, etc. This made the party's ideas understandable to the masses and helped it to urge all progressives in the country to join in revolutionary struggle and support socialist ideas.

Continuous effort to strengthen its ranks, a strategic line understandable to the masses and flexible, consistently revolutionary tactics raised the party's prestige high. By October 1917 the Bolsheviks, who had entered the political scene as a relatively small organization of professional revolutionaries, were a mass party. After the victory of the February Revolution, when the party emerged from illegality, it had about 24,000 members. Five months later, by the time of its Sixth Congress, it had 240,000 members and in October 1917 its membership stood at 350,000, or was 15 times as large as immediately after its emergence from illegality. Even so, the party was very small compared with the vast mass of the people. Nevertheless, the majority of the working people followed it. In advancing to victory, the party merged in one revolutionary stream the struggle of the working class for socialism, the people's movement for peace, the peasants' fight

for land and the fight of the oppressed peoples of Russia for national liberation, and directed these forces toward overthrowing capitalism.

The people followed Lenin's party and put its confidence in it, and the Party honorably performed and performs the role of their political leader. In carrying forward and concretizing Marxist teachings, the party evolved a great program for building socialism whose main components were industrialization and electrification, the reorganization of farming on socialist lines, a cultural revolution and a higher standard of life. The Bolsheviks drew the masses into carrying out the plans made by the party and inspired them with devotion to the socialist cause.

The party exists for the people and sees the deepest meaning of its activity in serving them. With due regard to this supreme goal, which lies in assuring a steady rise in the people's living and cultural standards, the party has evolved and applies an economic strategy that also specifies the ways and means of achieving the above goal. These consist in dynamic and balanced development of social production, raising its efficiency, speeding scientific and technological progress, raising labor productivity and improving the quality of work in every economic field.

Along with perfecting economic relations, the party gives much attention to furthering the political system of socialism and to extending socialist democracy. It helps to improve the functions and enhance the role of government bodies, the trade unions and the Young Communist League, promotes unity and friendship among the peoples of the Soviet Union and gives special attention to educating the new man.

It follows that the program for communist construction, being expressive of the communist ideals of the working class, is a class program that is also genuinely humanist and serves the people because it concentrates on concern for man, on the development of the individual.

A Communist party relies in its every activity on the masses. Ever since it came into being, our Party has seen one of its major tasks in fostering links with the working people, educating and enlightening them in a class spirit and preparing them for revolutionary struggle. If the party wants its activity to be real class activity, Lenin pointed out, it must not only participate in politics but direct the political life and initiative of large sections of the population toward activity at a higher level for the attainment of more important, fundamental objectives (see Vol. 17, p.422). To know how to lead the masses, never to give in to prejudices nor adapt to backward sentiments and to organize the movement instead of trailing behind events constitute an art which

our party has been steadfastly mastering under Lenin's leadership and according to his precepts.

Persuasion is the principal method of party leadership of the masses. It is beyond question that the Soviet people's social consciousness and ideological maturity have increased immensely over the years of socialist and communist construction. This is not to say, however, that persuasion is no longer required. Indeed, it has always been a most important task of the party to spell out the meaning of its policies, presuade the masses and lead them. This is the substance of party work and this work bears good fruit. The Soviet people accept the party's policy as a cause of their own. They take a creative approach to the tasks facing them, to the plans that are made, and search for and find the ways and means of carrying them out as speedily as possible.

Dynamism is a distinctive feature of a Marxist-Leninist party. A consistent exponent of the revolutionary ideals of the working class, of the hopes and aspirations of all working people, the party reacts promptly to changing social conditions, sets and carries out bigger tasks with due regard to the given situation, prefects its functioning and improves its forms and methods of leadership.

Marxism-Leninism is the basis on which the party as a political organism carries on its effort for revolutionary transformation and perfects itself. This is an earnest of its ideological unity as a genuine mass party, a safeguard against disunity, vacillation or departures from principle. While firmly upholding Marxist-Leninist principles, our party opposes all dogmatism in applying theory. It regards creative elaboration of its revolutionary doctrine as an honorable internationalist duty and carries it out with the keenest sense of responsibility. 'Marxism-Leninism,' L. I. Brezhnev told the 25th Congress, 'derives its power from its constant and creative development. That is what Marx taught. That is what Lenin taught. Our Party will always be loyal to their precepts!' The decisions and other records of the 25th CPSU Congress are proof of a continuous scientific quest, of creative effort to contribute to revolutionary theory.

Criticism and self-criticism are a tested instrument of promoting every aspect of public life, including party life. As the scale and complexity of the tasks facing us grow it is becoming more and more important to approach every activity from a critical standpoint. The substance of the method of criticism, the 25th Congress pointed out, is that every aspect of the activity of this or that organization, of this or that individual should be given an objective evaluation, that the existing shortcomings should be subjected to all-round analysis in order to eliminate them. The value of criticism lies not in sharpness of expression, but in its authenticity, and in the social importance of the

questions being raised. Self-criticism, for its part, is valuable when it is sincere and when shortcomings are not only admitted but eliminated without delay. The deliberations of the 25th Congress, its conclusions and decisions set for Soviet Communists an example of exacting criticism and self-criticism, Leninist loyalty to principle and soberness in both assessing achievements and pointing to untapped potentialities.

The party develops on the principles of continuity of revolutionary tradition and precept and appreciation of the experience of previous generations of revolutionaries of both its own country and other countries. This is the spirit in which the CPSU educates its members and its new enrolment. '... It is useful to remind youth of earlier movements,' Engels wrote, 'for they imagine that they owe everything to themselves alone.' This approach has always been important and is still more so today, with the brother parties' gains and influence growing and their experience becoming more varied. The great Lenin advised us to respect the experience of the past and present. The CPSU follows the efforts of brother parties with interest and understandable attention and studies their achievements, and this contributes to the ideological mouldings of Soviet Communists as patriots and internationalists.

A characteristic of the development and world outlook of a party that does not isolate itself but operates as a real mass party is its awareness of being an inseparable part, a contingent of the international communist movement. The CPSU always abides by the tried and tested Marxist-Leninist principle of proletarian internationalism. It devotes all its energies and every means at its disposal to fraternal support for the struggle of the revolutionary forces of all countries and contributes to the growing cohesion of the community of socialist countries, of all the Communists of the planet, of all champions of national self-determination, social progress and peace among nations.

The 25th CPSU Congress presented the vast panorama of our party as a great and powerful organism. It showed how the party's ideological and organizational unity is growing and acquiring a new content because the party firmly applies and carries forward the Leninist standards of party life and principles of leadership.

The experience of socialist and communist construction is evidence of the steadily increasing leading role of the party, of its growing prestige as organizer and inspirer of all our victories. Steadfastly guiding itself by Marsism-Leninism and carrying it forward, the CPSU is confidently leading the Soviet people toward the triumph of communism.

Communists on the shopfloor

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION AT HELSINKI

The problems of forming a strong working-class core in building a mass Marxist-Leninist party and the activity of the primary Party unit in industrial enterprises, were the subject of a round table discussion in Helsinki organized by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Finland at the request of *World Marxist Review*. Taking part were *Erkki Kivimäki*, member of the CC Political Bureau; *Kalevi Makela, Kyösti Sandelin* and *Hannu Huhtala*, head shop stewards at factories in Pori, Helsinki and Tampere; *Urô Välilä, Mikko Kulmala* and *Petri Salonen*, district Party secretaries in charge of factory-level activities in Satakunta, Helsinki and Tampere; *Reino Lohikivi, Ossi Nurminen* and *Urjô Tirri*, Central Committee officials. At the Helsinki shipyards the discussions were also attended by the head shop steward *Erkki Ranta*, the party branch secretary, *Matti Ouvinen*, and the trade union secretary *Tapani Tammela*.

Speakers cited examples of how factory nuclei are building the party and increasing its mass influence, and dwelt on the difficulties and problems they have to cope with.

It is very important, said *Kivimäki* in opening the discussion, to increase party membership by recruiting more class conscious and active industrial workers and building up the party's popularity at enterprises, where the main forces of the working class are concentrated. This is a key problem in Finland because for us a mass Marxist-Leninist party means not only quantity, but also quality. For what we need is not only a numerically large party, but also a politically influential one, a class organization reflecting the workers' interests and with a support base in the large industrial centers and among working people who share the basic interests and views of the working class.

The Party represents the working class, the leading class of society, and must therefore orient its activities on the real problems of this class and on the process of its development. The technological revolution is bringing with it essential changes in the working class, altering its structure as new groups come into industry. The party's

reaction to these changes is very important, particularly how it adapts its own structure to the new conditions. We are making slow headway, the speaker said. Obviously, there are weak spots and difficulties in party work with the 'old' working class, but work with the 'newcomers' is our weakest link. We must establish closer interaction between the party and the entire working class and penetrate deeper the specific interests of all sections of working people, widen the knowledge and acceptance of Marxist-Leninist ideas. This is particularly important in the conditions under which the Finnish Communists are working today, because new prospects are opening up for our party.

What are these prospects? Objective conditions are helping increase the Party's prestige and influence. *Kivimäki, Lohikivi, Huhtala* and *Salonen* spoke of the changes in the world balance of forces and of the relaxation of tensions, which the masses see as fulfillment of ideas that the party had always been working for. Many have chosen to continue their work for these ideas as members of our party, they said. The achievements of the world communist movement are thus helping the Finnish Communist Party extend its influence among the masses.

Another factor, participants pointed out, is that the deepening capitalist economic crisis has turned the working people's attention to the essence of socialism and to its achievements in the Soviet Union and other countries. Many turn to their experience for solution of vital problems, thus strengthening their ties with the Communists, who have consistently popularized socialist ideas and experience.

It is noteworthy that the new generations entering public and political life are not prejudiced against the Communists, opinion polls show. In the past this had been a serious obstacle in the party's work. Characteristically, most new party members are young people.

This has helped reduce anti-communist sentiments in Finland. Cooperation between the Communists and other political forces which in the past was largely a matter of theory rather than practice, is becoming a reality at both national and local levels.

Speaking of conditions at the Pasila engineering plants in Helsinki where he is employed, *Sandelin* said: 'Sixty per cent of our workers support the Communists; the trade union committees are led by Communists; of the 21 elected shop stewards, 18 are either party members or sympathizers; the Democratic Youth Union and the Finland-USSR Friendship Society have branches at the plant . . .' A few years ago it was almost unheard of for Communists to work so openly.

The party is working in conditions of a mounting working-class struggle. It is claimed that during an economic slump, said *Tirri*, the

workers' struggle tends to lose momentum. That is not borne out by the facts. The worsening economic crisis, growing unemployment, inflation and a mounting tax burden have not dulled working-class action. According to the Central Board of Statistics, 174,700 workers participated in strikes in the first four months of 1976 as against 125,370 for the whole of 1975. Metalworkers, railway, port and building and food-industry workers took part in strikes involving, on some days, as many as 80,000 workers.

It was generally agreed that the growing strike movement was directly bound up with so significant a factor as re-unification of the trade unions. When the trade unions were split, said *Tirri,* there was no united and effective force in the factories capable of organizing the masses for struggle. Now 80 per cent of the work force are union-organized; the Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions has a membership of 920,000, compared with only 250,000 a few years ago.

The trade unions are concerned mainly with economic demands. That the struggle could acquire a more pronounced political character, was stressed by *Makela, Kulmala* and *Huhtala*. By showing that capitalism, for all its various forms, is always the same and cannot solve the problems facing the people, the Communists are helping politicize the economic struggle. But this has its problems too.

Strengthening factory party nuclei, *Salonen* said, has lagged behind the progress made by the trade union movement. The result is that without a broad and effective network of such nuclei, we are not able to sufficiently influence the economic struggle and make it a part of the common struggle for working-class interests.

The very fact that the trade unions, now united, have won stronger positions in the factories, should be seen as a challenge to intensify party activity on the shopfloor. The party has traditionally relied on its branches in residential areas. Considering the importance of, and opportunities for party work at factory level in the new conditions, it is obvious that it rests on too narrow an organizational base.

The highest number of factory nuclei was in 1961 (205 out of a total of 1,547 party branches), and the lowest (139) in 1970. As party membership increased so did the number of factory branches, and by the end of last year there were 171. But we are only approaching the level of several years ago, and we cannot be satisfied with that.

True, these nuclei are concentrated mainly at the larger plants. The smaller enterprises, with greater organizational problems, particularly in industries with a constant turnover of personnel, remain outside the sphere of party work, for we have little or no contact with them. Today factory nuclei account for 12.1 per cent of the party membership. About 40 per cent of the membership cannot participate in

factory work. These are pensioners, housewives, a small number of self-employed, small peasants, cultural workers, students, etc.

But the Communist Party — and this was stressed by many speakers — is first and foremost a working-class party, and it is concentrating on building up strong support and its ideological influence among the workers.

What does party building imply in practice? How does the party promote closer ties with the masses and accentuate the political aspects of their struggle?

Communists have always taken the day-to-day interests and demands of the workers as a starting point, and through struggle for concrete goals, have sought to bring to the workers an understanding of their vital interests as a class, *Lohikivi* and *Sandelin* pointed out. The problem is to determine, study and comprehend the dynamics of these day-to-day demands.

Makela, Kulmala and *Auviren* pointed out that in recent years not only the conditions for party work had changed, but man himself had changed, with whom and for whom the party is working. The technological revolution, the gains won in the class struggle, and the worker's general level have removed some of the sharp distinctions between various categories of working people. The contrasts are fewer between the 'bourgeois' and 'non-bourgeois' neighborhoods in the capital. There are no more recreation areas open to some and closed to others. The student body in higher educational establishments is no longer made up solely of children from rich families. Conditions at the production level have also changed. In the past a man had to see and listen to a dozen officials before he could get to the factory manager. Today this is much simpler, the contacts are more direct. Bourgeois tactics have become more flexible, and there is more scope for concessions to the workers.

The Communists are well aware of the true value of many of these changes, for the system has not changed, but the changes are there and to ignore them would mean isolating ourselves from the masses, not getting our message across.

It would be wrong, *Tammela* said, to reduce the workers' real needs solely to higher wages. We have to consider the entirety of his interests, evaluate the motives for his actions. There is a great difference today, for example, between workers' living standards in the North and the South of the country. But the fact that in the South people are more prosperous is not, in itself, of great importance. Our factory nuclei can gauge the mood of the masses, they know what people are concerned with, especially those who have already reached a certain level of material comfort. The worker wants to be certain of the morrow, of being able to provide his children with an

education; he is concerned for his job but also with broader problems, the state of affairs at his factory and in the country, the outlook for peace.

It would seem that there is a great deal here that should bring the worker closer to the Communists. But does it always work out that way?

At elections of shop stewards and other worker representatives the Communists usually win, *Kulmala* said, but in presidential or parliamentary elections, or even electing delegates to trade union conferences, many vote for other political groups. Our shipyards are a good example, said *Valila*. Most of the workers support the Social Democrats, but when a Communist and a Social Democrat were nominated for head shop steward, the vote went to the Communist. Then both were nominated delegates to the trade union conference, but this time the Social Democrat had a majority of 200 votes. Three or four months later, in new elections for head shop steward, the Communist candidate won by a majority of 100.

What are the people guided by in such cases and where is it that we Communists, fall short? continued *Kulmala*. Could it be that we cannot get them interested in social problems, so vital to their personal interests, or maybe the workers don't always understand us? By supporting Communists, they show their trust in people they know can do the job. We appreciate this. But evidently we have not sufficiently established our ideological influence and have not organized our work in a way that every concrete goal is followed by another, higher goal that helps raise political activity and awareness.

It was generally agreed that it was not enough to *appeal* to the worker, with our tried and tested slogans, to join the struggle; the important thing is to *convince* him, with effective and realistic arguments, of the need for struggle and the arguments should vary for different categories of workers.

The nearly 100,000 unemployed have lost all illusions of a 'bourgeois paradise. The poorer workers don't always know who is responsible for their poverty. Many think they can improve their lot by changing jobs. It is important, said *Salonen,* to help them understand that they are exploited not by an individual capitalist, but by the capitalist *class*.

Workers who have attained a definite level of prosperity are apt to brag of this, forgetting the price they had to pay. At the Helsinki engineering plant, added *Sandelin,* some have been moonlighting for ten years at the plant or on some outside job. The drive for material well-being has drained them spiritually. Communists at the Helsinki shipyards have noiced that young people often take jobs with the one naive goal in mind of leading a 'bourgeois life,' and strain themselves

to achieve this: working overtime, taking bank loans, making debts which their children will have to repay. The problem of these 'wealthy' workers, or striving to be wealthy, remarked *Tammela,* is perhaps the most complex one for Communists. We have to convince them that one must fight for more money, but also for a more meaningful life.

Communists use concrete facts to show the workers the reality of their position and the essence of exploitation. For example, that pay for strenuous overtime goes almost entirely into taxes, or that buying on time only increases the profits of the credit agencies. As a rule, it is the Communist working by his side who gives the worker an understanding of realities, and more and more workers are now seriously beginning to reconsider their position. Objective conditions, *Sandelin* said, are leading the workers to reassess old values, and Communists cannot hold aloof from this process.

A key aspect of the work of factory nuclei, speakers stressed, is to protect the workers from bourgeois and reformist influence which leads them off the revolutionary path.

The bourgeoisie is adapting its policy to present-day conditions. The right forces and the Social Democrats, said *Kivimäki,* change their domestic and foreign policies whenever it suits their purpose. Not long ago, for example, the peace movement was branded as 'Communist propaganda.' Today, however, no politician can count on popularity unless he comes out for peace. At one time the Communists were alone in advocating closer cooperation with the Soviet Union, now almost all political trends favor that. Communists on the shopfloor explain the essence of bourgeois maneuvering, helping the workers see through its deceptive attractions.

During the discussion at the Helsinki shipyards, party members cited some concrete examples. For instance, employers have been at pains to stress democratic forms of management. At this shipyard (a private enterprise), there are some 30 commissions, committees and groups, all of them including workers. But they deal only with minor problems: one commission discussed partitions in the canteen. Communists join these commissions so as to settle the problems in the workers' interests. They invariably explain, however, that the commissions — mostly formal and temporary affairs — only distract the workers from the real issues, creating an illusion of 'participation' and labor-management 'cooperation.'

Indicative in this respect, it was pointed out, are the elected production committees at large enterprises comprised of workers, employees and management. They look democratic enough, but their proceedings are confined to 'exchanging views.' If the management agrees with the agenda, the problems are discussed, said *Ranta,*

decisions taken and carried out. But if a question is raised by the workers, it is acted upon only if the management is interested. No wonder the workers call these production committees 'talking shops.' For the management this is a convenient way of maintaining contact with the workers. At best, it is a channel for negotiations, and certainly not the advertised production democracy. Everything hinges on who controls the economy and profits from it. Stressing this, the Communists help the workers understand the fallacy of all the talk about new opportunities in a bourgeois society.

The democratic forces' cooperation program adopted by the 17th CP Congress poses many new problems for factory nuclei. For Communists, *Huhtala* and *Salonen* said, the program is a guide to action, and our nuclei are popularizing its ideas and fulfilling its goals. But, *Salonen* pointed out the other political forces party to the program are pursuing their own interests and aims. Exposing this to the workers raises problems for our nuclei. For dealing with forces representing opposite class interests is one thing, but dealing with a man working next to you and upholding the same interests, but on a somewhat different basis is quite another. It's not easy for the worker to see the difference between the Communists and Social-Democrats, particularly now that they are cooperating on many issues.

Communists at the Helsinki shipyards explained it in a cartoon in their bulletin: two banks of a river, the Communists on one and the right on the other, with a boat in the middle, a Social Democrat rowing with one ore toward the left and the other toward the right.

Party nuclei, fully aware of the inconsistency of Social Democratic views and activities (management prefers the Social Democrats, they are easier to get along with) concentrate on the main issue, the attitude toward reform. For the Social Democrats, *Sandelin* said, partial reforms are the be all and end all, whereas for the Communists they are not the ultimate aim. The struggle for reforms is no substitute for the workers' ultimate aims, and the nuclei must consistently follow this line.

The same goes for work in the trade unions. Commenting on the new opportunities afforded by the reunification of trade unions, *Nurminen* pointed out that this unity would remain a formality if the Communists did not follow a consistent policy, assert their demands and explain their goals. In recent years Communist trade union influence has grown at plants with party nuclei. Communists have a majority in five industrial unions affiliated to the Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions, and in ten are supported by almost half the membership. Wherever the Communists followed a clear class policy, *Salonen* said, they won influence, and lost influence when they followed an inconsistent policy.

In carrying out the cooperation program. Communists draw a sharp line between tactics and principles and reject any compromise on principles. Working together in mass organizations we can agree on common demands and achieve good results. But our factory nuclei must always be guided by a class program showing exactly what they stand for.

Participants recalled Lenin's behest that Communists working at industrial enterprises must 'pursue their *Party* line under all conditions, in all circumstances and in all kinds of situations, to influence their environment in the spirit of the whole Party, and not allow their environment to swallow them up' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 15, p. 354).

Party members know that if they lose momentum, advocates of compromise take over. Many instances were cited of reformist trade union functionaries being prepared to make a deal with management behind the workers' backs, and it was the mass struggle organized by the Communists that in the end won the workers demands.

One of the main tasks of the nuclei is to back demands with mass struggle in which the workers also gain political experience. Many now join the Party via the trade unions. But most, it was noted, join because they feel that economic struggle is not enough. And if their choice falls to the Communists, that means that the Communist ideals have the strongest appeal.

The Communists are building the party in the factories by studying the workers' daily concerns, by a differentiated approach to various segments of the working people, by opposing the reformist forces and following a well-defined political line in working with other democratic forces. The round table discussions also examined the forms of party work — how best to use available opportunities to recruit new members, and the contribution each party member can make.

The nuclei make maximum use of established forms of mass work, *Makela, Auvinen* and *Huhtala* remarked. These include meetings, lunch-hour talks, and particularly such practical measures as solidarity strikes against the unjustified firing of workers. Organized by the Communists, they help instill a feeling of class solidarity and overcome political passivity.

By way of example, *Sandelin* described a case at his plant when a worker, employed there for 20 years, was fired without justification. Management refused to reinstate him. The Communists and their supporters called a meeting and explained that the worker could be defended only by mass action. The workers unanimously agreed to hold a series of flash strikes. The very first one, lasting four hours, forced the management to retreat.

Such cases help us give the workers a broader picture, *Sandelin* said. We explain that although this particular conflict involved only

one worker, it was important that we stand up for him, because if we did not others might be fired too. Such actions bring the workers closer to us, they see that we are right. We then go further and explain the essence of the contradictions between labor and capital. We try to show how this or that acute conflict could be settled, but we explain that a final solution is possible only under a different social system.

Personal contacts, speakers noted, are an important element. Practically every Party member has close contacts with one or several workers, usually young men with inquisitive minds and an interest in public affairs. This day-to-day contact helps to form their political awareness. They discuss current issues, and other party members are drawn in when more complex problems arise. The result is that trust on a personal level turns into trust in the party and, subsequently, acceptance of party ideology and policy. For example, at the Pasila plant, where for years Communists were refused employment, now about ten new members join the party annually and today it accounts for 10 per cent of the entire personnel.

The chief steward plays an important role, and if he is a Communist, he can accomplish a good deal not only in establishing personal ties and in contacting potential party members, but also in promoting the party's authority.

The discussion showed that factory party work was often hampered by the lack of trained cadres. This is a serious problem, and participants discussed what could be done. *Välilä* suggested ways of training worker Communists, particularly the new members, popularizing socialist theory and the achievements of existing socialism. These methods, he said, had greatly increased party influence in his district. In fact, in Pori, the district center, the party is supported by a third of the population and has steadily increased its vote in local and national elections.

Välilä, Huhtala, Kulmala and *Salonen* laid stress on the role of the printed word in the work of factory nuclei and in cadre training (public opinion polls show that the press largely determines a person's political choice). Examples were cited showing how best to organize distribution of party publications among the workers, how to arrange publication of newspapers, bulletins and leaflets at large industrial plants with financial aid from the trade unions.

Party members are well aware of the fact that a great deal has still to be done to raise party work in industry to accord with the new opportunities and requirements. Important steps have already been made. Industrial concentration, it was pointed out, is a major factor in building a mass party and asserting its class character.

Toward social homogeneity

Stefan Mocuta
Member CC,
Rumania CP,
First Secretary of its
Cluj Province Committee

The program of the Rumanian Communist Party is a blueprint for building a comprehensively developed socialist society and its advance to communism. It formulates our overall strategy, charts the course of the country's development over the next 20-25 years and sets out the main tasks and goals for the subsequent period.

In its analysis of Rumanian reality, based on dialectical and historical materialism, the program emphasizes that in this age of the technological revolution, expansion of the productive forces, a more rational geographical pattern of industry and administration, concordance of productive forces and production relations, will make for substantial changes in our social structure. Their ultimate aim is a socially homogeneous society. To quote the program: 'The process of building a comprehensively developed socialist society will make for closer unity of classes and strata, promote cooperation of the various branches of the national economy, bring production relations into conformity with changes in the socialist division of labor and meet the requirements of social and economic progress.'

Social homogeneity implies the formation of a united society of working people, in which there are no classes or strata, no essential social and economic distinctions between industrial and agricultural, mental and manual labor, between town and country. An advanced, homogeneous communist society will assure equality to all its members.

The road to that leads through a highly complex historical process which extends and enriches cooperation between social classes and strata in all spheres of activity, gradually equalizes conditions of work and life, professional, ideologico-political and cultural levels and, in the longer-range, will obliterate essential social and economic distinctions and gradually change the substance and character of the old division of labor. Other, more specific distinctions between social

groups, resulting from the differences in the nature of work, skills, cultural and consumption levels, will likewise be erased.

But first we must provide the material, economic and social prerequisites for this process. And high among these is expansion of the productive forces, the building and development of the material and technical basis of communism. Important, too, is rational and planned geographical distribution of the productive forces and the administrative machinery. The economic basis of the homogeneity process is development of public property of the means of production and phased merger of its two forms, state and cooperative, into a single communist form. As for the social preconditions, the most important is the political unity of the people based on identity of fundamental economic and political interests, with all classes and strata working toward a single goal and sharing a common ideology, dialectical and historical materialism, as the guide in all their activities.

In combination, expansion of the productive forces, emergence of the communist form of property and promotion of communist consciousness will convert the different types of labor into varieties of a single, socially and economically homogeneous type of labor as the prime necessity of all members of society.

These prerequisites are of a general, all-embracing character. They determine society's advance to a homogeneous social structure. But they do not produce the same effect at different periods or in different sections of society, for the social structure is influenced by other factors, too. And though these have a lesser 'operating radius,' they must be reckoned with in developing socialism and building communism. The conditions forming a homogeneous structure have therefore to be considered in their concrete historical setting. And account has to be taken of all the factors, those that determine the process as a whole, and those that influence it to one or another degree. This is essential if our policy in building the new system is to be scientifically grounded, realistic, effective and capable of mobilizing the masses.

Erasing distinctions between town and country

Experience has shown that essential distinctions between industrial and agricultural labor remain after the triumph of socialist production relations in town and country (i.e., at the socialist stage of building communism). And this applies not only to natural conditions (which will never be fully overcome), but also to distinctions of a social and economic nature, such as the level and character of the productive forces, the existence of state and cooperative forms of property with their differing degrees of socialization and social division of labor. As a result, in a socialist society, too, industrial and agricultural workers

differ in terms of their place and role in the organization, management and development of production, the nature of their work, their economic interests and the way these are realized in the distribution of the national product. The most obvious expression of these distinctions is the existence of two social classes, the workers and the peasants.

Rumania began building socialism from a low social and economic level. In 1938 it was predominantly an agrarian country: most of the active population were engaged in agriculture and there were many survivals of feudal relations. Big landownership played an important role, while the vast majority of the peasants were either in the poor or middle categories. Agriculturally, Rumania held a very low place in Europe. The disparity between town and country widened as the former exploited the latter.

In this situation the Communist Party's policy was based, correctly, on alliance of workers and peasants as the decisive factor in overthrowing the exploiter classes, refashioning society along revolutionary lines and providing a solid foundation for the new system. Rumania's changed social structure is one of the biggest gains of our socialist-construction effort. For there are no more exploiting classes; socialist production relations have triumphed in town and country and the position of the working class and peasantry has changed radically.

The working class advanced to the leading role in the country's social, economic and political life by virtue of it involvement in the most progressive branch of the economy and its contribution to the national income. The workers are steadily raising their ideological and political, professional and education levels and play a front-rank role in the scientific and technoligical revolution. The peasantry has changed, too, to become a new class of cooperative farmers. Both as producers and as owners of means of production, they hold the key place in our socialist economy, in public life and in the building of the new system.

The existence of two friendly classes and the socio-economic distinctions between them, just as the distinctions between industrial and agricultural labor, are one of the realities of the development of Rumanian society. They are an inalienable part of the that development both before and during the socialist revolution and in socialist construction.

As Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu has pointed out: 'Rumania's socialist society now consists of social classes and strata actively participating in the production of material and spiritual values. They jointly own all the means of production, all the national wealth, and are equally interested in building a society of social justice, in building

socialism and communism, and are working in close unity toward that goal.'

The fact that these friendly classes are pooling their efforts and dedicating their abilities and energies to achieve a common goal should not obscure the class character of their relations. But the building of a socially homogeneous society presupposes ending the division into social classes and strata, obliteration of social and economic distinctions between various types of work and the people engaged in them. Our Communist Party is well aware of this objective requirement and is acting in accordance with it, but also with due account to Rumania's concrete conditions. In line with the party program, we are concentrating the efforts of the people on uninterrupted and comprehensive development of the productive forces in every branch of the economy.

Transforming agricultural work into a variety of industrial work is one of the chief ways of erasing the essential differences between the two. And we are doing that by building up the material and technical basis of the new society, particularly in agriculture. We have an ambitious integrated program for promoting mechanization, more use of electric power and chemicals, more efficient organization and management, wider employment of the new technology in crop and cattle-farming, and in the latter the accent is on more industrial-type operation. At the close of last year, there 118,000, tractors on our farms, compared with 44,000 in 1960, 13,700 in 1950 and only 4,049 in 1938. The number of harvester combines is now 18,000, compared with less than 2,000 in 1960 and only 44 in 1950. Irrigated farmland at the close of last year amounted to 1,474,000 hectares. Our overall social and economic development plan envisages the supply, in the current five years, of an additional 70,000 tractors, 16,300 harvester combines, and irrigation of another 1,450,000 hectares, so that by the end of 1980 the irrigated area will be close to 3 million hectares. In these five years, too, agriculture will receive more than 11 million tons of mineral fertilizer.

Another significant development envisaged in the Party's program for the current quinquennium is mechanization of most farming operations. In grain, that will be accomplished by the end of this year, corn and fodder in 1977, potatoes in 1978, sugar beet, grapes, fruit and vegetables in 1980 (with the exception of grape-harvesting, which will be partially mechanized, and tomato cultivation 60 per cent mechanized). Mechanization of crop and cattle farming in hilly areas will be completed within this five-year period.

Expansion of the material and technical base of agriculture, more scientific research and wider use of scientific findings and technology, will bring agricultural work closer to industrial, and with wider use of

power and machinery it will become more productive. But this will require more concentration, specialization and establishment of the optimal size of production units. The process will create new professions in agriculture, with skills similar to those required in industry, and we will have to borrow from industry some of its organization and management methods.

This will be facilitated by closer cooperation between the two and by the organic intertwining and combination of industrial and agricultural elements. There are already many examples: the mechanization depots in rural areas, repair shops, mechanized fodder processing, canning plants, etc. Another important contributing factor is an efficient transport system, which acts as the bloodstream of the economic organism.

The continued development of industry and agriculture, rational distribution of the productive forces, planning of urban and rural communities (120 rural communities will be built up to agrarian and agro-industrial towns by 1981), harmonious development of existing towns and closer economic and cultural ties between town and country and other measures now being implemented by the Party, will substantially change the image and structure of our towns and villages. The overall purpose is to even out working and living conditions and social and cultural amenities, or, in other words, gradually remove all essential social and economic distinctions between town and country.

The economic basis of all these processes, as indicated above, is continuous development and accelerated merger of the two forms of public property into a single, communist form. The party program states that 'socialist property, irrespective of its form, will be raised to a new plane and will assure all categories of working people, both in town and country, better and more equal working and living conditions.' This will be followed 'by a process of closer cooperation between state and cooperative property, their closer intertwining as part of building developed socialist society and the advance to communism.' The new, qualitative changes within each class and social group that make up our society will serve to promote their closer cohesion and will strengthen the unity of the society as a whole.

Still another factor is the numerical growth of the working class, the constant heightening of its professional, ideological, political and educational standards, its greater role, the universal acceptance of its ideology and morality. The figuers show that the share of the population engaged in industry increased from 12 per cent in 1950 to 29.6 in 1974, the figures for the building trades being 2.2 and 8.1 per cent respectively. During the same period the share of the agricultural population declined from 74.1 to 38 per cent. The absolute and

relative growth of the working class and the decline of the farming population will continue in the years to come, so that by 1990 the working class will make up the bulk of the gainfully employed population, with agriculture accounting for only 12-15 per cent.

Thus, part of the peasant population will become members of the working class or will find employment in other non-agricultural branches. This will be attended by the peasants attaining higher professional, cultural and educational standards and becoming more mature ideologically and politically. Their working conditions will be more or less similar to those in industry and material and cultural amenities will enable them to make their life more meaningful and interesting.

Eliminating essential distinctions between mental and manual labor

Complete elimination of the counter-position of mental and manual labor is one of the historic achievements of socialism. And this is confirmed by the processes now taking place in Rumania and all other socialist countries: people engaged mainly in mental work do not set themselves apart from the manual workers. There are no antagonistic contradictions; the relationship is one of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance. But there are still essential socio-economic distinctions, which will be gradually obliterated in the course of building developed socialism and full communism.

Manual and mental work have different functions in the process of extended reproduction. That will be so under socialism, too, and hence there will also be such a social group or stratum as the intelligentsia. We should not disregard the fact that this division of functions still engenders narrow professionalism and keeps a person tied to one and the same type of work. Narrow specialization is contrary to the very nature of the new man — an active and conscious builder of communism, a man of all-round development and free of the restrictions imposed by the social division of labor. Marx and Engels remarked that in communist society 'nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes.' In other words, everyone will be free to change from one sphere of production to another, guided solely by the requirements of society and by his own inclinations and abilities.

All-round development of the personality is, at one and the same time, a condition for, and result of, the scientific and technological revolution and of the transformation of labor into a prime necessity. In communism, development of the personality will mean full freedom and equality and will give one's work a vastly increased creative content. All-round development of the personality entails full profes-

sional training, wide knowledge and a standard of craftsmanship that will make work akin to art. It entails, also, an understanding of nature and society from the standpoint of dialectical and historical materialism, the foundation of one's world outlook and behavior. It entails assimilation of the genuine values of culture.

Formation of the new man is, by its very nature, a revolutionary transformation, for it gives the people a new consciousness and represents, in the words of Comrade Ceausescu, 'the greatest task the Communists have ever undertaken' and 'a great commitment by our Communist Party and an honorable revolutionary duty.' The training of the new man requires not only providing more knowledge, but also higher moral standards and the cultivation of character traits which, while maintaining one's individuality, accord with the revolutionary ethics of communism.

This, of course, has nothing in common with levelling out. As Comrade Ceausescu has emphasized, 'we should make it perfectly clear that we are not out to achieve uniformity, make all people alike. That would be absurd. What we want to do is form a human man, a man of versatile knowledge and ability, a human Communist. And we are working to afford the most favorable conditions for everyone to apply his abilities in accordance with his possibilities and individuality, in all spheres of public life, in society and for society.'

Training this new man, all-round development of the personality, presupposes elimination of essential distinctions between mental and manual labor. And this is achieved, first and foremost, by developing the material and technical basis of the new society and employing all the achievements of the technological revolution in material production and all other spheres. The new technology, mechanization, automation, chemicalization and, in time, cybernation, will give the worker an entirely new part in production. In fact, even today we can see how the worker is being 'withdrawn' more and more from manual operations and is shifting to supervision and control of machines. Naturally, this adds to the significance of mental activity, which will account for a large share of working time. The manual worker is increasingly coming to perform the functions of the technician and engineer.

The technological revolution imperatively demands organic fusion of industry and research to make science an inherent function of production, and production a process of technological application of science. That process can be traced in our present five-year plan. Researchers, designers and engineers are devising techniques to discover and effectively use new natural resources and less valuable raw materials. They are also working on new processing methods that will make for higher quality and lower costs. Still another aim is intensi-

fication and industrialization of agriculture, and last but not least, measures to ensure a better environment and a healthier population.

At this high level of production and socio-economic development generally, it is only natural that all workers should have high skills based on thorough and comprehensive theoretical and practical training, broad economic vision and wide cultural interests. Accordingly, our party has drawn up a program for universal lyceum education.* Ten-year schooling will be made universal before the end of the present five-year period and full lyceum education after 1980. In this way, school leavers will have a rounded out education designed to meet the requirements of the national economy. This is now complemented by a law providing for a national system of adult education.

All these measures will integrate the educational system with production and research. This will vastly enrich the value of our training, increase its effectiveness and, as the end result, actively contribute to changing the very nature of labor, combining science with production and merging all types of labor into a single process.

The transition to universal lyceum education, the national adult education program and continuous improvement of professional levels, will give the country workers capable of performing mental and manual work, men and women with a broad cultural outlook and a progressive, communist ideology. This will provide ample scope for creativity and encourage innovation and invention. The worker will thus assume also such functions as organization, innovation and management. Indeed, these will virtually become the collective function of the masses. This will do away with the present division into mental and manual labor.

Equalizing the social and economic development of all parts of the country though rational distribution of industrial units and more rational administrative division is central to the attainment of a homogeneous socialist society. In fact, it is the only basis for full equality of all members of society; the only way to eliminate disproportions in the territorial division of labor inherited from the old system.

Of immense importance in this context is the party's investment policy, designed to accelerate the development of the more backward areas so as to equalize economic levels. The crucial factor here is industrialization, giving every province a solid industrial base. This policy is already producing results as will be seen from the following table:

*The Rumanian educational structure is as follows: primary cycle (4 years), secondary cycle (4 years), lyceum (2 two-year cycles).

Gross industrial output by province	Number of Provinces 1965	1970	1975	1980
Up to 2 billion lei	14	5	1	
2.1 to 4 billion	13	11	4	
4.1 to 10 billion	9	15	14	
10.1 to 15 billion	3	5	7	16
15.1 to 25 billion		3	11	12
Over 25 billion	1	1	3	12

Thus, the geographical pattern of industry has changed radically over the past 15 years. By the close of the present five-year period there will be about 700 communities with major industrial enterprises, each producing more than 10 billion lei of output. And if we add to this local enterprises, both state and cooperative, the figure will be more than 2,900.

To fill out the picture of our changing industrial geography, we might add that more provinces are focusing on steel, engineering, chemicals, power, i.e., industries basic to industrialization. Even in the last five-year period many provinces started such industries as optical and precision instruments, electronics, machine-tools, synthetic fibres, fertilizers, etc.

Industrial growth has been accompanied by growth in other non-agricultural branches of the economy, where employment is rising at a faster pace. This means more urbanization, more modern facilities penetrating every part of the country. And this trend will continue under the current five-year plan, with its accent on maximum use of the new technology.

The emergence of major industries in every province will greatly facilitate socio-economic development, increase the industrial working class and assure its more rational distribution and greater influence in carrying out its leading role.

And so, territorial socio-economic homogeneity is a key factor in the gradual removal of essential distinctions between the working class and peasantry, between town and country, between manual and mental labor, thereby steadily erasing class divisions in society. But this process also removes differences in working and living conditions, equalizes material and cultural facilities for all our people, irrespective of ethnic and other distinctions. And that is our objective, for the conditions for all-round development of the personality must be created in every city, every town, every village.

The effort to produce a homogeneous social structure helps strengthen the cohesion and unity of our people and accelerates their advance on the radiant road to communist humanism and communist civilization.

comment

Toward the Europe of tomorrow

Antonin Vavrus
CC member,
CP Czechoslovakia,
Head of its International
Policy Department

The Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties has been the subject of worldwide discussion. And that is only natural, for implementation of its important proposals would go a long way toward peace, security and social progress on our continent. More, the Conference has implications for beyond Europe. And not only because Europe is at the crossroads of many crucial trends in global policy, but also because historically it has been associated with the formation of class forces and social trends whose confrontation determine the image of the modern world. Capitalism and the first centers of colonial expansion originated in Europe. And it was from Europe that the fascist plague spread. But it was also in Europe that the working-class movement was born and matured, and it was from Europe that the Communist clarion call, 'Workers of All Lands, Unite!' was first heard. The first organized vanguard contingents of the proletariat, the Communist Parties, appeared in Europe and led the class battles for the workers' social emancipation. The socialist era began in Europe as a result of the Great October Revolution and the formation of the USSR. Fascism was defeated on the battlefields of Europe, and it was in Europe that the international socialist community, now the main guarantor of peace and security, took shape.

To this should be added that thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, supported by the communist and workers' movement and progressive forces, it is in Europe, the arena of two world wars, that détente produced its first shoots and a start was made in applying the principles of peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems. These principles are formalized in the Final Act of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation, which summed up all that is most valuable in the experience of peaceful coexistence.

The Berlin Conference justly stressed that 'the very fact that the

Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was held reflects with maximum clarity the changes that have taken place on our continent since the peoples won victory in the war against fascism and had shown their determination to live in conditions of peace and security and to cooperate with one another and to build their future in accordance with their legitimate aspirations.'

The favorable changes on the continent are particularly apparent to the Communists of Czechoslovakia, a country situated in the heart of Europe. Speaking at the Berlin Conference, General Secretary Gustav Husak said: 'The peoples of Czechoslovakia are vitally interested in the continuation of the positive changes in Europe. For our country was affected by practically all the major military conflicts on the continent. It is only thanks to our lasting friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community that today, for the first time in our history, our security, freedom and independence are guaranteed.'

Czechoslovak Communists have been unstinting in their efforts to develop and consolidate and make irreversible what has been achieved and to complement political détente with military détente so as to banish for all time the very possibility of a new world war. In this struggle the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the working class firmly adhere to proletarian internationalism and closer unity of the European and world communist and workers' movement. Our Party — and this was stressed at its 15th Congress — consistently supported the European conference and helped prepare it. The activity of the CPCz and its principled stand stem from its international policy, the country's interests and the tasks of building socialism in Czechoslovakia.

The situation in Europe and the political, social and economic changes on the continent were thoroughly analyzed at the Conference. Its document is an alloy of theory and practice, of a Marxist-Leninist approach to problems and revolutionary militancy, of the general strategy of the communist and workers' movement and the experience of individual parties in the concrete conditions of their countries. It enables the Communists and all revolutionary and progressive forces to wage an effective struggle against imperialism, for peace, independence, democracy and social progress. Elaboration of means to extend détente through effective measures for disarmament and European security are the core of the Communists' international-political approach to Europe's problems and their internationalist contribution to the settlement of the more urgent problems confronting the world. For their part, Czechoslovak Communists consider it their bound duty to carry out the tasks set by the European Communist and Workers' Parties at the Berlin Conference. These

tasks, recorded in the Conference document, For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe, fully accord with the policy of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The September 1976 Central Committee plenum stressed that 'the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia will develop every effort to have the document of the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties play an important role in activizing the masses in the struggle against imperialism, for a Europe of peace and social progress. In line with the decisions of its 15th Congress, in its relations with the fraternal parties the CPCz will continue to strengthen the movement's unity and cohesion, oppose all attempts to disrupt unity and will fight right opportunism.'

The long-range program for peace, cooperation and social progress in Europe, outlined in Berlin is a versatile one. Its significance and its many aspects have been discussed in *WMR** and in the press of fraternal parties. In assessing the paths of mankind's development Communists stress the role played by the three revolutionary forces of our time — the socialist countries, the working class in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement. The Communists of Czechoslovakia welcomed the Conference document's appraisal of the outstanding role played by the socialist countries in promoting peace.

Our people, as those of other socialist countries, led by their Communist and Workers' Parties, are creating a new history of mankind, the history of socialism. We are convinced, and our experience confirms this, that although every country has its own economic, historical and other conditions, socialism is built on the basis of universal laws, with national and international actions being indivisible, as a historically single process and collective effort of the fraternal peoples. Socialism unites them in a single family that lives by the standards of internationalism; a growing community of equal, sovereign and independent states whose strength and prosperity derive from emancipated labor, and whose might and influence are used to uphold the interests of all peoples, of all toiling humanity. Socialism's internationalist aspirations embody, to an increasing extent, the Marxist-Leninist theory of the alliance of labor opposing the alliance of capital. The Communist-elaborated foreign-policy principles of proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems serve peace and social progress.

Together with the entire socialist community, Czechoslovakia is steadfastly working for peace, disarmament and extension of détente — aims understood and cherished by the people — and is generously and unselfishly extending aid to all fighters against colonial and social

*See *WMR*, August, September, October, 1976.

oppression. The fraternal solidarity of the socialist countries and their equal cooperation are multiplying the might of each and increasing their potentialities. This was clearly demonstrated by the 30th CMEA session, which summed up the results of the first five years of the Comprehensive Program of socialist economic integration, and outlined qualitatively new steps in developing economic and technological cooperation.

The Berlin Conference's high appraisal of the role of the socialist countries in preventing a new world war, strengthening international security and deepening détente, is of immense political importance. It is a serious blow at attempts by imperialists, reformists, extremists and other forces hostile to socialism to distort the content of the true role and significance of the socialist world. It showed Europe and the whole world the real objectives of the socialist countries' peaceful policy and the indissoluble bond between socialism and peace, thus strengthening respect for existing socialism and helping Communists and all progressives to extend the struggle for social progress and the socialist restructuring of the world.

The Communist program for a free and democratic Europe of peace and social progress gives the progressive forces an effective weapon in combating monopoly attempts to complement EEC economic integration with political integration. In their search for a solution to the profound social, economic and structural crisis, bourgeois politicians, alarmed by the maturing revolutionary transformations in many countries, have turned from talk of a supranational European federation to concrete steps to bring it to reality. Elections to a European Parliament have been scheduled for the spring of 1978. It is conceived as the directing center of 'Eurocapitalism,' with national European parliaments, and consequently governments, relinquishing some of their powers in its favor. Bourgeois leaders believe this would 'remove some of the counter-pressure on the national governments' and would allow them (in total disregard of the people's interests, of course) to pursue policies that suit the multinational monopolies — reduce social expenditure, freeze wages and suppress the working people's struggle for better conditions. And there is another aim: the 'new federation' would simplify coordination of the EEC countries' foreign policies. An example of this was the conference in Puerto Rico last summer, where the United States, Federal Germany, Britain and France discussed plans to terminate economic cooperation with Italy if the Communists were in the government.

The supporters of 'Eurocapitalism' are thus prepared to limit their national independence for the sake of capitalist class solidarity. This confirms the conclusion reached in Berlin that the economic and

social structure of capitalist society is becoming more and more inconsistent with national interests, the needs of the masses, social progress and democratic development, and the universally accepted principles of national independence, sovereignty, equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. This is one of the clearest manifestations of the social and political implications of capitalism's general crisis. The Communists counter these plans with their own alternative for a democratic way out of the crisis which would be in the interests of the people and would open the way for a socialist transformation of society, taking into account the fundamental national interests of the peoples of Europe.

For the imperialists, the greatest obstacle to the realization of their plans is the struggle and united action of the Communist Parties. That is why anti-communists stop at nothing to undermine, weaken and split our movement.

They banked heavily on failure of the Berlin Conference. The long and thorough preparatory work to clarify viewpoints and arrive at common positions on cardinal issues, they argued, betokened irreconcilable differences. Some even claimed that this was the end, or at least the beginning of the end, of communist unity which (they hoped) would be replaced by regional variations of 'Eurocommunism,' etc. Their tactic was confrontation between the Communists in non-socialist countries and the fraternal parties in the socialist states to create the impression that the European socialist countries were not an inseparable part of Europe. As was only to be expected, this proved a gross miscalculation.

Contrary to their expectations, the falsehoods and conjectures spread by the anti-communists long before the Conference was convened only helped to excite international interest. And, as on other occasions, they cut a poor figure in the eyes of the public, for the Conference showed how unfounded were their attempts to pit Communists of one country against another. The common class enemy, imperialism, though torn by contradictions, is exerting every effort to rally its forces against the growing revolutionary process. The conference participants counterposed to this their even closer unity in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. This is gratifying to all Communists and mortifying to our opponents, who, unable to hush up the Conference results, are trying to distort and belittle them. The Conference was barren of results, they argue, because on several issues the Communist parties still hold differing viewpoints.

Well, first of all, let us say that unanimity on all issues, disregarding historical conditions, is impossible, and no one was aiming for that. The monotony of views, which bourgeois propaganda ascribes to us, is to be found only in a cemetery. We however, are among the living

and our movement is growing in scope and strength. The wealth of varieties in world developments means that the Communist and Workers' parties have to work in differing conditions. This is a historical, objective reality. In Czechoslovakia and other fraternal socialist countries the Communists are the governing parties. In some non-socialist countries the Communist Parties enjoy high prestige and use their participation in government to exert a positive influence on the development of society. Other Communist Parties, including mass and influential ones, champion the working people's interests from the opposition benches, and the ruling circles have to reckon with their policy and activity. There are also Communist parties which still work in conditions of illegality.

It is only natural that such a diversity of conditions should give rise to distinct approaches to the concrete problems of the struggle in one or another country. For example, there are differing views on the effect of the broadening social base of the anti-imperialist struggle, the motive forces and allies in this struggle, etc. But, as the Berlin Conference demonstrated, the Communists have a dependable means of striking a proper balance between the particular, the national and the common, the international. This is achieved through class solidarity, which for over a hundred years has faithfully served the working class; the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which makes for a profound and precise analysis of concrete situations and of the correlation of class forces in the world and in individual countries based on the general laws of the revolutionary struggle; the historical experience of the formation, development and consolidation of the Leninist norms of relations between fraternal parties. Such are the factors that enable the Communists, while observing full independence of each party, mutual respect, equality and frankness, to conduct a thorough, patient and principled discussion of the most contentious problems, coordinate their positions and find mutually acceptable solutions, as was the case in preparing the Berlin Conference. Comparing different viewpoints on individual problems, while maintaining unity on cardinal issues, is an indication of our movement's democratic character and its growing strength.

The Berlin Conference, the Central Committee Presidium of the CP Czechoslovakia says in its statement, 'was an important step toward closer cooperation of European Communist and Workers' Parties, a practical expression of their desire to strengthen the European revolutionary movement and exercise a stronger influence on Europe's peaceful, democratic and progressive development.'

In contrast to the Social Democrats (including those whom I might call 'Euroreformists'), who maintain international and regional centers, the Communists do not plan creating a central organization. This

should not be taken to mean that they are confined within the narrow national interests of their particular country. In Berlin, the Communist and Workers' parties declared that they '. . . will develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, strictly adhering to the principles of the equality and sovereign independence of each party, non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for their free choice of different roads in the struggle for social change of a progressive nature and for socialism. The struggle of each party for socialism in its own country and its responsibility toward the working class and the people of that country are bound up with mutual solidarity among working people of all countries and all progressive movements and peoples in their struggle for freedom and the strengthening of their independence, for democracy, socialism and world peace.'

Another important proposition underscored by the Conference is that the Communists reject 'any policy or ideology which in essence means the subjection of the working class.'

These conclusions of the Berlin Conference, I believe, are of fundamental importance not only for each individual Communist Party, but for the international communist movement as a whole.

The Conference document is addressed not only to Communists, but to all democratic and progressive forces and to those influential bourgeois circles who realize that there is no future for mankind without peaceful coexistence. The Communists believe that a Europe of peace and progress can result only from efforts in many directions: rapprochement, understanding and cooperation of the broadest political and social forces and the removal of mistrust and prejudices hampering such cooperation and understanding.

The Berlin Conference evaluated the progress made in détente through the efforts of the popular masses in socialist and non-socialist European countries and called for a constructive dialogue with all democratic forces, with due respect for their individuality and independence. The Communists, naturally, will not abandon their program goals, political positions and ideology, nor their historic mission of replacing the capitalist system with a socialist system. However, in the struggle for peace, security and social progress we are prepared to cooperate with forces that do not share our convictions. Our movement's internationalism does not preclude such cooperation.

We hold that the desire for democratic unity is but a step, however big, toward genuine internationalism, revolutionary in essence and subordinate to the revolutionary restructuring of capitalist economy and policy.

The Conference participants declared their determination to isolate

and overcome aggressive anti-communism, a weapon the imperialists employ not only against Communists, but also against other democrats and against democratic freedoms, in an attempt to disunite and undermine the movement for progress and peace. This statement is of special importance for the international labor movement and the cause of democracy, peace and social progress. Czechoslovak Communists regard the struggle against all forms of anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, anti-socialism, reformist, right-opportunist and extremist views not only as a national, but also as an internationalist duty.

Events since the Conference have, I feel, confirmed the correctness of this policy. Greater activity by Europe's progressive and peace forces is becoming a sign of the times. The anti-monopoly, anti-war, general democratic movement is being joined by ever more Social Democrats, Catholics, various trade unions, by women and the youth (as evidenced by the Second Stockholm Appeal signature campaign). In their class battles the working people in capitalist countries are strengthening anti-imperialist unity.

In these conditions, the Berlin appeal to the workers, peasants, the middle strata, scientists and cultural workers, to women and the youth, to all progressive and peace forces and parties, to democratic mass organizations, to multiply their efforts for a peaceful and prosperous future for all nations on our continent is a sound basis for a new upsurge in the struggle for peace, security and social progress.

Seven years ago, in 1969, the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow singled out the struggle for peace as the main link in anti-imperialist action. Many of the points of the action program endorsed by this meeting have today been carried out, and the line approved by the Berlin Conference in the Communists' struggle for peace and social progress is helping to further intensify the working people's anti-imperialist actions in European and other countries. Czechoslovak Communists will spare no efforts to energize the common struggle for a lasting peace, international security, national and social emancipation and the unity of all the revolutionary, democratic and peace forces of our age.

Latin American panorama

Developments in Latin America are in the focus of public attention throughout the world. The revolutionary process on the continent, says the Declaration adopted by the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean (Havana, 1975) 'is a difficult and complex battle, with a place for forces opposed to North American imperialism. The revolutionary movement must employ different forms and methods, correctly determining their place and time in accordance with the prevailing conditions in the countries concerned.'

In the following contributions, authors from Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile and Honduras analyze the general and particular aspects of the present situation in these countries, providing an idea of the Communists' gains and the difficulties facing them.

ARGENTINA: LIGHT AND SHADE IN THE SOUTH ATLANTIC

Alberto Kohen
Argentine journalist

The contradictory and dangerous situation in Argentina should be viewed with regard to the situation in the world, where the balance of contending forces is changing in favor of existing socialism, of the peoples and governments working for peace, democracy, economic independence and social progress. U.S. imperialism is doing its utmost to retain latin America as a colonial appendage.

In an effort to set up a system of reactionary regimes in South America, take full possession of its natural resources and bring the South Atlantic under its undivided military and police control, U.S. imperialism has before and since the March 1976 coup been doing its utmost to aggravate the economic, social and political situation in Argentina. It has the backing of its internal allies — the landed oligarchy and big comprador capital.

The United States has already promoted Brazil to the rank of a 'rising world power' and entrusted it with policing South America. The fate of its strategic designs in the area now hinges on the trend of development in Argentina. Henry Kissinger has said of Argentina that

at present it is of as decisive importance to the West as Brazil or perhaps even more so.

'The United States,' wrote Orestes Ghioldi, an Argentine Communist and noted public figure, 'aspires to turn the South Atlantic into an American lake. Besides, it covets the humid pampas (one of the most fertile regions of the globe — *A.K.*) . . . the riches in oil, especially on the continental shelf, and uranium. It would like to control together with Chile the Strait of Magellan and Argentina's Antarctic possessions.'[1] 'Subcontinental integration' is used as a pretext for efforts to turn Argentina, a major food producer, into a U.S. colony dependent on industrial Brazil.

Proponents of the theory of 'ecological terror' take advantage of the conflict between agricultural and oil-producing countries to camouflage the exploitation of food-producing countries and their subjection to monopoly.

The apocalyptic-sounding report submitted by the CIA in May 1976 predicts the advent of a new climatic era and the end of the world, to be preceded by a terrible famine. Even capitalist experts think the report 'pursues political and economic rather than scientific aims' and is intended to exert pressure at a time when frictions are developing between industrial countries and poor countries producing raw materials.[2]

Argentina's traditional landed oligarchy, considering that 'blackmail through hunger paves the way for a dominant world position,' proposes to adopt the model of a country producing and exporting agricultural goods to replace the 'closed, autarkic pattern of the economy' (that is, an economy independent of imperialism) by 'a different, more open pattern' (one more open to monopoly activity — *A.K.*) that 'would make it possible substantially to increase exports'[3] — by cutting popular consumption, of course. If put into practice, these projects would doom our country to dependence and perpetuate its backwardness.

One may get the impression that reaction has carried the day in Latin America. But neither imperialist plans of aggression, the coups carried out in Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay and Chile at the imperialists' bidding, the dictatorship surviving in Paraguay, attempts to upset the political stability of Argentina, efforts to swing Peru to the right and stamp out the revolutionary process there, support from the reactionary forces in other countries of the continent, nor the threats constantly levelled against Cuba can stop the anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist liberation process. Having risen to a higher plane with the victory of the heroic Cuban revolution, this process opens various new, unexplored avenues leading the peoples of our countries to democracy, independence and socialism. Social development follows

objective laws and every country gains revolutionary experience of its own. For this reason, the process cannot be checked in any country and takes its, at times zigzag, course.

We will examine in this context the antecedents of the military coup in Argentina, its contradictory nature and its effects.

Imperialist reaction backed the rightists in and outside the constitutional government that came to power as a result of the democratic changes initiated in May 1973. It helped to establish closer links between the government and the more reactionary Peronist elements and to secure the government's gradual abandonment of a program containing democratic and progressive demands and approved by most voters, both Peronist and non-Peronist.

Argentina, social and economical contradictions are aggravated by the world capitalist crisis. The main contradiction is the one between production relations based on ownership of the means of production by foreign monopolies and latifundium holders, on the one hand, and the productive forces whose growth is fettered by these relations, on the other. In these circumstances, the inevitable result of the government's policy is economic and social chaos and hence political instability. Shortley before the coup, the people acted over the heads of conciliating and corrupt leaders by demonstrating, particularly in the period following Peron's death, in support of the demand for revision of government policies. The working class was in the van of the masses seeking better living and working conditions, greater political and civil freedoms and national independence. It took a stand against IMF plans and the fierce reign of terror and repression imposed on instructions from the CIA.

The Communists and other partisans of unity of the democratic and popular parties, taking account of the situation, championed a constitutional way out of the severe crisis. So did sizable groups in the armed forces. The Communists proposed a 'democratic national agreement,' a common minimum program aimed at forming a military and civilian government based on a broad coalition. Their proposal stands.

The alliance of financial tycoons and politicos representing extreme reaction and lacking popular support demanded changes of an entirely different nature. It called for a 'strong government' to curb the masses. The rightist minority among the military, being too weak to win, urged the country — and still urges it — to seek a way out of the crisis through Pinochet's method. It lacks a mass following but is still very dangerous, being supported by monopoly, the landed oligarchy, important mass media and the CIA.

The lack of unified leadership steadfastly upholding the interests of the working-class movement on the one hand, and the position of

reactionary trade union leaders defending capitalist interests, on the other, hampered the courageous struggle of the working class, which made ever more far-reaching social and political demands. The extreme right wing of the government took a provocative stand. Besides, there was no consensus of opinion or unity of action among the democratic parties. As a result, these parties hald their important joint meeting only a few hours before the March coup.

The bungling and venal government under Maria Estela Martinez de Peron was deposed in the end. Not a voice was raised in its defense. Nor was that surprising since the government had become a puppet of Lopez Rega, then minister. The Rega group did not express the sentiments of the Peronist rank and file even though it belonged to the Peronist movement. It helped to divide the movement, expecially after Peron's death (1974), and is more responsible than anyone else for making the coup possible in those conditions. The Communists pointed out that the coup was fraught with dangerous consequences and could not lead the country out of the crisis.

Political instability in the country drew near the danger point.[4] It was the fifth coup to have been staged since 1930, apart from the so-called counter-coups and palace revolutions. In this period, General Jorge Videla became the 23rd President. It should be noted that seven of his predecessors took over as a result of rather dubious elections and that only two completed their term in office. The main cause of political instability is the structural crisis, the country's dependence on imperialism and the preservation of latifundia and a privileged oligarchy.[5]

A few hours after the coup, the Communist Party issued a guideline document. It noted that the military junta which had come to power did not follow the path chosen by Pinochet. However, the ultras who had expedited the coup still clung to their plans although they had failed to win. 'Our internal and external enemies,' the document said, 'are on the alert. The imperialists and fascists long for a bloodbath.' The fascist danger was still there. The 'Pinochetists' were very active and fascist bands fomenting anti-communism went on operating with impunity.

The motley composition and contradictory nature of the military junta's government are due to the presence of nationalist, populist, democratic, conservative and liberal currents that joined forces to accomplish the March coup and, confronting them, the 'Pinochetists.'

Meanwhile imperialist agents are busy imposing anti-national and anti-popular economic plans on the country. They curtail democratic rights and misrepresent the goals announced by the military junta and General Videla aimed at restoring democracy, improving the socio-economic situation and enabling the country to shape its own destiny.

For the first time in the history of coups in Argentina, no political party — not even the Communist Party — was dissolved. The authorities merely suspended parties' activity while banning Trotskyist and 'leftist' groups. The Communists, for their part, avoided a serious mistake which they would have made had they opposed the junta or, on the contrary, backed it without qualification.

Fascist plans in Argentina were foiled by the growing struggle of the masses and the trend toward unity, and also by the detestable image of the repugnant Chilean and Uruguayan regimes, by international solidarity, which resulted in isolating the Pinochet regime, and antagonism between the ruling quarters of Argentina and reactionary Brazilian generals. The experience of relations with socialist countries based on equality and mutual benefit cut the ground from under many anti-communist and anti-Soviet arguments.

U.S. imperialism, O. Ghioldi writes, 'had to countenance, against its practices, that distinctive type of coup because conditions for using the Pinochet recipe were not ripe and because it feared that growing popular resistance ... would gain in depth and scope on the national level.'[6]

However, certain mouthpieces of U.S. finance make no secret of the bid of Pinochet's followers for full control of Argentina. The weekly *Barron's,* pointing to 'government inaction,' wrote that some day, undoubtedly, a leader would bring things under control and, incidentally, give the banks some hope of recovering their money. But President Videla was the wrong man, it added. The *Wall Street Journal* deplores the fact that the government failed to give Minister Martinez de Hoz[7] the same kind of support as the Chilean junta gave its economists. Commenting on the document published by the Communist Party of Argentina in connection with the coup, *El Mercurio,* mouthpiece of the Chilean fascist junta, warned the new Argentine government that 'establishing friendly relations with Communist Parties' would be a 'negative' move.[8] Furthermore, it criticized the Argentine government for the lack of a 'clear-cut' policy comparable to the Chilean regime's.

A peculiar situation was thus created in Argentina. The Communists firmly abide by the thesis of their 14th Congress, which says: 'Everything can be achieved with the mass movement and nothing without it; he who goes against it can land in the quagmire of counter-revolution.' In the new conditions, with the activity of parties suspended, the Communists aim to achieve a consensus among all democratic and patriotic forces, whether civilian or military, secular or religious, in or outside the government, for the ultimate purpose of setting the interests of the partisans of liberation against the interests of those who prefer dependence.

'In the political sphere ... the working class and its allies were enabled to forge an alliance with nationalist democratic sectors in the armed forces.'[9] This opportunity hinges on the answer to the main question, namely, who is in power at a time when the situation is so uncertain.

In spite of existing restrictions, the working-class movement goes on developing, translating itself into demonstrations, petitions and strikes. Auto and power workers, for example, demand higher pay, the reinstatement of fellow-workers, the release of unlawfully arrested union leaders and kidnapped citizens. They have scored notable gains. Among the demands met are the reinstatement of the dismissed, the release of the workers who were kidnapped or unlawfully arrested, and a general wage increase, if an inadequate one, on two occasions, although wages have been frozen by decree for 18 months.[10]

There is a growing organized mass movement against terrorism, especially against the activity of fascist bands. It manifested itself, among other things, in National Human Rights Day late in August. The action, sponsored by the Permanent Assembly in Defense of Human Rights, was legal and public and involved bishops of all churches, prominent Peronists, Radicals, Socialists, Communists, Christian Democrats, trade union leaders and intellectuals. President Videla sent them a message of greetings, which the national press made a point of publicizing.

At a time when antagonisms resulting from differences in the approach to acute political problems are standing out more and more, democratic and progressive opinion cannot stay inactive. It insists on isolating and defeating 'Pinochetism' and urges democratic unity both in and outside the government. However, this position does not amount to a desire to exonerate the government as a whole of responsibility for the negative aspects of its activity, its mistakes or the anti-popular steps taken by it: these facts must by no means be ignored. But neither should one overlook the important thing — the need to stop the more dangerous fascist elements.

The negative aspects of the government's activity, those that hold up democratization and, indeed, benefit 'Pinochetist' plans, include, first of all, the policy of curbing civil freedoms and democratic rights, as well as the implementation of the economic plans of the Martinez de Hoz group. The government is criticized for this from diverse points of view.

One of the two main opposed views is held by the ultra-leftists, who indiscriminately accuse the government as a whole of being a Pinochetist-type fascist dictatorship. The other view, shared by the Communists, calls for the removal of the negative aspects of the

government's policy on the basis of democratic unity, through mass action and the subsequent isolation of the more reactionary elements, those that have discredited themselves by their links with U.S. imperialism. The latter view is winning support among the democratic and popular forces in the face of objective difficulties and the confusion created by them.

A close look at developments reveals that the coup was a setback for both the second Peronist government and the entire system backed and defended by right-wing Peronist groups. It would be very wrong, of course, to imagine that Peronism as a social and political phenomenon is spent. This idea is propounded by those who are pushing the government toward a showdown with the people. The Peronists, especially among the working class, and their more enlightened and upright leaders, learning from experience, realize the gravity of the problems of the country, their causes and the need to solve them by effecting far-reaching changes.

Nor have other political parties exhausted their potentialities, even though some spokesmen of both fascist and ultra-leftist currents say so. These parties express the views of definite social classes and strata and so cannot be simply abolished by decree or by other voluntarist acts. In fact, the outcome of the democratic parties' meeting mentioned earlier suggests that they can come to terms on fundamental issues, such as democracy, independent economic development, national sovereignty and world peace.

The masses, who never abandoned the struggle even under the previous regime, are preparing to play their role this time as well. They gradually find ways and means of fighting in the new situation. It would be a big mistake to believe that this powerful movement, first of all that of the working class, has been defeated and put down. In spite of the telling blows the movement has been dealt, its main forces are intact and it shows its maturity again by rejecting passive, wait-and-see or adventurist positions.

The suspension of trade union activity, official meddling in their affairs, the ban on strikes, the curtailment or nullification of certain social gains, the imprisonment of union leaders, the high cost of living, declining wages, massive and unlawful layoffs all bring active protests in various forms from the workers. Their class enemies try to stamp out the movement by splitting the unions and the General Confederation of Labor (GCL) and by distorting their activity with the backing of certain conciliating union leaders. Reubens Iscaro, a leading worker Communist, stresses in his pamphlet *The Attitude of the Working-class Movement to the New Political Situation* that there is no equating the activity of certain venal union leaders with the tasks of the unions in general, which should not be limited to administra-

tive or social matters. He suggests steps to normalize the working-class movement on the principles of trade union democracy and unity in spite of attempts to split the movement under the pretext of 'trade union pluralism.' The important thing is to re-establish democracy in the movement through elections at all levels, in which the most gifted and devoted representatives of labor would be nominated and which would pave the way for a GCL congress. The workers must not allow this process to be carried on from above, over their heads. They are the main force, the one that must prevent new infringements of the standards of trade union activity.

Liberal, neo-liberal *desarrollist,*[11] corporativist, populist and other models designed to preserve outdated social structures with certain modifications necessitated by the circumstances have failed completely. Imperialist and oligarchic reaction has blocked consistent implementation (even within the framework of the prevailing system) of reforms affecting its interests, such as the reforms initiated in May 1973.

The armed forces, which have assumed responsibility for ruling the country, should come to grips with the nation's big problems. They have to choose between 'becoming a pretorian guard, such as Pinochet's followers want, and becoming the people's armed fist in the struggle against dependence.'[12] Neutrality is out of the question: they will either help to strengthen the democratic nationalist current in their ranks and its alliance with the liberal sections of society with a view to isolating the 'Pinochetists,' or take a fascist road.

Depending on the degree of maturity, social consciousness and fighting efficiency of the masses, on the one hand, and on the differentiation process under way in the armed forces, on the other it will become historically possible for the working class and other democratic forces to form an alliance with the democratic section of the armed forces. This alliance is a prerequisite of forming painlessly and at an early date a new type of democratic government speaking for diverse social groups. This would make it possible to head off civil war, which still threatens the country.

Geronimo Arnedo Alvarez, Rodolfo Ghioldi and other prominent Communist politicians have made the following statement: 'To put an end to the bloodbath our country is going through and to the dangerous progress of disruption directed especially from without, it is necessary to hold without delay a broad forum that would make it possible publicly to reach a national democratic agreement on a minimum program with a view to countering in unity the country's grave social, economic and political emergency.'

There are two obstacles to the attainment of this goal: one, the escalation of violence, crime and kidnapping, and two, the economic

measures which Minister Martinez de Hoz proposes with the approval of the International Monetary Fund. The expanding scope of unwarranted repression, which, in turn, causes discord and concern among large sections of the population, is as inseparable from them as one's shadow from one's person.

As if to admit the differentiation going on in the Church, Argentina's bishops have pointed among likely mistakes to 'arbitrary detention for inexplicably long periods, the lack of information on the fate of detainees, their protracted isolation, the denial of religious succor.' They have also noted that 'there are deeds which are something more than mistakes: they are sins, and we condemn them without qualification, regardless of who commits them; they consist in dooming people to hunger to make uncontrolled profit, in killing people, some of whom are first kidnapped, and this irrespective of the alignment to which the assassinated belong.'[13] This is said in official records of the 33rd Argentine Episcopal Conference held in connection with the assassination of priests and religious leaders.

One of the key problems on whose solution the country's future largely depends is to call a halt to both ultra-leftist and ultra-rightist terrorism. In spite of isolated measures and recurrent statements by the president and top-ranking military leaders that repression shall be a state 'monopoly,' ultra-leftist terrorism is being combated by all the armed services and security forces, while fascist bands, once patronized and abetted by Lopez Rega, carry on with impunity. The terror launched by the ultra-rightists is conducted by armed bands operating both within and outside the framework of the regime, with substantial aid from a repressive machinery controlled by the more reactionary circles. They want to paralyze the masses, unsettle the domestic situation and ultimately assume full power. They are dangerous because they are backed by the landed oligarchy and big capital at home and by the CIA from without. They show initiative and act with determination, which is seen in the ghastly crimes they perpetrate.

Nevertheless, the fascists have few supporters in the armed forces and the nation as a whole. Public anger at their crimes is mounting from day to day. This sentiment is echoed more and more strongly in the armed forces and the government and helps to create conditions for curbing the fascists.

Ultra-leftist terrorism plays into the hands of the ultra-rightists, and both sides cause chaos, taking part in a real conspiracy against the people and democratic elements in the government and contributing to the materialization of CIA plans for the establishment of a fascist dictatorship. To quell ultra-leftist terrorism, reaction resorts to unbridled repression and anti-communism. It uses the most draconic re-

pressive legislation the country has ever known, in particular laws providing for the death penalty, imprisonment without trial on political or social grounds, the most atrocious tortures and exile. In keeping with the logic of the witch hunt, reaction goes to absurd extremes, which gives rise to opposition even in the armed forces and increases differences — witness the stand taken by former President Lanusse, who has spoken out in defense of human rights. Similar differences are in evidence in the universities, where massive dismissals and other discriminatory measures clash with the advocacy of academic freedoms by Constantini, former Rector of Buenos Aires University, and certain deans appointed as a result of direct intervention by President Videla and forced to resign over their differences with the Minister of Education. Unwarranted persecution, curbs on freedom of speech and opinion, the indefinite suspension of political parties and trade union organizations, and the dissolution of certain explicitly democratic or class organizations widen the gulf between the people and the armed forces in favor of reaction. Struggle for the most extensive democracy and in defense of human rights is the order of the day.

International solidarity with those who demand an end to the crimes committed by fascist bands, the return of the kidnapped, the publication of lists of persons arrested on political or social grounds and the release of persons being held without trial contributes to the struggle of the forces both in and outside the government calling for a democratic dialogue, the restoration of civil rights and the consolidation of national independence.

The ultra-leftists' concept and practices, which contribute to rightist activity against the aspiration of democratic circles in the armed forces for a dialogue, have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism. The objective boundary between ultra-leftist ventures and reactionary conspiracies is becoming less and less distinct. Argentina is not in a state of civil war and to prevent its becoming another Lebanon is the duty of all democratic and anti-imperialist forces.

In addition to terrorism, a major obstacle to this is the economic program set in motion — a continuation of what the more reactionary and corrupt elements of the previous government tried to impose. It has been sharply criticized by the Communists as well as by spokesmen of the Civic Radical Union, political parties and the Church, by labor and peasant leaders and even some industrialists and military men. The country's foreign economic situation is deteriorating because foreign credits are used to pay off the external debt. The home market has already narrowed badly and the living standard of the working people and middle strata of town and countryside shows a steep decline. The transfer of public enterprises to private manufac-

turers, the granting of oil and power concessions and various other privileges to foreign capital, and the abolition of the state monopoly of trade in meat and grain endanger the nation's independence and sovereignty. The incomes policy has resulted in removing all price controls; talks between the unions and employers on wage levels have broken down, which is tantamount to a wage freeze. This is how the 'market social economy' recommended by the IMF under the 'program for the stabilization of monetary systems' is being put into practice.

Rodolfo Ghioldi and Jaime Fuchs, two Marxist scholars of Argentina, have published *A Plan for Change*, a pamphlet in which they set out an alternative program for easing the crisis and laying the groundwork for future changes and economic independence. The program envisages concrete priority steps to restore the earlier level of production by greatly expanding public works, retaining state control of the main levers of management in foreign trade and the basic natural resources, encouraging domestic business and raising the people's incomes and standard of life, which would help to end unemployment, bankruptcy and poverty. The authors consider that 'balanced development of the productive forces requires substantial changes in production relations' and that 'there is no progress and can never be without solving Argentina's problem of problems — the agrarian question and winning genuine national independence.'[14]

The diversity of evaluations of the new government makes it perfectly obvious that while not everything has settled into final shape — far from it — there are essential differences between the various military and civilian alignments that reached agreement on the need to remove Maria Estela Martinez de Peron, on the one hand, and the fascists who so far have been unable to gain a dominant position.

The Communists and other progressives are in the thick of current events. They work for the broadest possible unity of democrats from top to bottom, refusing to give in to provocation, never failing to criticize the regime's moves against the people, steadfastly demanding respect for human rights and campaigning for the satisfaction of the people's demands and for civil freedoms. They want to see to it that sectarianism, underestimation of the differentiation going on in the armed forces and in the Church, and passivity or indifference due to primitive nihilism or vacillation in certain sectors do not get in the way of active supporters of deep-going changes. It is necessary to take a differentiated approach to the different forces in order to unite them in struggle against the chief enemy and eliminate the impending threat. No far-reaching changes can be brought about by democratic means without the decisive participation of the masses and without support from the democratic-minded section of the armed forces,

which is still searching for a place in the people's fight for national liberation and social progress.

The vulnerable point of the democratic camp is still the lack of unity on a program for a civilian and military government based on a broad democratic coalition. The erroneous notion that one social or political group or the army can lead the country singlehanded out of the plight in which it finds itself has yet to be defeated.

Solutions are not readily discernible in complicated situations. Not all political alignments that could take part in solving the nation's problems have yet taken a clear-out stand. It is certain, however, that none but the people headed by the working class can swing the country toward radical social changes.

1. O. Ghioldi, *Democracia renovada o pinochetismo*. Buenos Aires, 1976, p. 5.
2. *La Nacion*, Buenos Aires, July 31, 1976.
3. See the statement of Caledonio V. Pereira, Chairman of the Argentine Rural Society, carried by *La Prensa* (Buenos Aires), August 1, 1976.
4. In 1930 there was a coup inspired by U.S. oil monopolies. It initiated a period of political instability that is continuing to this day. — *A.K.*
5. For details, see O. Ghioldi, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
6. O. Ghioldi, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
7. Big landowner and director of several branches of multinational companies.
8. *El Mercurio* (Santiago), April 1, 1976.
9. O. Ghioldi, *op cit.*, p. 4.
10. In the first half of 1976, the prices of necessities went up 196 per cent while wages were raised by only 15 per cent.
11. From Spanish *desarrollo*, development. — *Ed.*
12. O. Ghioldi, *op. cit.*, p.6.
13. *Opinion* (Buenos Aires), No. 4, 1976, p. 14.
14. Rodolfo Ghioldi, Jaime Fuchs, *Un plan para el cambio*, p. 13.

DOES FASCISM EXIST IN LATIN AMERICA?

Jose Soares,
Member of Central Committee, Communist Party of Brazil

This may seem to be a purely rhetorical question in view of the political situation on the continent, and the terror regimes in Chile, Brazil, Uruguay, Bolivia and Guatemala, regimes called fascist by the Communists of those countries. Nevertheless, it is a legitimate and timely question first, because there are some on the continent denying the fascist nature of these regimes.[1] Second, wholly dependent on the answer to this question are the strategy and tactical line of the continent's revolutionaries, their alliances, the scope of joint actions by the democratic forces in the face of U.S. imperialism's global strategy of crushing all liberation movements and preventing them

from merging with the movement for détente, peaceful coexistence, and world peace.

Those who deny the existence of fascism in Latin America refer to Georgi Dimitrov's statement that fascism represents regimes comprised of the most reactionary, the most chauvinistic and the most imperialistic elements of finance capital. Latin American countries, they insist, are poorly developed and, for this reason, fascism cannot be applied to them. Other groups try to prove that traits inherent in German and Italian fascism in the past are not to be found in Latin American reactionary regimes. They do not have mass support, they declare.

In order to disprove these groundless arguments, let us first examine the continent's political development after the Second World War.

The defeat of nazism, to which the heroic Soviet people and their armed forces made the greatest contribution, and the emergence of socialism as a world system, narrowed down imperialism's sphere of activities. The general crisis of capitalism worsened and the class struggle gained in scope both nationally and internationally, inter-imperialist competition for new markets and sources of raw materials became more vicious. The people's liberation struggle, including the struggle in Latin America, was greatly activated.

The blockade of Cuba failed, and imperialism's defeats in Southeast Asia and Africa gave impetus to the Latin American people's struggle. Such is the inter-dependence of events in the world today, where the increasing might of the socialist system and the achievements of peaceful coexistence and détente are particularly distinctive.

After their defeat in Asia and Africa and even in Latin America which they look upon as their domain, the U.S. monopolies took urgent steps to protect their privileges and strategic positions on our continent, with its tremendous wealth and great potential of cheap labor. And the worsening capitalist crisis makes it particularly difficult to accept the loss of their privileges. This is the primary reason back of the tendency to establish ruthless dictatorships. Financing, preparing and carrying out rightist military coups, including of a fascist type, is the work of the CIA whose operations have been exposed in Guatemala, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay and in other countries.

At the onset of the 1960s, Brazil was the prime target of American imperialism's plans of expansion. U.S. monopolies were interested in the opportunities for large capital investments, Brazil's great untapped natural riches, its cheap labor, huge markets and advantageous geographical position. The monopolies had reason to be disturbed by the people's growing pressure on the Goulart administration to carry

out radical structural reforms. The Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean says: 'The most typical case of imperialism's new forms of penetration and domination is, undoubtedly, that of Brazil ... The fascization process, which began after the 1964 coup by the rightists, created the necessary political prerequisites for the "economic miracle." The brutal suppression of the workers' trade union movement, the democratic and anti-imperialist forces reflected the ultra-reactionary nature of the Brazilian regime and was used as a powerful political means to impose on the country a type of economic development even more dependent on and subordinate to U.S. imperialism ... Interfering, in cahoots with U.S. imperialism, in the political and economic affairs of neighboring states (especially Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay and Chile) and conducting an expansionist policy, the architects of the pseudo-miracle — the Brazilian oligarchy and military — encroach on the interests of all the peoples of the region, converting Brazil into a dangerous imperialist stronghold in South America.'

After Brazil the CIA turned to other countries in the south of the continent. With the unconcealed help of the Brazilian 'gorillas' governments were overthrown, fascist regimes established and widespread reprisals started in Bolivia, Chile and Uruguay.

The Declaration of the Havana Conference further notes that 'the deterioration of the general crisis of capitalism, which is completely unable to resolve it, prompts the more aggressive sections of monopoly capital to resort to fascism. President Ford admitted in cynical statements that the U.S. government had been directing subversion on the continent. Besides, he arrogantly claimed the right to go on doing so "in the best interest" of his country.'

Internal factors are important when considering the reasons for fascism appearing in several Latin American countries. The very fact that in these states power is concentrated in the hands of the big financial oligarchies creates conditions for the installation of ultra-reactionary regimes, including fascist-type regimes. To this should be added their economic, social and political crisis. Some countries inherited elements of a corporative-type state (the so-called 'new state' in Brazil in the 1930s) and preserve caudillo traditions. In other words it is important to keep in mind the specific conditions of individual countries.

So it is clear that fascism in Latin America is the offspring of powerful external forces.

In the light of what has been said, let us now examine the arguments of those who doubt the existence of fascism in Latin America.

In the first place, the Latin America countries mentioned above are poorly developed only relatively speaking. Some have a high level of

capitalist development while in others the economy shows signs of monopoly capitalism. This does not mean that they are economically independent. It is precisely their dependence that shapes their capitalist development, preventing them from discarding outdated structures. However, the weight of domestic oligarchical clans in the economy and the process of concentration of capital taking place in some countries where the 'national' monopolies operate in concert with the big international monopolies should not be underestimated. The local oligarchies, refusing to comply with the demands of the workers and the people for effective structural changes within the bounds of bourgeois legislation, resort to open violence. The big imperialist monopolies whose interests would suffer as a result of revolutionary transformations, start carrying out their ominous plans to create strong dictatorships capable of protecting their tremendous privileges and opening the way to a still greater influx of foreign capital.

Those who deny the existence of fascism on the continent do not allow for the closely interlaced interests of the monopolies and the big landowners opposing agrarian reforms. This is especially true of Chile.

As for their second argument, concerning fascism's social base, it would not be amiss to recall certain aspects of fascism in Southeast and Central Europe. 'The particular conditions prevailing in the countries of Southeast Europe.' said Georgi Dimitrov, 'lend fascism a *peculiar character*. This peculiarity consists primarily in the fact that, in contrast say to Italy, fascism in these countries comes to power as a state form of government *not from below,* through a mass movement, but on the contrary —*from above*. Relying on the control of state power, on the military forces of the bourgeoisie and the financial power of banking capital, fascism attempts to penetrate the masses and create there an ideological, political and organizational basis. This happened in Bulgaria after the military-fascist coup of June 9, 1923. In Yugoslavia the inspirer and organizer of fascism was the bloc of monarchy, militarism and banking capital. In Rumania and Greece, with minor deviations, the situation is much the same. Hungary under Horthy and Bethlen is no exception to this rule.'[2]

Though the Latin American countries have distinctive features and the international situation differs from that of prewar years, the traits characteristic of Southeast and Central European countries in the 1930s are present in today's fascist dictatorships in Latin America established through coups.

It is important to bear in mind Dimitrov's warning that no general characterization of fascism, however correct in itself, can relieve us of the need to study and take into account the special features of the

development of fascism and the various forms of fascist dictatorship in the individual countries and at its various stages.[3]

In Latin America, fascist-type regimes are most prominent in Brazil, Chile and Uruguay. However, it is possible that other terrorist dictatorships on the continent will also show signs of fascism. But this does not mean that every repressive regime is a fascist regime.

A class analysis of the rightist overthrows and the dictatorships in Latin America shows that they were established in the interests of local and foreign monopoly capital operating hand-in-glove with the big landowners. After taking over power dictatorships are intent on abolishing all the gains won by the people and, contrary to national interests, extend maximum support to the monopolies, particularly foreign monopolies as happened in Guatemala, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay and elsewhere. Regress was especially harsh in Chile where the Popular Unity government had carried out radical structural reforms before the putsch. The forces behind rightist overthrows also plan to speed up concentration and centralization of industry and of capital and strengthen monopoly positions. Monopoly and state become entwined, forming state-monopoly capitalism as happened in Brazil. The state becomes a tool in the hands of local and foreign, mainly North American, monopolies using fascism to ensure their undivided control, freeze wages and accelerate accumulation of capital.

Some who deny the existence of fascism in Latin America argue that Brazil holds elections and has a functioning Parliament. It would be well to recall, however, that in Europe in the 30s there were various forms of fascist dictatorships, depending on the historical, socio-economic and national distinctions of one or another country, the presence or absence of a mass base and the depth of the contradictions between the ruling classes. In Brazil, there were serious contradictions between the military, who carried out the coup, and the bourgeois forces backing them. Because the 'gorillas' claimed that the purpose of the coup was to 'save' democratic freedoms and 'protect' the Constitution which was allegedly encroached upon by the legitimate government, it was difficult to establish fascism immediately. This was a gradual process. In Chile, on the contrary, fascism's appearance was immediate and harsh. With a single blow, reaction wanted to cut short the revolutionary process during which the working class was represented in the government, which carried out a program of radical changes, enforced measures against the monopolies and landowners, and was working for national emancipation and in the nation's supreme interests. Just as in the 30s in Central and Southeast Europe, fascist dictatorships in Latin America (in Brazil, for instance) are maneuvering: they maintain a 'parliament,'

hold 'elections' while terrorizing the population, depriving citizens of political rights and members of parliament of their powers, interfering with the work of labor and student organizations, carrying out mass arrests, torture and executions, presecuting Communists, the working people, certain religious and military circles and members of the Brazilian Democratic Movement, an officially recognized opposition party. Such are the conditions under which the so-called 'elections' are held. Obviously, there can be no talk of liberalizing the system. The fascists are forced to maneuver, especially today when the example of the socialist countries is showing the broad masses the way to their liberation.

In view of what has been said, the following are characteristic traits of fascism in Latin America:

— Fascist regimes are imposed on countries by local and foreign monopolies together with the landed oligarchy. They are dependent on imperialism and their aim is to stop the revolutionary process (Brazil and Uruguay) or to prevent radical structural changes in countries where the working class had a say in ruling the country (Chile).

— They are the result of coups which, it is claimed, will 'deliver' the countries from the economic, social and political crises caused by the monopolies themselves which oppose any structural changes.

— All the coups are preceded by vicious anti-communist campaigns under the guise of 'defending freedoms.' After usurping power, the new regime starts liquidating the institutions of bourgeois democracy: individual guarantees, freedom of assembly and the press, political parties are dissolved, legislative bodies and the courts are either destroyed or are placed under strict control, the Constitution is replaced with decrees such as Institutional Act No. 5 in Brazil sanctioning absolute power to the dictator who obeys only the supreme military command.

— Special repressive organs are created with unlimited powers in which the military play the main role. Often, as in Brazil, the armed forces are repressors of the people and not defenders of national sovereignty. The repressive organs use such methods as kidnapping, torture and assassination and jailing or throwing into concentration camps all who oppose the regime.

— The policy being pursued is that of freezing wages, maintaining a high rate of unemployment and interfering in trade union affairs, which are reduced to ineffectual charitable organizations not adhering to positions of class struggle.

— Attempts are made to unite the bourgeoisie around its most active nucleus with the opposite result of increased contradictions among the ruling classes.

— Industry and capital are concentrated in the hands of the big, mostly foreign, monopolies who capture key economic positions.

— A powerful propaganda machine is created to indoctrinate the population in the spirit of chauvinistic and expansionist nationalism.

— Wide use is made of demagogy intended to mislead the most backward section of the population and the middle strata.

Such, among others, are the main traits of fascism in Latin America, particularly in Brazil. As an anti-national regime, a dictatorship destroys national culture and clashes with the church. That is why ever more people are joining the struggle against fascism and this includes a large section of the armed forces. Brazilian fascism is striving to create an anti-communist bloc as a NATO support on the continent.

The anti-fascist struggle cannot be separated from the struggle against imperialism. Fascism is a dangerous foe because it has the financial support of imperialism and the CIA. Therefore, in order to isolate and destroy fascism it is necessary to educate and mobilize the masses, the many forces, including those that fascism could possibly win over or neutralize. Work must continue without let-up among the part of the population dissatisfied with the dictatorship and that is why ideological work is so important in this struggle. To involve the broad masses in the anti-fascist movement, every act of reprisal, every instance of corruption, every economic, social or political measure that runs counter to the interests of the population, of students, intellectuals, the middle strata and even part of the national bourgeoisie, must be exposed. We must express the interests of all who suffer from the reactionary, anti-labor, anti-popular and anti-national policy. Winning the broad masses over to the anti-fascist and patriotic front requires untiring explanations of the front's goals, the seriousness of the tasks facing the struggle, the need for unity and exposing fascist propaganda.[4]

The world must learn of the danger emanating from the fascist tendency in Latin America. In this connection of tremendous importance is the 25th CPSU Congress declaration 'Freedom for Prisoners of Imperialism and Reaction.' From positions of proletarian internationalism, the CPSU calls on the world public to step up solidarity with peoples waging the liberation struggle under brutal dictatorships in the service of imperialism.

In his report to the 25th CPSU Congress, General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev said: 'having gathered at our Congress, we Soviet Communists send militant greetings and wishes of success to our comrades and like-minded people abroad. And first and foremost we address our words of solidarity to Communists fighting in difficult underground conditions. We salute all fighters for the working

people's cause, all those who expose their lives to danger each day and, defying all trials, remain faithful to their ideals and duty. Hundreds, even thousands, of freedom fighters are held in prisons and concentration camps in Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Indonesia, Brazil, Guatemala, Haiti, South Africa and other countries. Many Communists have laid down their lives for the revolutionary cause.'

The CPSU's internationalist position is helping the forces of peace to better understand the need to broaden the struggle, to understand the meaning of militant solidarity with all peoples living in conditions of terror, in particular, the peoples of Latin America where fascist dictatorships are a serious obstacle to détente, peaceful coexistence and peace.

1. Such view are held, besides rightist ideologues in the service of imperialism, by the 'ultra-leftists' and representatives of petty-bourgeois trends. In Chile, for example, the 'ultra-leftists' claim the military junta is a dictatorship of a 'weak, dependent bourgeoisie' existing solely on the support of imperialism and the reactionary officers.

2. G. Dimitrov, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Foreign Language Press, Sofia, 1967, p. 413.

3. *Ibid*, p. 643.

4. The Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean said on this score: 'In the context of the Latin America peoples' struggle, defense of democratic organizations and the people's rights acquires special importance. Full national independence, which presupposes the rout and elimination of the ruling oligarchies, is inseparably linked with the struggle for genuine democracy.'

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE URUGUAYAN DRAMA

Sergio Sierra
Member of Central Committee, Communist Party of Uruguay

The world is shocked by reports of the continued terror prepetrated by the present Uruguayan regime, which has been misruling the country for more than three and a half years. But popular resistance, led by the Communist Party, continues. The Party is working for broad anti-dictatorship unity, a goal for which its members and supporters, cinfident of ultimate victory, are shedding their blood in the fight against the despotic regime. It is a struggle between the people and fascism. And though the character of the drama now being played out in Uruguay is clear enough, it is important also to see it in the context of U.S. imperialism's global strategy and our people's unabating liberation struggle.

The methods imperialism employs to adapt to the new world situation pose many problems for the peoples. The U.S. imperialists, according to a cynical remark by Kissinger, are for a certain stretch of history 'doomed to peaceful coexistence' with socialism.[1] And Washington is not only adapting to the changing international situation, but in some regions is mounting a counter-offensive through its client governments, itself remaining behind the scenes. Its policy in Latin America, notably fascization of the continent's southern part, should be seen not only in the context of one or another country, but as an international problem.

The rise of the liberation movement in Latin America, in which the three main revolutionary currents are merged, predetermines the counter-revolutionary character of imperialism's retaliatory measures. It is using every available method to retain its dominant positions and win new ones. In some countries this counter-revolutionary offensive has brought fascism or fascist tendencies. They represent a worldwide danger, and that is why there is such a keen interest in what is happening on our continent.

'The most advanced movement of our epoch,' Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of our Communist Party, writes, 'especially when its actions take form in such political categories as détente, influences the situation in individual countries and becomes a catalyst of national prospects. But what would become of us if we forgot Lenin's axiom that revolution breeds counter-revolution, and vice-versa! ... Although the historically positive changes on the world arena are favorable for the revolution in some countries, they also aggravate the internal contradictions of the capitalist system and may be accompanied by increasing aggressiveness of the imperialist and local exploiters. More, these achievements may give rise to preemptive or retaliatory, but nonetheless real, counter-revolutionary actions, which may prove temporarily successful in different parts of the globe.'[2]

Collapse of the cold-war policy and relaxation of international strain helped to thwart imperialist plans in Latin America and promote the revolutionary process. The transplantation of fascism is not a mere episode of history, but the result of deliberate imperialist actions carried out against the background of the general crisis of capitalism.

The Uruguayan Communists have been engaged in polemics both with the ultra-leftists, who are prepared to clap the fascist label on any repressive bourgeois government, and petty-bourgeois ideologists, who dismissed warnings of the fascist menace as repetition of 'theoretical schemes based on European reality' or 'outdated excerpts from articles about a reality entirely alien to us.' In warning of the impending danger, one of our Party leaders, Jose Massera, wrote

in 1972: 'We do not confuse the specific *form* of fascism in Italy and Germany ... with the *essence* of fascism, which is anything but "alien" or something "already overcome by history," but the greatest danger, emanating from the main imperialist power, the United States, if we view the problem in its worldwide implications.'

U.S. pressure on Uruguay became especially strong toward the close of the 60s, when there were visible changes in the social structure, particularly within the ruling classes. We witnessed the emergence of a thin layer of the financial oligarchy, which speaks for the big imperialist monopolies, the latifundists and the comprador bourgeoisie closely linked with U.S. capital. Having gained control of the main levers of the government machine, it could dictate its will to the regime. Gradually there began to surface distinct signs of state-monopoly capitalism (but dependent on imperialism) in a country with a medium level of capitalist development. Super-exploitation of the working people, economic stagnation and virtually imperialist control went hand in hand with an assault on all democratic freedoms.

Our Party therefore focused its propaganda on democracy and the fascist menace. For distortion of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of democracy is a favorite technique of bourgeois ideologists and petty-bourgeois leftists. True, they employ different methods: the former accuse the Communists of opposing democracy, while the latter accuse it of democratic illusions. 'The common denominator of both,' we replied, 'is an abstract rather than a concrete historical approach to the problem. They conceal the fact that Marxism-Leninism is opposed to bourgeois democracy not because it is *democracy,* but because it is *bourgeois*. In other words, they emasculate the *class content*.' We also pointed out that Marxism-Leninism, drawing on the experience of the mass struggle and consistently applying the dialectical method, regards 'communism as something which develops *out* of capitalism' (Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 25, p. 471). And Lenin carefully analyzed forms of transition in concrete historical circumstances to show that the democratic republic is for the proletariat the nearest approach to power *(ibid.)* 'The Communists,' we added 'are not indifferent to the political form of bourgeois dictatorship. We are not indifferent because we uphold democratic freedom against feudal survival or fascist reaction, and because we fight for democratic demands which, though not socialist, go beyond the framework of capitalism at a time when the material prerequisites of socialism are maturing.'

For several years Uruguay was the scene of a confrontation between the oligarchic-imperialist forces determined to suppress all democratic freedoms, and the working class, the people, fighting to safeguard their gains, for national liberation and an advanced demo-

cracy. In this setting of structural crisis and sharpening class struggle, the reactionaries yielded to imperialist pressure and resorted to measures never before employed in Uruguay. On June 27, 1973, there was a coup d'état and the beginning of the 'transplanting' of fascism. Frightened by the continued growth of the revolutionary forces, the more reactionary faction took advantage of the position in the army to form an alliance with its high command. At the crucial moment this alliance, supported by U.S. imperialism, proved stronger than the working class and the people.

It should be observed that ultra-leftist terrorism played into the hands of the reactionaries and contributed to the army's swing to the right. But the main, determinative, factor in bringing on fascism was the ruling class' fear of the rising popular and workers' movement at a time when Uruguay was going through a profound crisis and the positions of imperialism were visibly weaker in Latin America and throughout the world.

Our experience is especially noteworthy because it shows how a typical bourgeois democracy (which has undeniable advantages, though they are exaggerated and idealized by propaganda designed to obscure its limitations and fallacies) is turned into a fascist dictatorship, with its oppression, economic dislocation, ruthless destruction of the political, cultural and humanistic values created over the years by the progressive forces and the working-class struggle.

In Uruguay the fascist takeover was carried out stage by stage. First, the bourgeois democratic institutions were gradually liquidated by exploiting the neo-fascists' fear of the revolution. Then the repression was stepped up. In combination, this enabled the fascists to penetrate the state machine and subsequently, with the support of the army, dissolve parliament, ban political parties, outlaw the National Workers' Convention and take repressive measures against the democratic forces. Five months after the coup the government formalized what had actually begun on the day after the coup, i.e., the banning of the Communist and Socialist parties, the Students' Federation and other left organizations. On October 21, 1975, after long and thorough preparation and CIA assistance, the dictatorship launched a savage campaign of terror expressly aimed at the annihilation of Communist Party members and the suppression of all opposition. There were kidnappings, the taking of hostages, torture, assassinations, humiliating treatment of political detainees and their relatives. And all this on a scale unmatched by any other fascist regime — suffice it to say that there is one political prisoner for every 400 of the population.

Uruguay is today in the throes of an economic and financial crisis. Living costs have risen by 44 per cent over the past 12 months. A

series of mini-devaluations (there were three in June alone) have pushed down the value of the peso against the U.S. dollar from 250 pesos three years ago to about 4,000 today. According to the World Bank, 30.1 per cent if Uruguay's export revenue goes to service its foreign debt, which now stands at more than 1.6 billion dollars, or three times more than export earnings over the past year. Data released by the government Commerce Board show that the 1975 trade deficit, 172.6 million dollars, was equivalent to 45 per cent of the total value of exports. The 1975 budget showed a 27 per cent deficit, according to the Economics and Finance Ministry. Denationalization of industry and demunicipalization of public utilities are proceeding apace. Foreign investors are given special privileges, with the result that the economy is entirely controlled by imperialist monopolies. So much so, that North American bankers have appropriated the national gold reserve, and continue to issue politically-motivated credit.

The dictatorship's social and economic policy is drastically reducing real wages (to half of the 1968 figure according to National Workers' Convention data), increasing unemployment, malnutrition and emigration.[3] It is also having an adverse effect on industrialists, cattle farmers and merchants. The only ones to benefit are the big financial bourgeoisie and their senior partners, imperialist business interests. With so meagre a social base, Uruguayan fascism, in its class character, is an open *terrorist dictatorship of the financial and latifundist oligarchy (with some features of state-monopoly capitalism) whose interests are intertwined with those of U.S. imperialism.* The regime is shifting the burden of the crisis onto the majority of the population and is converting Uruguay into a bridgehead for all manner of provocation in other parts of the continent.

We cannot, therefore, equate the present regime in Uruguay (and in certain other Latin American countries) to the military or semi-colonial dictatorships of the past. For though they employed fascist-type methods, they were not fascist regimes, inasmuch as they were not so closely linked with the financial oligarchy and did not present a viable alternative to maturing revolutionary change.

This has an important bearing both on theory and on the evolvement of correct tactics. For there is a tendency to regard dictators merely as idiosyncratic or grotesque figures. This ignores Marx's remark that the class struggle can create circumstances that make it possible 'for a grotesque mediocrity to play a hero's part.'[4] In fact, even now some fall into the tragic delusion of seeing in fascism only the pretentious pomposity of a Hitler or Mussolini. And sometimes the whole pattern of fascism is reduced to the ambitions of some general, to a clash of personalities or caste interests, though all these are, undoubtedly, elements of modern Latin American history (I

refer to the role of the armed forces). In short, there is a tendency to confuse substance and form, cause and effect. In characterizing any regime we must first examined its class nature.

And a concrete analysis will show that in a number of Latin American countries there is a clear tendency, based on the existing socio-economic structures and U.S. imperialism's global strategy, to devise *a new type of state* (i.e., not merely change the form of government), create a social superstructure that would help strengthen fascism and bring it to power.

The main function of the authoritarian state now evolving in Uruguay is systematic repression. That is evident even from the national budget, of which 54 per cent goes to finance the police and other repressive agencies. This leads to hypertrophic growth of the non-productive sector, to a privileged bureaucracy upon which the regime leans for support, and breeds social parasitism in a crisis-ridden economy. The whole thing is modelled on U.S. state-monopoly capitalism.[5] But it should be clear that in a dependent country like Uruguay the only result can be complete economic dislocation and the loss of whatever remains of national sovereignty.

The fascist dictatorship in Uruguay has no political party, has been unable to organize pro-government trade unions and split the labor movement, of which the National Workers' Convention remains the recognized spokesman. The government has no mass social base. More, contradictions are growing within the ruling class; there are continuous conflicts with the Church and more pronounced differentiation within the armed forces.[6]

A close look at political life in Uruguay (which is much the same in several other Latin American countries) will bring out the marked difference between the present fascist dictatorships and the dictatorial regimes of the past. This is due to the marked change in the international alignment of forces: in the 30s fascism was on the offensive, today it is the result of a counter-offensive by an imperialism in a state of crisis.

The recent assassination of former Uruguayan parliamentarians Gutierrez Ruis and Zelmar Michelini and General Torres, ex-President of Bolivia, (they were kidnapped, tortured and killed in Buenos Aires) with the complicity of the Uruguayan and Bolivian dictatorships suggest a compact between the fascist criminals operating under Yankee supervision. This internationalization of terror is paralleled by a frienzied arms drive, threats and provocation, the idea being to make the southern part of the continent a hotbed of tension. The formation of an anti-communist bloc in this area is part of U.S. imperialism's global strategy and the prelude to the organization of a continental armed force under Pentagon command. It would be used

to interfere in the affairs of any country on the pretext of combating 'subversion.'[7] Washington has singled out Brazil as its sub-regional gendarme (primarily in the South Atlantic, and in connection with Brazil's possible entry into NATO), and has encouraged close ties between the fascist dictatorships and the racist Vorster regime. All these plans and maneuvers are contrary to détente and the peoples' efforts to make it irreversible.

Anti-fascist resistance is a salient feature of Latin American political life. The 15-day general strike in Uruguay, in reply to the coup of June 27, 1973, reaffirmed the vanguard role of the working class in defending democracy and prevented stabilization of the regime, despite all its demagogy. The strike also gave a fresh impetus to the struggle and brought new forces into it. It was a factor in sharpening contradictions within the ruling clique and, beyond all doubt, told on the political crisis partially resolved by the ousting of Bordaberry. The departure from the political scene of one of the hated leaders of the 'holy' anti-communist alliance in the southern part of the continent testifies to the degradation of the dictatorship, which is being undermined by economic crisis and is wrathfully condemned by the Uruguayan people and world public opinion.[8] No one has been misled by subsequent events. The repressions continue, the prisons are filled with political detainees, many of whom are subjected to inhuman torture. The puppet rulers are following one of the worst varieties of the Brazilian model.

As in Chile, U.S. imperialist maneuvers have failed to crush the popular resistance of international solidarity. Washington is trying to bolster the fascist regimes by more financial and military support, and by camouflage to give its servile dictatorships a better image.

The situation prompts us to take a new look at the question of tactics.

The growth of the Latin American socialist-oriented revolutionary, democratic and anti-imperialist movement is attracting new allies of the working class. The Communist Party is working for a broad patriotic front comprising civilians and military men, atheists and believers, to crush fascism and create the conditions for national renewal. The success of that policy will largely depend on unity of the motive forces of the revolution, of which alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the former's leadership, is the core. Concentration on this tactic does not preclude other alliances. For instance, we should explore opportunities for closer understanding with other forces, even the big bourgeoisie, which finds itself compelled to take an anti-fascist and anti-imperialist stand. These tactics can be applied both in individual countries and on the continent as a whole, for the

conditions are maturing for broad movements in defense of democracy, national sovereignty and natural resources.

But the problem of fascism, I repeat, is an international problem. Aid to the Chilean people is a splendid example of international solidarity of the democratic forces. There is also the widening campaign of solidarity with the Uruguayan and other Latin American peoples. But there must be *a wide joint struggle* of the whole of mankind against fascism to isolate and eliminate the dangerous seats of tension. The Latin American peoples and their Communist Parties highly appreciate democratic and anti-imperialist solidarity. The annals of our struggle are replete with examples of solidarity with the victims of imperialist aggression, the Spanish Republic, the Soviet people and the other anti-fascist forces in the Second World War, Cuba and Vietnam. Undeviating fulfillment of our international duty has contributed to a higher level of political understanding among the masses. Support for and assistance to other peoples was a weighty factor in changing the situation in many countries. The Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean emphasizes that democratic solidarity and proletarian internationalism are inseparable from the struggle for national and social emancipation. It points to the role of the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, which 'have always fulfilled their proletarian internationalist duty in an exemplary way.' Fidel Castro has repeatedly stressed that Soviet support of the Cuban people's heroic struggle made possible the final assertion of socialism in this Western Hemisphere country.

The presence of fascism, that product of Latin American counter-revolution, underscores as never before the need for proletarian internationalism and anti-fascist, anti-imperialist solidarity. And in the name of such solidarity we must lose no time in intensifying the campaign to free Luis Corvalan, Jaime Perez, Jose Massera, Antonio Maidana, Miguel Soler and other comrades languishing in Latin American prisons.

Anti-fascist unity and international solidarity require energetic and concerted efforts, especially by the Communist Parties, for they are an inalienable part of the great battle for peaceful coexistence and the revolutionary transformation of the world.

1. *Le Monde,* April 14, 1976.

2. 'On the dialectics of peaceful coexistence and revolutionary change,' *WMR,* January 1976.

3. About a quarter of the Uruguayan population has had to quit the country because of economic difficulties and political persecutions. The emigrants are mostly young people, trained technicians and other specialists. Considering that the 7,000 political prisoners and many of their relatives are not engaged in production, and the

steady growth of the repressive apparatus, one wonders if, in these conditions, Uruguay can survive as a state.

4. Preface to the second edition of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.

5. See Gus Hall, 'The barometer points to stormy weather.' *WMR*, April 1976.

6. Generals Seregni and Licandro and Colonel Zufriategui are still in prison, along with other patriotic-minded officers. Several officers active in politics found refuge in foreign embassies. One managed to send to the Vatican a letter and two photographs showing torture in Uruguayan prisons. Published in the world press, they caused widespread indignation.

7. The Pentagon and the South American dictators demanded operation of the inter-American mutual assistance treaty and revisions of the OAS Charter. The demand was turned down by the Eleventh Conference of American Armies (October 1975) and by the last OAS Conference (June 1976). Now attempts are being made to make the Treaty factually operative by closely coordinating terror campaigns and interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

8. Bordaberry insisted on the dissolution of all political parties in favor of a cooperative system that would legalize rule by the military. An alternative to that was proposed by Economics Minister Villegas acting on instructions from the U.S. Embassy. He submitted a memorandum suggesting that the 'forced dissolution for an indefinite period' of the traditional bourgeois parties would endanger the country's future, for the resulting 'political vacuum' would provide wide opportunities for clandestine activity by the Communist Party and other Marxist groups. It would be a gross delusion, he argued, to believe that this could be avoided by repressive measures. Accordingly, he proposed a rather crude plan designed to create a semblance of restricted democracy (but excluding the left parties and purging all others) in order to divide the opposition and rescue the country from international isolation. The elections appointed for November 1976 were cancelled by a series of 'institutional acts' and a 'council of the nation' was appointed, composed of senior officers and members of the 'state council' set up by Bordaberry. The purpose of all these moves was to provide a semblance of legality to the new 'President of the republic' (one Aparicio Mendez, a very shady individual), who began his presidential career by extolling the Brazilian regime and promulgating a decree under which an estimated 20,000 Uruguayans were banned from political activity. It was envisaged that five years later the so-called traditional parties would elect a new president who, after several more years, would appoint elections in which two officially allowed parties would participate. This farce has only aggravated contradictions within the dictatorship, which, apart from everything else, has banned all trade union and political activity and is grossly violating human rights.

RESULTS OF JUNTA RULE

Hugio Fazio
Representative of the Communist Party of Chile on the journal

'Our children will be grateful to us for the Chile we are building,' Jorge Cauas, Minister of Finance under the fascist junta, declared at the 'First Seminar on Socio-Economic Policy,' held in June this year to commemorate the 'successes' allegedly achieved in that field after the coup d'état.[1] A few days earlier Cauas had told a group of businessmen that the country had once and for all taken the path of

progress, adding without embarrassment that 'employment and real incomes are going up.'[2]

Such assertions are ridiculous because ever since the fascist coup, the country has actually been experiencing an enormous economic disaster caused primarly by the policy of the Pinochet regime. Within the last few years, the country's economy has moved back to the level of 15 years ago, leaving a large section of the population in utter poverty.

In 1975 the gross domestic product was down by 14.3 per cent — a drop of 16.2 per cent in per capita terms. If we draw a comparison with the days of the Popular Unity government, with its most indicative period — 1971-72, the gap would be 20 per cent or so. It is important to emphasize this in view of the current claims that the Chilean economy was in a state of chaos during the years of Salvador Allende's government.

Gross domestic product
(Estimated according to the 1974 exchange rate of the dollar)

	Volume of GDP in million dollars	Per capita GDP in dollars
1970	10,961	1,170
1971	11,804	1,237
1972	11,793	1,214
1973	11,369	1,150
1974	11,858	1,178
1975	10,115	987

Source: data of the National Planning Board of Chile.

Production has declined in nearly all economic branches. According to statistics given by the Industrial Development Society, the output of the manufacturing industries in 1975 was 23 per cent less than in 1974. Throughout the first half of 1976 production remained at this low level. Between January and June 1976 the index for the production of consumer durables was 23 per cent less than in the first half of 1975, and 42.4 per cent less than in 1972; the index for the production of transportation vehicles and equipment was down by 23.5 and 58 per cent respectively, and that for the production of building materials — by 8.8 and 43.6 per cent. As a result, thousands of enterprises closed down.

The slump in housing construction is even greater. The number of housing starts in the state sector in 1975 was no more than 7.3 per cent of the number of houses completed in 1971-72. The figures for the first

quarter of 1976, released by the National Statistics Institute, show that the downward trend continues.

Most of the mining industries have registered a drop in output of 50 per cent and more. The coal output from January to May 1976 was 22.7 per cent less than in the same months in 1975. The first four months of this year showed a drop of 15.2 per cent in oil refining.

Agricultural production fell by 18.7 per cent in the period from 1971 to 1975. The junta kept the public uninformed about the disastrously poor harvest of the 1975-76. In that fiscal year the output of 13 major crops dropped by 15 per cent compared to the previous year. The amount of fertilizers used was reduced from 159,800 tons in 1971-72 to about 108,100 tons in the last season. This was one of the main causes of the decrease in the yield of wheat — the country's staple crop.[3] During the last harvest each hectare yielded 1,200 kg of wheat, whereas in 1970-71, under the Popular Unity government, the average yield was 1,780 kg per hectare.

In 1975 total capital investments declined by 32.4 per cent below the 1974 level. And the first half of 1976 saw a drop of 39 per cent compared with the same period in 1975.

The fascist regime has forced the working people and the less well-to-do sections of the population to shoulder the whole burden of the economic crisis. Under the Popular Unity government more than 60 per cent of the national income was spent on the welfare of the working people; in 1974 public spending was cut down by not less than 40 per cent, as *El Mercurio*[4] admitted, and has since continued to be reduced. The incomes of the lower paid civil servant who has a family of three members and receives family allowances were nominally increased by 74 times in the period from September 1973 to May 1976; in the same period the price of bread soared 345.5 times, transport fares by 250 times, the price of rice by 412.5 times, of sugar by 516.6 times, and that of vegetable oil by 338.8 times. According to a survey conducted by the National Statistics Institute over a three-month period, from April to June this year, the number of people out of work in Santiago and its suburbs, where the bulk of the economically active population is concentrated, amounted to 19.1 per cent of the total work force. But in fact the unemployment scale is closer to 25 per cent. In June 1973 it was hardly 3.1 per cent.

No wonder the volume of per capita consumption in the gross domestic product is some 25 per cent below the level of 1971-72.

These facts irrefutably prove that Chile is experiencing a profound economic and social decline. The victims are the overwhelming majority of Chileans. All state agencies, including the colossal machinery of repression, serve the interests of the ruling elite, the financial and landed oligarchy, and foreign capital.

Volume of consumption in the gross domestic product
(Estimated according to the 1974 exchange rate of the dollar)

	Total consumption (in million dollars)	Per capita consumption (in dollars)
1970	8,147	870
1971	8,965	940
1972	9,382	966
1973	9,132	924
1974	8,491	843
1975	7,486	730

Source: data of the National Planning Board of Chile.

1. *El Mercurio*, July 31, 1976.
2. *El Mercurio*, July 19, 1976.
3. *Ercilla*, December 10, 1975.
4. *El Mercurio*, Informe Economico Mensual, July 1976.

JUSTIFIED APPREHENSIONS

Letter from Honduras

Your journal recently carried an article on the events that took place in Honduras after the coup of April 22, 1975.* Noting the contradictory nature and inconsistency of the new government's activity, the author of the article pointed to the danger of the government moving to the right. The last few months have confirmed these apprehensions.

The reformist bourgeoisie that came to power in December 1972 and proclaimed its plans for national development and an agrarian reform has been retreating under the pressure of the landed oligarchy and the comprador bourgeoisie, who are regaining their lost positions in the state apparatus. The right-wing forces are carrying on an extensive slander campaign against the workers and peasants, blaming them for all the country's present troubles (decline of industrial output, shortage of agricultural produce, etc.).

The anti-labor policy of the capitalists is being coordinated on a nationwide scale. It aims at kindling social conflicts, which lead to army intervention and ruthless repression of the working people. The talks on the conclusion of collective contracts, earlier sabotaged by

* See M. Paredes, 'What Honduran reaction wants to revert to.' *WMR* June 1976.

the employers, are today causing sharp political clashes. The agrarian reform, with which the peasants linked their hopes for a better life, is completely paralyzed.

Reaction is directing its main blow at the vanguard of the working people — the Communist Party of Honduras, and the press, radio and television have launched a vicious propaganda campaign against it. The central organ of the CPH, *Vanguardia Revolucionaria,* is banned (another newspaper has begun to come out instead). To justify their repressions against the democratic and revolutionary movement, the arch-reactionaries are spreading the rumor that the Communist Party and certain army men are plotting to overthrow the government. This is blatant slander. At its 18th Plenum the Party Central Committee did criticize the government for its shift to the right, but firmly denounced conspiratorial tactics. On June 30, agents of the security service detained and interrogated Party General Secretary Dionisio Ramos Bejarano and Political Bureau Member Rigoberto Padilla. But they were released the same day due to strong protests lodged by many of the country's public and political organizations against this arbitrary act.

Accused of being led by Communists who are allegedly carrying out the agrarian reform to suit their purposes, the trade union of employees of the National Agrarian Institute (NAI) has become the target of continuous attacks. The new NAI Director, R. Correa, encouraged by the authorities, has changed the Institute's trade union leadership twice and dismissed more than 500 'suspicious' employees, including agricultural specialists who were undergoing training under a UN Food and Agriculture Organization program.

Recently NAI employees staged a two-week strike to force the director to negotiate with the trade union leaders whom he had discharged. In retaliation the army occupied NAI premises in all parts of the country. This evoked energetic protests on the part of all trade unions campaigning for solidarity with the strikers.

Under the pretext of combating communism, the authorities are cracking down on teachers. The Minister of Education, Mrs. Lidia Williams de Arias, is demanding the disbandment of the Educational Reform Committee, which she has accused of being 'a nest of pro-Soviet Communists' and of trying to 'Sovietize' the education system.

The activities of Juan Alberto Melgar Castro's government are extremely contradictory. While making so many concessions to the reactionary circles, it takes some measures assessed as positive by the democratic forces. State control has been established over the ports, the land and the railways, which were formerly in the hands of the banana companies. An important political act of the government

is its establishment of a Consultative Council (Consejo Asesor) under the Head of State — a body consisting ot representatives of the working class, the peasantry, the university, the women's association, the cooperative associations, teachers, etc., and of the new political parties (the traditional ones — the Liberal and the National — have refused to appoint their representatives). The Council has become a rostrum for voicing our ideas and exposing police arbitrariness. The Communists want the Council's activity to accord with the basic interests of the people.

With reaction on the offensive, our slogan is unity of all the forces fighting for the democratization and social regeneration of Honduras.

Luis Reynosa
Tegucigalpa,
September 1976.

Redundant people in the 'free' world

Georg Kwiatowski
Representative of
German CP
on the Journal

THE CONDITION OF YOUTH IN WEST GERMANY

Recent years have seen a considerable increase in youth unemployment in capitalist countries. Previously, the jobless were mostly members of the older generation but now they are people of 25 years and under (about 30 per cent of the workless in West Germany and about half in France and Denmark).

In the EEC countries alone there are over 1.5 million jobless under 25, according to official data. One should add to them the 'hidden' jobless not included in the statistics. Last year, hundreds of thousands of school-leavers in the EEC Nine could find no jobs, not even as apprentices. But since they are still not part of the labor force, agencies concerned with employment problems ignore them. Numerous young men and, above all, women who lose their jobs and whose relief has expired are no longer registered as unemployed and must look for a job without help from government agencies.

The latest unemployment census by age groups in West Germany was conducted in September 1975. It revealed that 287,420 people of 25 years and under had no work.

The youth unemployment rate is especially high in the United States, the main imperialist country. In April 1975, as many as 3,351,000 Americans between 16 and 24 years of age were jobless. If one adds to this number those who have resigned themselves to their fate by giving up all hope of finding a job, as well as the many others ignored by official statistics, then almost every fifth young American has been unable to secure employment. Young Blacks are hit hardest of all, unemployment affecting 40 per cent of them and almost 80 per cent in densely populated communities and the slum areas of big cities.

One should also regard as jobless teenagers who, unable to find employment, are continuing their studies in the hope that they may have better luck next year. This group also includes unemployed taking advanced training courses. These young people are struck off the lists of the workless although most of them find no job on completing their courses of study or if they do, this usually happens at the expense of others, who lose their jobs.

It follows that there is no ascertaining the exact number of unemployed youth. However, research findings suggest that official figures can safely be doubled.

Politicians and economic experts who uphold the interests of the ruling class have repeatedly claimed that the worsened job situation is a passing phenomenon, a mere nuisance marring the beauty and harmony of capitalism, lauded as an essentially 'humane' system. Yet developments have refuted this claim, intended to mislead people. Numerous investigations show that in the next few years the huge army of 'redundant' labor, far from decreasing, will grow. The weekly *Welt der Arbeit,* published by the Association of German Trade Unions (FRG), estimates (Feb. 6, 1976) that before the early 80s over one million young people in West Germany will be left without any vocational training and that in 1982 a quarter million school-leavers will be unable to find work. The period of unemployment among youth tends to grow longer, which makes their plight even worse.

The above data are not mere statistics, for every figure symbolizes the fate of someone who is compelled to settle for temporary unemployment relief or continue as a dependent of his parents. Unemployed youths cannot develop their abilities, cannot acquire the skill and experience they need, and this at an age when the mind is particularly receptive. Even if a youngster does find a job after a long period of search he will still have missed the best years of his life and will have to work hard for low pay. He will have no chance of improving his skill and will be the first to get the sack because of inadequate qualifications. This situation gives the young a feeling of inferiority, uselessness, frustration. The result is growing alco-

holism, drug addiction and crime, as well as an uptrend in the suicide rate. Last August, a 17-year-old youth of Nuremberg took his life. He had applied to 40 firms for an apprentice's job but had been turned away everywhere. There is a danger of demoralization primarily among young people who are inexperienced and unorganized and have no connection with the working-class movement. Job competition is on the rise, attempts are made to set native workers against immigrants and whites against blacks. This breeds violence, chauvinism and racism.

The climate of mass unemployment causes suffering to both those who have jobs and those who can't find any. The monopolies keep the workers under strong pressure, constantly reminding them of the jobless 'waiting at the gate.' The workers' social and political rights are curtailed. To get the most out of young workers, they are threatened with dismissal, especially in the early period of employment. Work on Sundays, unpaid overtime, pressure on apprentices to force them into renouncing the apprenticeship allowance granted by law, and even fairly frequent cases of corporal punishment are all social realities in West Germany.

The attitude of any class or its political organizations toward the youth is an indication of their attitude to society as a whole and to its future. Mounting unemployment among youth is not accidental. It is an expression of the deep economic, political and moral crisis of the capitalist system, a result of growing contradictions between labor and capital. It strikingly reveals the inability of capitalism to cope with deteriorating social problems, in particular to guarantee youth social security.

Through long years of unrelenting struggle, the working class of many capitalist countries has won legislation defending the interests of youth. Specifically, there are laws prohibiting youth labor at night and on Sundays, as well as on heavy jobs. They also provide for allowing young people more free time and for compulsory vocational training, which is equated with work in the production sphere. Big business is up in arms against these legal provisions. It takes advantage of its economic power to step up the exploitation of youth contrary to the law or to exclude it from production because it brings less profit.

This accounts largely for the fact that in the past six years openings in the West German vocational training system have declined by half. A youth organization in the Hesse Land has obtained a copy of the circular sent by the Toom-Markt firm to all its executives. 'In view of the steady extension of legislation in favor of working youth (longer holidays and breaks, added free time, a reduced working day, and so

on),' the circular says, 'it is necessary to refrain in the future from taking on young people or at least to take on as few as possible.'

Under capitalism, the basis for growing unemployment among youth and for young people's low qualifications is formed in early school years. Official policy is designed to prevent people from receiving an education that goes beyond the immediate needs of capitalist production. This clashes with the scientific and technological revolution, which makes a more educated working class an objective necessity. The monopolies fear that the higher the education of this class, the more resolutely and successfully will it defend its interests. They follow their own logic and have their own idea of the requirements of the technological revolution. They hold that a small proportion of workers should be well-trained and highly qualified while the rest whould merely be able to perform simple operations on the conveyor belt that can be learned without difficulty. 'In spite of increasing rationalization and automation,' says the Federal Association of German Employers' Unions in a frank statement, 'there will still be a fair number of jobs in the economy requiring no particular vocational training. This should underlie educational policy.'

Numerous investigations show that the young are the first to be laid off because they generally have little or no experience of production. Hence to be young in capitalist society means being doomed to outspoken discrimination. This is particularly true of workers' children, whom bourgeois society, being elitist, continues to regard as people with 'limited abilities.' The latest specimen of this gratuitously overbearing attitude was furnished by *Bayern Kurier*, mouthpiece of Franz Josef Strauss, who speaks for all West German ultras. The paper described the jobless as 'incapable fools.' This amounts to protraying the victims of monopoly, to the latter's delight, as having brought on their own misfortunes.

Young foreign workers are hit by the scourge of unemployment more painfully than anyone else. Most of them are employed in economic fields particularly liable to fluctuations. Besides, they are less skilled — a direct consequence of social discrimination against foreign workers and their families. A survey carried out in the Baden-Württemberg Land has revealed that only 65 per cent of the foreign workers' children can attend school. Their future is thus programmed in advance, so to speak.

The capitalist press often argues that the impending crisis of education and the high rate of youth unemployment are due to the growing birth rate. In other words, the youth is accused of having been born into an economy that has no use for it. Cynical, and unconvincing: the birth rate in socialist countries is no lower, yet school-leavers there have every opportunity to go on to higher studies or take a job and are

seen as a welcome reinforcement of the labor force that will join in the common effort to increase public wealth.

Capitalism robs youth of the elementary rights and freedoms laid down in constitutions, such as the right of the individual to develop freely and choose a profession or a place of work or study. Speaking of the right to work under capitalism is pointless since no capitalist country can guarantee it. And yet the world where millions of young men and women are compelled to begin their life careers as jobless people, where the crisis of education is becoming ever more intolerable and where whole generations fear for their future is called 'free.' It is becoming ever more evident that capitalism is identical with lack of freedom for youth, for all working people.

Only under socialism does youth enjoy real freedom. A guaranteed right to education and work, and opportunities for the individual fully to develop his abilities and personality, are provided by a system based on the political power of the working class allied with other working people, on social ownership of all basic means of production, and on planned utilization and expansion of every source of public wealth in the people's interests. It is for this kind of system and, hence, for the fundamental interests of youth and all working people and for their freedom that the Communists fight.

The German Communist Party sees one of its pressing tasks in acquainting youth with existing socialism, with the opportunities the younger generation has under the socialist system. By accomplishing this task, it will help young people to discard sentiments of resignation and hopelessness, regain confidence in their potentialities and visualize all the more clearly the future they must fight for.

In speaking of unemployment and its disastrous impact on youth, it would be very wrong not to point out that more and more young men and women realize that the capitalist system has no future and must be replaced. Needless to say, this trend varies from country to country depending largely on how strong the democratic forces and communist influence are. But never before has the youth movement for jobs, the right to education and the right to learn a profession been so powerful as now. The young go into action alongside their elders. Furthermore, young people of differing political views and convictions have in recent years carried out numerous joint actions in defense of their interests.

How effective youth actions are is seen in the fact that today all political and mass organizations show concern, if from different points of view, about the problem of unemployed youth. Hanns Martin Schleyer, President of the Federal Association of German Employers' Unions, said in December 1975 that youth must be integrated into society as a prerequisite of stabilizing the outlook for the

future. What he meant was, of course, the future of big business. The same preoccupation prompted Bonn to announce a special 3 million mark program. Alarmed by the fact that more and more young people turn away from the capitalist system, bourgeois parties profess concern for the interests of youth. The CDU/CSU has advanced an urgent program for ending the shortage of apprenticeship jobs in industry and of unemployment among youth. All these measures are bound to end, as usual, in bug business getting further cash subsidies and bonuses even though this affords youth no greater opportunities for jobs or vocational training. The only effective solution is through measures that would remove the causes of the evil, and not merely ease things for a while.

At a big election meeting called in Göttingen after GCP Days, Hermann Gauthier, deputy Chairman of the Party, listed the urgent steps needed to remedy the youth job situation. Enterprises employing over 1,000 workers must be made to create a total of at least 250,000 new apprentice's jobs providing high skills. Effective steps must be taken to prohibit the dismissal of young workers. 'On completing his apprenticeship, everyone should be given by the enterprise concerned a job according to his qualifications. Young people under 20 years of age should be safeguarded against dismissal on account of age or inadequate experience, which should be included in legal provisions or wages agreements.' Also, a democratic law should be passed on vocational training meeting the demands of the Association of German Trade Unions. In every sphere the trade unions, production councils and youth representatives must be guaranteed the right to participate in management.

The GCP demand that associations of employers be denied the right to impose their will in regard to the training of young workers has won ready approval. To finance an education system taking account of the interests of youth, appropriate funds should be set up to which all enterprises should make cash contributions according to their size and profits. The trade unions must be guaranteed the right to take part in using these funds.

To improve the condition of youth, the GCP demands a cut in arms spending, proposing that part of the released funds be used for ending the crisis in education and for creating new jobs and places of study.

In campaigning for these demands, the GCP tells youth and all working people that to eliminate unemployment and extend the workers' right to participate in management and in every public activity, it is indispensable to curb and ultimately eliminate monopoly power.

The Communist parties of all developed capitalist countries have worked out action programs for combating the effects of the crisis, which also tell seriously on the conditions of youth. As the Com-

munists are the most consistent exponents of the interests of youth, more and more young people are drawn to them. And it is perfectly natural that the party's strength is growing due chiefly to the influx of young people.

The Communists attach decisive political importance to the fact that more and more young men and women devote themselves to the struggle for social progress. They counter the hostile policy of the ruling class toward youth by carrying on an all-out struggle along with and for youth, for the satisfaction of its specific demands, for assigning youth a bigger political and social role. This is also reflected in the joint document of 29 Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, which says: 'The participants in the Conference support the efforts of young people, in whose hands lies the future of our continent, to take part with growing strength in the struggle for a Europe of peace, progress and freedom which marches forward to a socialist future.'

This statement accords fully with the position of our party. Reporting to the Bonn Congress in March 1976, its Chairman, Herbert Mies, said: 'Now and in the near future as never before, every Communist must devote himself to the numerous issues involved in the search for a way out for youth from a grievous situation, concern himself with its problems and side with it everywhere.'

The Communists say with legitimate pride that they are the most determined defenders of the interests of youth, of its present and future, and are on the side of young people who join in struggle for their fundamental rights. Our task was formulated by Marx and Engels. 'The Communists,' they wrote in the *Communist Manifesto,* fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement.'

The Communists give the young no empty promises. They therefore tell youth that it must fight actively if it wants its demands to be met.

---

viewpoints

The development logic of theoretical knowledge

Vladislav Lektorsky
Soviet philosopher

Hamid Safari
Iranian economist

'Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.' Capsuled into these words of Lenin — which are just as valid today as when they were written more than 70 years ago — is the essence of the Communists' attitude to theoretical knowledge. More, the importance of theory for social practice, and primarily for the revolutionary struggle, is constantly increasing.

Socialist and communist construction, the changes in the position and conditions of struggle of the working class and other sections of the working people in capitalist countries, the social processes in the newly-liberated countries, and the worldwide scientific and technological revolution pose many new complex problems requiring creative Marxist-Leninist analysis and interpretative generalization. Hence the heightened interest in how and by what means theory is likely to develop.

The vastly greater scope and practical implications of methodological research to disclose the logic of the rise of new scientific knowledge is a characteristic feature of contemporary science. An understanding of the regularities of our advance to new results in science, of the place and role of the different means and methods employed to obtain such results, is today an essential condition for continued cognitive progress.

Marxist methodological analysis of the development of scientific knowledge rests on the principles and categories of materialist dialectics. These are well known and there is no need to examine them here. Let us merely recall that in analyzing social phenomena, the result is largely determined by a partisan approach. Furthermore, the class position of the researcher is not some external appendage to, but an inherent part of his methodological principles.

In this article we propose to examine, taking as our starting point the principles of Marxist-Leninist methodology and examples of the

theoretical work of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the logic of the motion of cognition from empirical data, from new facts, to the enrichment and concretization of theoretical propositions or the formulation of new ones. Or, in the language of contemporary methodology of science, the correlation of empirical and theoretical knowledge in the development of social practice and science.

Reliable and effective guide to action

A disparaging attitude to theory is wholly alien to Marxism-Leninism, as is also empiricism, so characteristic of many trends of bourgeois philosophy. And it is precisely in the one-dimensional empiricism inherited from the metaphysical philosophy of Locke and the subjective-idealistic philosophy of Berkeley that Marx saw the methodological basis of vulgar bourgeois political economy, which he countered by his scientific theory of economic relations. It was the subjectivist empiricism and positivism of the Machists, who gave their own idealistic and relativist interpretation of the revolution in natural science at the turn of the century, that Lenin criticized in his 'Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,'

Both the proponents of vulgar bourgeois political economy and the Machists maintained that the purpose of theory was to provide a full and scrupulous description of what lay on the surface of phenomena. The Machists, for instance, argued that explanation and disclosure of the essence of regularities was superfluous and, for the sake of 'economy,' counselled that they be removed from science altogether. In fact, Mach included the concept of casuality among the 'parasitic' elements of science.

In criticizing these erroneous views, Marx and Lenin demonstrated that if the investigator is concerned only with describing and systematizing the facts of wark-a-day experience, confining himself to the study of phenomena, with no attempt to penetrate their substance, we are not yet dealing with science. 'The vulgar economist,' Marx wrote, 'thinks he has made a great discovery when, as against the revelation of the inner interconnection, he proudly claims that in appearance things look different. In fact, he boasts that he holds fast to appearance, and takes it for the ultimate. Why, then, have any science at all?' (Letter to Kugelmann, July 11, 1868).

It need hardly be said that in criticizing the empiricism of the vulgar bourgeois economists and the Machists, Marx and Lenin were not negating or belittling the importance of experience. Their criticism was directed against the erroneous philosophico-methodological interpretation of its nature and place in the process of cognition. In its dialectico-materialist understanding, and cleansed of subjectivist and idealist interpretations, experience is an inexhaustible source of sci-

entific knowledge. But, at the same time, dialectical materialism emphasizes that the development of cognition implies more than merely bringing out the content of things, given to us in finished form in our sensations and perceptions, but presupposes its inclusion in more complex cognitive structures and, as a result, the emergence of knowledge that cannot be directly given to us in our sensations and perceptions. In this sense, theory differs from empiricism, first, by the authenticity of the scientific knowledge it provides, second, by generalizing the characteristics of the analyzed phenomena, which makes it possible to forecast new, hitherto unstudied facts, and third, by revealing the interconnection of its laws and propositions.

Counterposing a genuine theoretical understanding of reality to empiricism and practicism has important methodological implications. It safeguards us against unnecessary 'earthliness' in theoretical research, against orientation on current requirements, which deprive theory of its broad historical perspective. As distinct from empiricism, Marxism, as defined by Lenin, 'is a *summing up of experience*, illuminated by a profound philosophical conception of the world and a rich knowledge of history' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 25, p.407). The history of science and philosophy shows that a superficial attitude to theory can result in serious difficulties of a theoretical, cognitive and practical nature. One convincing example is the history of neo-positivism, which laid claim to be the 'philosophy and methodology of modern science.'

Like the Machists, the neo-positivists sought to reduce science to a description and systematization of facts, negating its ability to use the facts to produce new knowledge or reveal new aspects or features of reality inaccessible to direct perception or imperical experience.[1] Their disparaging attitude to theory cost the neo-positivists the trust even of those natural scientists who embraced their doctrine in the 30s through the 50s, and the complete collapse of their philosophical and methodological propositions.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy regards practice as the criterion of the authenticity of scientific knowledge. But a theory that reflects and generalizes objective reality is verified differently from the propositions of empiricist facts, or even empiricist laws. No theoretical proposition can be comprehensively and conclusively refuted without recourse to theoretical arguments. Experience divorced from theory is neither comprehensive nor conclusive. For instance, a fundamental theoretical idea deduced from the totality of objective facts characterizing one or another stage of world development, cannot be refuted simply by pleading that it was formulated and elaborated in a situation different from the present one. A profound appraisal of a theoretical idea, from the standpoint of its fruitfulness and perspec-

tive, cannot be made out of its theoretical context, out of context with the genesis and trends in modern science.

The relative independence of theoretical knowledge becomes especially clear in situations when the facts do not, apparently, correspond to theoretical generalizations. If we take certain important theoretical propositions of Volume I of *Capital* and compare them with formulae in Volume III, we might arrive at an apparent contradiction. Volume I says that surplus value is the product exclusively of the part of capital expended on wages, i.e. variable capital. But in Volume III we find this passage: 'However that may be, the outcome is that surplus value springs simultaneously from all portions of the invested capital.' Following the publication of Volume III, bourgeois economists made much of the alleged contradictions in Marx's economic theory, thereby attesting to their complete ignorance of his theoretical method.

External manifestations of the laws of capitalism not only obscure, but also mystify their essence. Nor is this merely the result of subjective illusions; it is a picture which is bound to arise in everyone involved in capitalist relations, for it is the result of the objective circumstances on the surface of capitalist society: the capitalist identifies production costs with the real cost of the commodity. This is an expression of the capitalist mode of production, for, to quote Volume III again, '. . . in capitalist economics the cost price assumes a false appearance of a category of value production itself.' To characterize this relationship, Marx introduced a special term, 'converted form,' widely employed by Marxist researchers. Production costs in a capitalist economy are typical of this 'converted form.'

And so, the contention that surplus value originates in all parts of the invested capital does not reflect the actual state of affairs, but is only an objective empirical vision. The introduction into our analysis of such a factor as the position of the individual capitalist removes the apparent contradiction between the theoretical proposition in Volume I, which expresses the essence of economic processes in capitalist society, and the economic analysis in Volume III, which discloses the external, distorted manifestation of these essential processes.

The 'converted form,' we believe, can be fruitfully applied also to analysis of other aspects of capitalist development, e.g., the dialectics of the substance and form of state power under state-monopoly capitalism. Marxism-Leninism has convincingly demonstrated that, from the standpoint of its socio-class essence, the modern bourgeois state is a dictatorship of monopoly capitalism. It maintains itself in power not only by the outright terror that is part of fascist regimes. In many cases imperialism's political system functions also in democratic forms, thereby obscuring and mystifying its class nature.[2] Thus

surface images produce misleading notions about the ability of the bourgeois system to express the will and interests of all sections of the population, of the 'majority,' and so on. And it is these 'converted forms' of real relations — precisely because they produce surface images — that appear to the ordinary bourgeois mentality as 'self-evident' and 'authentic.' A study of how this 'self-evidence' is formed and maintained, and how false notions of the relation between democracy, freedom and dictatorship under capitalism are kept alive, acquires particular theoretical and political importance now that imperialism is adapting to the changed conditions of history.

Or this example: ideologists of the 'white revolution' in Iran manipulate surface technical and economic data, but disregard the social and economic factors, to prove that Iran now has a non-capitalist mixed economy. The supporting evidence most often used is the rapid growth of the state sector, which is presented as a form of classless 'people's' ownership, though the facts will show that the mixed economy is a form of capitalist development.

The social essence of the state sector is determined primarily by the class character of state power, and in Iran state power is in the hands of the big capitalists and landowners. The state sector, part of the mixed economy, serves as a means of creating favorable material and technical conditions for the expansion of private capitalist enterprise. The bourgeois character of state property is evidenced also by the regime's policy of giving foreign monopoly capital a generous share in joint enterprises. This 'big industry strategy,' to use a term current in Iran, tends to ruin small and middle capitalists or to bring them under the tight control of local and foreign big capital. These tendencies are indicative of qualitative changes in Iran's capitalist evolution. The material groundwork is being laid for its conversion from state capitalism with its multi-formation basis into state-monopoly capitalism. Such is the essence of the mixed economy. It differs fundamentally from its external form, which creates an entirely false impression of Iran's socio-economic basis.

The methodological conclusion from the foregoing is that the apparent disparity between theoretical ideas and one or another empirical fact does not per se prove that the theoretical idea has to be discarded or revised, for we might be dealing with the results of unfinished or incomplete theoretical analysis. That is all the more so when we are dealing not with everyday facts or real, historically recorded events, but with possible trends of development. To elevate to a theoretical generalization a proposition untested by experience and unbacked by a reliable body of argument, means, willingly or unwillingly, belittling the value of theory.

The efficacy of theory lies in its ability — even before practice

pronounces its final verdict — to test the 'durability' of one or another generalization through discussion, comparison of viewpoints and experience. This benefits both theory and practice.

'There is nothing more practical than a good theory.' These words, by a renowned physicist of our time, aptly define, we think, the place of theory in the study and practical repatterning of reality. Theory gives practice what it cannot acquire from experience divorced from theory. But only theoretical knowledge capable of accumulating and interpreting new data gained from practice and scientific cognition can be a reliable and effective guide to action. How is theoretical knowledge enriched?

The development dialectics of theory

Science is now developing amidst sharp struggle against mistaken ideas about the mechanism and laws that govern the growth of our knowledge. That lends special importance to the theoretical conclusions and generalizations we draw from the new data provided by practice and scientific cognition.

Some absolutize the relatively of science, the interruptions in its development. For these relativist-subjectivist interpretations of the nature of theoretical creativity, the value of theoretical thought lies not in its authenticity but rather in its 'newness.'

Proponents of dogmatic-metaphysical conceptions go to the other extreme, denying the legitimacy of the new and examining every event merely as an illustration and confirmation of long-discovered general regularities. The development of theory is reduced to extending a system of stagnant concepts to more and more types or classes of events and phenomena. Established theoretical concepts and principles are regarded as absolute truths that do not require enrichment or concretization. Not so very long ago such views enjoyed wide currency in the natural sciences and in non-Marxist philosophy.

Employing general theoretical propositions in analyzing new empirical data is, of course, an important element in promoting scientific, including theoretical, knowledge. The question, however, is how these theoretical propositions are applied. Is it merely a case of attaching 'theoretical labels' on new 'empirical raw material,' bypassing the process of analyzing experience to draw theoretical conclusions? Obviously not.

The history of science knows situations in which it was necessary to concretize general theoretical ideas, impart a more precise content to their principles and formulate new theoretical generalizations. Such situations arise not only as a consequence of the emergence of new facts, but also out of the very logic of scientific development. One example is the revolution in the natural sciences at the turn of the

century. The special, and later general, theory of relativity, and quantum mechanics injected new ideas into science which not only explained the new experimental data, but prompted scientists to rethink many of the fundamental theoretical ideas of classical natural science.

Bourgeois philosophers, and also many scientists, interpreted this revolution as the collapse of the entire system of theoretical physics and of the old, classical guidelines. Lenin showed that this relativist interpretation of science was unfounded, and developed the theory of the dialectics of absolute, relative and objective truth, which provided a key to understanding the real change-processes in science.[3]

Lenin demonstrated that the development of science is an endless process of approximation to the absolute truth, a process of progressively more accurate and fuller reflection of objective reality. No genuine scientific knowledge tested by socio-historical practice is ever lost. It becomes a part of the theoretical edifice erected in the course of scientific advance. Nor is it merely a matter of adding new bricks to the foundation: ideas about the plan of the edifice, the place of one or another of its elements, can change in the course of construction. But not a single brick is thrown out, if we take 'bricks' to mean objectively authentic knowledge and not delusions, of which there are no few in science, and which are discarded in the course of scientific progress.[4]

The strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its constant creative development. We know with what keen attention the founders of Marxism-Leninism followed the emergence of new data in social practice and in science and, conversely, how irreconcilable they were to all attempts to disregard new phenomena and social processes. 'We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable,' Lenin wrote in one of his early works. 'On the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life' (Vol. 4, pp. 211-12). And Lenin consistently followed that principle, just as it is being followed by fraternal Communist Parties in creatively interpreting and generalizing the experience of building socialism in differing conditions (thus demonstrating its common regularities and the diversity of concrete forms); defense of the people's vital interests; the fight for socialism in countries with different economic and political levels. 'All this,' L.I. Brezhnev told the Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, 'requires analysis and generalization, and doubly so because, apart from its very own specific features deriving from national peculiarities, the experience of every fraternal Party necessarily contains common features of interest to our entire movement. Also, life continuously

adds something new to the objective socio-political and economic processes in the individual countries and on the world scale . . .'

Lenin's work, in which concern for the principles of Marxist theory and practice are organically combined with profound interpretation of new processes and phenomena, are a model of creative approach to the development of theory. In the context of this article, which treats the relation between experimental data and theoretical generalization, we propose to examine some aspects of Lenin's methodology of analyzing social processes.

First, there is his understanding of the very process of applying theoretical ideas and principles to analysis of new empirical realities. Lenin demonstrated that the application of theory is, by its very nature, a creative process in the course of which there arise such questions as the similarity and dissimilarity of past and present practical problems; to what extent analysis of past situations and the theoretical solutions based thereon are applicable to new situations; what correctives are required in accepted generalizations to devise optimal solutions of a given problem, etc.

In one of his early polemical works, 'On the So-Called Market Question' (1893), in which he refutes the Narodnik contention that Russia was not undergoing capitalist development and that Marxist methodology was inappropriate to examining its social and economic trends, Lenin did not confine himself to the statement that Marx's general propositions were fully applicable to Russia's conditions, but cited a wealth of supporting evidence. And the evidence was not confined to facts, because facts can be contradictory and must be correctly understood and interpreted, which presupposes development of the theory involved by enriching and concretizing its initial premises. To give a scientific explanation of the ruin and pauperization of the Russian peasantry and reply to the question whether this supports the contention that there cannot be a capitalist market nor capitalist development in Russia, Lenin developed and rendered more precise a number of cardinal theoretical propositions set out in *Capital*. Reference is to the schemes of simple and extended capitalist reproduction.

In particular, Lenin showed that the classical scheme of extended reproduction given in *Capital* does not take into consideration technical progress. If it is taken into consideration 'there will be a relatively more rapid increase in means of production than in articles of consumption' (Vol. 1, p. 85). Having constructed a new scheme of reproduction which concretizes Marx's formula, Lenin draws the theoretically important conclusion that pauperization of the peasantry and development of the market, despite the apparent contradiction between the two, are not mutually exclusive processes. The impoverishment of the masses of the people 'not only does not hinder

the development of capitalism, but, on the contrary, is the expression of that development, is a condition of capitalism and strengthens it' (Vol. 1, p. 102).

And this second example: Lenin's careful and responsible approach to concretizing and rendering more precise the propositions enunciated by the founders of scientific socialism. He never lightheartedly tried to 'enrich' the ideas and concepts of Marxist theory. The golden rule of science, so scrupulously followed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, is that any proposition that lays claim to the status of a theoretical thesis or statement must be measured not only against the totality of objective facts, but also against their theoretical understanding. Lenin emphasized that every proposition of *Capital* rests on a veritable 'Mont Blanc of facts.' And these facts are considered in their historical context and enriched by scientific theory. That appraisal fully applies to all of Lenin's works.

Needless to say, the movement from new data of practice and cognition to theoretical ideas can and does give rise to difficulties of a gnoseological and methodological nature. And it is precisely gnoseological causes stemming from the very complexity of the cognitive process that often produce inadequately substantiated, superficial, at times even erroneous theoretical generalizations and conclusions. In bourgeois society, such 'thought blunders' in the social sciences have a definite social function: bourgeois ideologists fashion them into false, unscientific concepts designed to defend an obsolescent social system. Communists, too, are not insured against mistakes. But in the communist movement, taken as a whole, there are no social factors that tend to harden wrong generalizations drawn from theoretical interpretation of new phenomena. On the contrary, the Communists who speak for the working class, the most revolutionary class of our era, whose interests fully accord with the requirements of social progress, have a stake in cognizing the objective truth. The best proof of that is the continuous progress of Marxism-Leninism, its enrichment and concretization in present-day conditions by the collective effort of the fraternal parties.

The Communist devote much attention to the entire range of questions involved in the further creative elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory. The program of the People's Party of Iran declares that the party's immediate and ultimate aims and its political course 'are determined by creative application of this scientific revolutionary world outlook in the specific conditions of Iranian society.'

Marxist-Leninist methodology, General Secretary Brezhnev declared at the 25th CPSU Congress, is incompatible both with scholastic theorizing divorced from reality and with a narrow utilitarian attitude to theory. Theoretical carelessness, attempts to sacrifice

fundamental propositions to some falsely understood immediate practical benefits might, from the standpoint of the broader perspectives of revolutionary practice, turn out to be losses.

Monism versus pluralism

A characteristic feature of scientific knowledge, one fully inherent in Marxism-Leninism, is monism. Unity of scientific knowledge, the universality of its laws and concepts, rest on the firm foundation of the material unity of natural and social reality. The history of philosophy and science will show that attempts to weaken or demolish the universality and unity of scientific knowledge have always tended to denigrate science and have contributed to unscientific forms of understanding reality (religion, mythology, mysticism, vulgar empiricism, etc.). There have even been attempts to provide a methodological foundation for these unscientific concepts, for instance, the 'post-positivist' concepts of philosophy and research methodology which latterly have won wide currency in a number of capitalist countries. Coined to provide a way out of the profound crisis of neo-positive methodology, they are predicated on the belief that science requires constant renewal of its conceptualizing apparatus (T. Kun, P. Feyerabend, et al).[5]

Sterile empiricism, so characteristic of positivism and neo-positivism, is in many cases being replaced by a more sophisticated relativism which sees in theoretical pluralism and the constant interruption and demolition of continuity in the development of knowledge the key conditions for the promotion of scientific thought. Some post-positivists even uphold 'anarchistic epistemology,' according to which scientific progress should welcome the coexistence and confrontation not only of differing theoretical concepts and concrete ways of solving one or another problem, but also incompatible philosophico-gnoseological theories of science.[6] What we get, in short, is the view that the greater the confusion of fundamental principles in one or another branch of learning, the greater will be scientific progress.

Post-positivist ideas are widely used to justify the theoretical confusion that reigns in the bourgeois social sciences. And it should not be hard to recognize the ideological kinship between the concepts of theoretical and methodological pluralism and attempts to question the universal, international character of Marxism-Leninism, fragmentize it into national and regional entities and thereby prove the legitimacy of different 'Marxisms.' It would eminently suit the opponents of Marxism-Leninism if such relativism and subjectivism could be injected into the theory of scientific socialism and deprive the Communist and Workers' Parties of their unitarian philosophical and

theoretical basis. There has been much talk of late about so-called 'Eurocommunism' (based on the peculiarities of various countries, which no one, incidentally, denies) as a specific 'interpretation' by West European Communist Parties of Marxism-Leninism that is at variance with its 'traditional' interpretation. All this talk about different 'Marxisms' has no basis either in fact or in theory and, as we know, is rejected by the Communist Parties.

Marxism-Leninism is a united, integral doctrine, with all its basic principles and ideas interconnected and interdependent, as if cast from one piece of steel. It is a theory from which one cannot extract a single essential part without negating the whole. There can be no place here for subjectivism, eclectic selection, 'preference' for some of its parts and fundamental ideas to others.

The principles of Marxism-Leninism are international by their very essence. Marx, Engels and Lenin never confined their research to Europe or Russia, and their conclusions have worldwide and not merely national or regional implications. Marxism-Leninism is universal also in its geographical extension. It is premised on the fact that the confrontation of proletariat and bourgeoisie, the rise and development of the communist socio-economic formation, are not confined to any particular country, but extend to the entire world and therefore represent the content of modern social history. Its motto is internationalism, which is incompatible both with contempt of the interests of one or another nation and with absolutizing these interests.

The typology of scientific theory is not national or regional, but according to the various disciplines, the logical structure of the system of scientific knowledge. There is no such thing as Russian physics, Italian mathematics, Swedish biology or South American chemistry. Science knows no national boundaries.

Specific conditions naturally lay their imprint on solution of the problems that arise in the course of the struggle and lead to different conclusions from analysis of concrete situations. However, this multiformity, even on cardinal questions, does not overshadow the deep community of Communist aims, or agreement on the main problems of our time, which follow from the common philosophical and theoretical basis of the Communist movement. Convincing proof of that will be found in the common appraisals and views on fundamental questions set out in the final document of the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties.

Socio-revolutionary practice calls for bold creative development of theory. But such development can be fruitful and scientific only if it rests on the time-tested principles of Marxism-Leninism.

1. See F. Frank, *The Philosophy of Science,* Moscow, 1960; R. Karnap, *The Philosophical Foundations of Physics,* Moscow, 1971; H. Reichenbach, *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy,* Berkely and Los Angeles, 1950; C. Hempel, *The Theoretician's Dilemma,* Minneapolis, 1956; etc.; Empiricism, so characteristic of positivism and pragmatism, enjoys wide currency in Iran. The most active propagandists of these bourgeois philosophical-methodological concepts are Tabatabai, Siasi and Sanai, Positivism and empiricism are trenchantly criticized in many Marxist works, among which we might mention M. Cornforth, *Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy,* London, 1965; V.S. Shvyryov, *Neo-Positivism and Empiricist Substantiation of Science,* Moscow, 1966; and L. Sève, *La philosophie francaise contemporaine,* Paris, 1962.

2. Besides, many democratic gains are the direct result of the workers' hard-fought struggle. Consequently, the very possibility of such gains stems not from the good will of the ruling classes but from the revolutionary potential of their antipode.

3. Marxist philosophers have analyzed the essence and causes of the revolution in natural science, drawing the necessary methodological lessons and conclusions. See, among others, B.M. Kedrov, *Lenin and the Dialectics of 20th Century Natural Science,* Moscow, 1971.

4. These problems are discussed in the following works, among others: P.N. Fedoseyev, *The Dialectics of our Epoch,* Moscow, 1975; P.V. Kopnin, *The Gnoseological and Logical Foundations of Science,* Moscow, 1974; *The Lenin Theory of Reflection and Modern Science,* Vols. 1-3, Sofia, 1973; *Lenin et la pratique scientifique,* Paris, 1974.

5. T. Kun, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* Moscow, 1975; P. Feyerabend, *Problems of Impiricism. Beyond the Edge of Certainty,* New Jersey, 1965; P. Feyerabend, *Problems of Empiricism II. The Nature and Function of Scientific Theory,* Pittsburgh, 1970; *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge,* Cambridge, 1970. Some proponents of this concept say that theirs is a dialectical approach and others (Feyerabend) even lay claim to a dialectico-materialist approach.

6. P. Feyerabend. *Against Method,* London, 1975.

Democracy and the class struggle in Denmark

Ib Nørlund
EC member, Secretary,
CC CP of Denmark

The world is now at the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism and this is the pivot of the class struggle growing in breadth and depth in the non-socialist countries and on the international scene. The historic need to complete this process is becoming ever more imperative.

It is only natural, therefore, that Communist and Workers' Parties should concentrate more and more on working out ways and means of going over to the new society with due regard to the conditions and

prerequisites existing in their respective countries. This applies in full measure to the Communist Party of Denmark. After a two-year debate among its members, followed by a public discussion, the 25th Congress of our party (September 1976) adopted a new program dealing largely with the above task.

Denmark has strong democratic traditions. That accounts for the fact that the capitalist system and the class domination of the bourgeoisie have taken the form of relatively developed bourgeois democracy. This makes the problem of interconnection of the class struggle and the struggle for democracy very important in shaping our party's policy and strategy. In grappling with it, we are guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, the experience of the struggle of the working class and the conditions prevailing in Danish society.

'Democracy' or 'people's rule,' is a well-known term. Even so, it will not be amiss to specify its meaning, all the more since lately people holding the most diverse views have come to regard themselves as 'democrats' or 'representaatives of democracy.' We must ask ourselves: What does fighting for democracy imply today? What is meant by winning democracy? What is the connection between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism?

In an antagonistic class society, the struggle for democracy does not imply an immediate change in the existing social system. Its first aim is to wrest concessions from the ruling classes so as to meet the pressing needs of the workers and other people and extend their social rights. Hence, the aim is to bring about social relations enabling the people to actively uphold their interests. This is the way to win democratic forms and conditions favorable to the expansion of the class struggle and affording the people new opportunities to restrict the privileges of the ruling and exploiting classes. The content and nature of this democracy depend on the balance of class forces in society, which may change under the impact of the working people's growing activity. It is democracy based on and achieved solely through the people's active effort.

The struggle for socialism goes further than that. Its purpose is to change the very foundations of society, primarily relations of ownership of the means of production. By defeating and abolishing the class domination of capital, it paves the way for a higher and more progressive form of people's rule, socialist democracy, which both makes possible and guarantees the working people's active participation in the defense of their interests.

It follows that there is an inseparable dialetical connection between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism.

Sustained action by the working class and the masses generally in defense of their elementary and other rights, which are flouted by the

monopolies, is indispensable political schooling. All the lessons of history indicate that in battling with the exploiting classes, the working people make the most far-reaching, revolutionary gains precisely when their struggle is based on the experience and methods acquired in general democratic action.

The struggle of the working class for socialism is, in effect, the most determined, comprehensive and consistent struggle for democracy. There is ample proof that the founders of Marxism were right in proclaiming, in the *Communist Manifesto,* that 'the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.'

Lenin revealed this interconnection between the day-to-day struggle for democracy and the revolutionary transformation of society. He stressed that 'in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy.'

The experience of the working class in the countries where socialism has become a reality indicates the existence of this general law: the transition to socialism is always the result of the working class and peoples' struggle for democratic goals growing into a struggle for socialism. The law operates irrespective of the diversity of forms in which the two struggles are carried on.

A highly important factor in socialism's first victory, the Great October Socialist Revolution, was the political activity of the masses which preceded it and which developed, especially between February and October 1917, into a struggle for freedom, peace, bread and land, that is, for democratic demands.

Lenin pointed out that the proletarian party should under no circumstances set itself the task of 'introducing' socialism in a petty-bourgeois country until the overwhelming majority of the population have realized the necessity for a socialist revolution. The struggle for democratic objectives increased the political awareness of the masses and their acceptance of the revolutionary doctrine; the majority were convinced that socialism was the only answer.

In several other countries, the prerequisites of the general democratic struggle becoming a struggle for direct socialist change emerged during World War II. Anti-fascist liberation movements against the nazi invaders and domestic reaction intensified the militancy of the masses and culminated in democratic risings. After that came a search for ways and means of establishing and furthering democracy. With the resultant emergence of the 'new democracy' or 'people's democracy.' In all these cases the task was to consolidate people's power, and experience has shown that the only way in which demo-

cratic gains could be upheld was by taking the socialist road.

In the postwar period, the progress of democratic and anti-imperialist struggle provided new opportunities for the people's effective advance to socialism. In some countries, such as Cuba, the socialist social system took root as a logical result of the national-liberation rising of the masses. The possibilities of discarding the old order and taking the non-capitalist road of development contribute in large measure to democratic activity in the fight against imperialism.

The many forms in which the historically outdated capitalist formation is succeeded by socialism are indicative of the revolutionary creativity of the workers and other people. They enrich our theory and carry it forward, confirming again and again the validity of its well-known conclusion that there is no one 'model' of transition to socialism, that there is no, nor can there be, a standard 'guide' directing the everyday practice of revolutionaries in all countries and in all conditions.

On the other hand, the diversity of forms and methods of the revolutionary movement cannot obscure the common content of this world process, nor its fundamental laws as revealed by Marxism-Leninism.

One of these laws is that the working class undoubtedly is, and has to be, the motive power in the struggle to curb and eliminate capitalist power and assure the progress of society. But precisely because the working class also upholds the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people, it is not alone in its struggle. It enters into alliances with other social classes and strata whose interests are likewise flouted by the ruling elite.

The unity of the working class itself and the solidity of its alliance with other social strata and groups are cardinal conditions for its becoming a transforming social force. And the road to this unity and alliance is through struggle for democracy, through study and assimiliation of the experience gained by the masses in democratic movements and through setting the people ever more far-reaching objectives that accord with their vital interests.

In what way can the working people of a country such as ours rise to recognition of the need to fight for the progress of democracy to the point of overthrowing capitalist class rule by revolutionary means? We have a key to the answer in the dialectics of the political and class struggle pointed out by Lenin in *The State and Revolution*. 'To develop democracy *to the utmost,* find the *forms* for this development, to test them *by practice,* and so forth,' Lenin wrote, 'all this is one of the component tasks of the struggle for the social revolution. Taken separately, no kind of democracy will bring socialism. But in actual life democracy will never be "taken separately"; it will be

"taken together" with other things, it will exert its influence on economic life as well, will stimulate *its* transformation; and in its turn it will be influenced by economic development, and so on. This is the dialectics of living history' (Vol. 25, pp. 452-453).

There is now an imperative need to carry forward democracy by creating new democratic institutions and agencies to uphold the working people's interests. In some cases this stems directly from the growth of the productive forces, which stimulates large-scale production, poses environmental problems and directly worsens the people's living and working conditions under capitalism. This, in turn, compels the working people to associate in organizations that are new in form or purpose, that is, to evolve new forms of democracy.

The struggle for the satisfaction of current needs is not confined to the demand for higher wages and a better standard of life. It is also a struggle for greater participation in decision-making on environmental protection, energy, transport, housing and other social problems.

These are some new aspects of the struggle for democracy and they cannot be examined in isolation from the class struggle, the balance of class forces and the fact that the bourgeoisie, too, is trying to adapt to the changed conditions.

The ruling class makes maximum use of forms and methods of state-monopoly capitalism, which represents an unprecedented interlocking of the economic power of monopoly and the political power of the state. This leads inevitably to the working people's economic struggle developing into a political struggle. The actions of the working class and its allies on the common platform of general democratic demands become an *anti-monopoly* struggle directed against the monopolies' power and their government institutions.

There are new opportunities today for the expansion of this anti-monopoly and democratic struggle. They are due above all to the changed alignment of international forces, primarily to the victory of socialism and its historic achievements in a number of countries. This means that the monopolies operating through states subordinated to them can no longer impose their will on the peoples are brazenly as in the past.

Owing to the deep crisis of the state-monopoly system, increasing segments of the population of capitalist countries are becoming aware of the need for fundamental social change. At the same time, the monopolies are trying to maximize their profits by oppressing and exploiting increasingly wider social strata, a trend which expands the objective basis for the formation of anti-monopoly alliances.

The struggle against monopoly is a struggle for the fulfillment of democracy. The historical roots of this struggle in Denmark lie in the tradition of democratic and popular movements, in actions by pro-

gressive democrats against landowner power in the last century, peasant movements for a democratic reform of agrarian relations and agricultural production on cooperative principles at the turn of the century, national and democratic struggles for freedom during the nazi occupation, and anti-militarist and anti-imperialist sentiments, which are now part of the social psychology of the masses. All this is a sound starting point for evolving new forms of struggle for democracy.

But this is not enough. The experience of working-class and democratic movements in Denmark shows that in spite of certain gains and concessions wrested from the ruling class, the development of society as a whole has not been geared to the working people's needs, to say nothing of the fact that there has been no 'growing into socialism' as some prophets predicted. When, in 1971, the Social Democratic Party of Denmark was celebrating its centenary its leaders had to admit that the distribution of the national wealth among what they call the 'upper, lower and middle classes' had undergone no change within a century. The class rule of capital is still there. The struggle for democracy has stopped at the barrier of bourgeois democracy.

In hard times, especially in periods of crisis or war, capital cynically carried on *its* class struggle, ignoring all democratic gains or 'rules.' The forms of bourgeois democracy were pushed aside and its class nature as dictatorship of the bourgeoisie was fully revealed. These class limitations of the earlier democratic struggle predetermined the deep crisis into which monopoly power has now plunged Danish society.

On the other hand, the Danish ruling class could in the past afford to preserve its profits and its political and economic supremacy over long periods by using relatively flexible methods to solve social problems. This was due, in particular, to Denmark's independent position on the world market and to its neutrality. This gave rise to illusions about the essential distinctions setting Danish capitalism apart from capitalism elsewhere. Reformist illusions gained ground in the working-class movement. In the favorable economic situation of the 60s, such illusions found a new receptive soil, and were boosted by the 'welfare state' propaganda. Recent developments show, however, that these distinctions were a passing phenomenon.

By now the monopolies have firmly tied the country to the overall policy of imperialism. By joining NATO and the Common Market, Denmark, a weaker partner, has shouldered an additional burden of the world capitalist crisis. In line with the supra-national policy of these blocs, the monopolies now attack the interests of the working class to rob it of gains made over a long period of class struggle. The concessions won from the 'welfare state' are being whittled away.

Democratic rights especially those relating to labor agreements are being withdrawn. Unemployment, said to have been abolished, has assumed a chronic character and wide dimensions.

But all of the monopolies' reactionary state-monopoly measures are proving inadequate for managing their own system. Accordingly, they are now contemplating the possibility of scrapping democratic forms. That the ruling quarters are laying such plans is seen, among others, in the following comment made by *Berlingske Tidente* (October 3), an influential bourgeois daily published in Copenhagen: 'How many abortive plans for a way out of the crisis have there been, how many useless attempts to stop the growing balance of payment deficit, how many fruitless efforts to curb unemployment, how many barren intentions to check growing inflation! Will not the moment come when no more solutions can be achieved by democratic means?'

All this, it may be said, drives home the need to carry the democratic struggle beyond the framework of bourgeois democracy and orient it on the defeat of bourgeois dictatorship and monopoly domination. With this aim in view, our program urges struggle, not for *bourgeois* democracy, but for *'anti-monopoly democracy* under which the people would gain new and more extensive democratic rights and use them in government institutions to crush the power of big capital. . . . The object of a consistently democratic policy is to utilize the country's riches and potentialities to improve the working people's life, meet their material and cultural requirements and enable them to make full use of their new and unfettered opportunities to achieve prosperity. Planned economic development should be based on these considerations and not on the principle of big capital, "What is good for the OK* is good for us all".'

This policy can be implemented given active participation by the masses in upholding their interests. This calls for more fundamental democratic rights and freedoms to rule out big capital interference in national policy-making.

A democratic economic policy must be based on social ownership, public control and the winning of key economic positions by the working people. This calls for democratic nationalization of the monopolies, big banks, credit institutions and insurance companies so as to ensure effective management of the socialized economy in the people's interests. Such democratic management of the economy can, according to our program, be based on the development of the cooperative movement.

The program shows in detail the substantial changes in both the

* *Ostasiatiske Kompagni*, a trading, shipping and industrial company. — *Ed.*

economy and other public spheres what a democratic policy directed against big capital will bring about.

To us, anti-monopoly democracy is no rigid concept nor an 'intermediate form' between capitalism and socialism. The program points to precisely the dynamic character of this democracy, stressing that it 'ushers in a new social process capable of assuring the working people decisive progress and making them confident of their ability to manage society. It can provide conditions for political and social struggle in which the transition to socialism can take place without civil war, as a result of active democratic struggle.'

All that Denmark's Communists propose is renewal and continuation of the democratic ideas and actions of the masses, but adapted to the requirements of our time. In this, development of the independent activity of the working class and other working people in defending their interests is of decisive importance.

This line of political and ideological struggle is the exact opposite of the new, manifestly anti-democratic trends encouraged by bourgeois ideologists in capitalist countries.

They claim that the crisis of state-monopoly capitalism is a product of democratic theories and practices. A typical argument is that for the state to risk allowing citizens who ignore a minimum of the rules of the game to take part in decision-making is against the interests of responsible social management.* The allusion, of course, is to the Communists, the trade unions and all who openly disagree with the class rule of the bourgeoisie. Statements of this kind merely express the invariable attitude of monopoly, which resists the growth of social activity by the people.

Bourgeois and reformist ideologists, who say that democracy is 'outliving' its usefulness and ceasing to function under contemporary capitalism, invariably deny the achievements of socialist democracy and are studiously silent about the experience of existing socialism in drawing the masses into the management of society. Yet the socialist construction shows that the revolutionary transformation of production relations is also necessary if society is to be managed by and for the people.

In analyzing the intricate interconnections of the democratic aspirations of the masses and the class struggle of the proletariat, Lenin described the stage that the revolutionary movement was reaching as the 'boundary line at which consistent democracy, on the one hand, is *transformed* into socialism and, on the other, *demands* socialism.'

To bring the workers and people to this stage is a task we set in the unfolding democratic anti-monopoly struggle, linking our road to socialism to the accomplishment of this task.

* See M. Crozier, S. Huntington, I. Watanuki, *The Crisis of Democracy*. New York, 1975. p. 17.

Book reviews

IN THE CAUSE OF COMMUNISM

A.P. Kirilenko, *Selected Speeches and Articles* (in Russian). Moscow, Politizdat, 1976, 512 pp.

The book under review contains articles as well as reports and speeches made by Politburo member and Central Committee secretary Andrei Kirilenko at anniversary and other meetings in the Soviet Union and at the congresses of the Chilean, French, Mongolian, Italian and Czechoslovak Communists in the period from July 1965 to June 1976.

This period witnessed signal achievements in all spheres of Soviet life and deep-going positive changes on the world scene. Accordingly, the problems dealt with in the book are varied. Yet it constitutes an integral whole because it elucidates the Party's policy as worked out by the October (1964) plenum of its Central Committee and by its 23rd, 24th and 25th congresses.

The main trends in the building of communism in the USSR, the goals set by the CPSU at the present stage, and the ways of attaining them, are outlined in the book.

These goals are: to effect a steady rise in the material and cultural standards by building up the economic potential, speeding up technological progress, raising the efficiency of social production and improving the quality of the goods produced; to promote socialist democracy, consolidate the friendship and fraternal alliance of the Soviet peoples, and foster the all-round development of the individual. These goals, which emanate from the very essence of the socialist system, and consistent work to achieve them, show the humanism of Soviet society and the Party's Leninist policy.

The author notes that the program for the further building of communism drawn up by the 25th CPSU Congress lays fresh emphasis on concern for the working man, for the people. The Congress decisions signify the USSR's entry into a new stage at which the advantages and potentialities of developed socialist society are even more conspicuous.

Much attention is given to an analysis of the tasks that the CPSU has been tackling in the course of communist construction. Whatever problems the Communist Party deals with — the improvement of economic management and planning or the gradual convergence of the classes and social groups, the further development of culture, or ideological and educational work — its policy is invariably marked by a comprehensive approach to social phenomena, by scientific substantiation and a spirit of innovation.

The enhancement of the Party's guiding role, the author notes, is a fundamental law of socialism that applies not only to the Soviet Union. The keynote of the book is the need for constant improvement of the style and methods of Party work, and loyalty to the Leninist norms of inner Party life as an indispensable requisite for increasing the Party's influence in all spheres of social life.

Practically all the selections in the book elucidate the basic aspects of the CPSU's foreign policy and the problems of the struggle for peace, democracy, social progress and socialism. Dealing with the energetic and multiform foreign policy activities of the CPSU, with the achievements made and the difficulties involved, and with the tasks yet to be tackled, the author says that the Party's foreign policy concentrates on making political détente irreversible and backing it up with military détente, on halting the arms race.

The CPSU takes a class approach to the solution of these pressing problems. Stressing that the CPSU and the Soviet state regard the peace endeavors as part of the fight for social progress, democracy and socialism, and that détente and peaceful coexistence do not abolish the objective laws of class struggle, the author notes that the chief factor that made for positive changes in the international situation is the growing might of the socialist states, their coordinated and dynamic foreign policies. 'The consolidation of the unity of the socialist community,' Kirilenko says, 'is seen by our Party as the earnest of success of the socialist countries in the all-round development of the new society, the foundation for further change in the alignment of world forces in favor of socialism and peace' (p. 503).

Considerable attention is devoted to the CPSU's effort to cement the unity of the communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Expounding the Party's stand on that issue, the author writes that the varying conditions in which the Communists of different countries operate require a creative approach to the problems and tasks involved. But he adds that while paying due regard to these specific conditions, the CPSU takes full account of the general laws governing socialist revolution and the building of socialism, of the need for close interaction among the Communist and Workers' Parties in the struggle for their common goals. This interaction is pivoted

on proletarian internationalism — a key principle of Marxism-Leninism. 'The policy of the Soviet Union, of the socialist community,' Kirilenko says, 'is a class-based, internationalist policy. Our country's support for the revolutionary, liberation movements of the peoples is of paramount importance for the sublime cause of reshaping the world' (p. 504).

Yu. Solodukhin

THE HAWKS REVEAL THEMSELVES

Janes W. Canan, *The Superwarriors. The Fantastic World of Pentagon Superweapons.* New York, Weybright and Talley, 1975, 375 pp.

The U.S. 'national defense' budget for the fiscal year ending in September 1977 is more than $113 billion.[1] But 'national defense' in official U.S. jargon is an elastic term. To the announced Pentagon budget, as economist Victor Perlo points out,[2] should be added the 'international affairs' budget of $9.7 billion and many more billions for 'defense-related' activities.[3] Moreover, the Pentagon's 'civil activities should certainly be included.[4]

Clearly, such gigantic military expenditures manifest a callous disregard of the domestic needs[5] and contempt for the obligations solemnly undertaken by the government to promote further relaxation of international tensions.

What is the reason for the huge U.S. military spending at a time when the ideas of international détente are gaining popularity the world over?

James Canan, a journalist specializing in the U.S. military establishment for *Business Week* magazine, presents some material shedding light on this circumstance. His book has the stamp of an authentic representation of the thinking of the more hawkish circles of U.S. policy-makers. The author seems to enjoy the confidence of high-ranking officials of the military establishment and, essentially, agrees with the military-political rationale of the Pentagon.

The rationale is a version of the well-known but thoroughly discredited cold-war concepts. The author quotes former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, who is considered one of the most articulate of the hawks, as saying: '. . . if we lack an adequate military establishment, we will be hard put to play the leadership role that we must play in the world.' (p. 118)

In support of these doctrines the U.S. policy-makers adduce doctored figures, speculation and fraud, which is repeated to the point of tedium, that the USSR is spending more on arms than the United

States, while every change in the international situation resulting from the interaction of the three currents of the revolutionary process is attributed to Soviet 'plots' and 'machinations.'

The hawks pretend to be seeking alternatives other than 'suicide or surrender,' other than escalation to all-out nuclear war, and maintain that these alternatives do not include a disarming first strike. (p. 128)

Yet, the data produced by the author show that each of the services is working day and night in search of a 'doomsday weapon.' In 1973 the General Accounting Office reported 116 weapons systems in development at a cost of $153 billion, which include production costs.' (p. 17).

A number of these weapons is listed either in development or in he procurement stage. These include methods of weather modification to trigger earthquakes, catastrophic cloudbursts, electromagnetic and acoustic fields in the ocean — in fact, all kinds of warfare which the Soviet Union is striving to have the United Nations prohibit.

As revealed by the author, the thinking of the hawks tries to lay the blame on technology as the arch-villain of the arms buildup, letting off the hook the military-industrial complex, the giant monopolies and the financial oligarchies, the real dictators of policy and of the arms race.

The book makes evident how powerful are the pressures exerted at present for wrecking the efforts toward relaxation and concentrating the country's resources in the other direction. It should serve to heighten the vigilance and intensify the efforts of forces striving to end the arms race and to establish a military détente as a step toward general and complete disarmament, toward international security, including the security of the people of the United States.

John Pittman

1. In the budget for fiscal 1978 to be presented to Congress in January 1977, the Pentagon is expected to ask for $130 billion.
2. *Daily World Magazine*, March 20, 1976.
3. The Coast Guard, National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other government agencies.
4. The financing of research and the development of industrial technology, which in the end serve military purposes. This involves dealing with more than 100,000 contractors and sub-contractors, with offices in all 50 U.S. states and in more than 100 foreign countries.
5. The people's tax money that could help to alleviate the distress of the ten million unemployed and the tens of millions officially said to be living below the poverty line, that could help solve the crisis of the cities, of housing, health and education, is diverted to the Pentagon.

THE CAUSES OF CAPITALIST INSTABILITY

The Political Economy of Modern Monopoly Capitalism (in Russian). Two volumes. Second edition, revised. Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1975.

Five years have elapsed since the first edition. But this short period has seen events of immense social importance. The turn from 'cold war' to détente — a result of the change in the balance of world forces in favor of socialism — the achievements of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the global competition with capitalism, the working people's growing anti-monopoly struggle, the notable successes of the Communist and Workers' Parties leading this struggle, the growth of the national-liberation movement and the political changes it has brought about in the world have all strongly affected the capitalist system. The deepening general crisis of capitalism shows many new aspects. The most disastrous postwar economic crisis, which hit the majority of capitalist countries in the early 1970s, has been accompanied by dramatic social upheavals: unemployment has reached unprecedented proportions and contradictions between labor and capital have become much sharper. Inflation is problem number one in all capitalist countries and has worsened even during the down-phase of the crisis. The energy crisis, recurrent breakdowns of the monetary system and the growing difficulty of resolving the ecological crisis — all combined with increasing imperialist competition — have made the crisis of world capitalism's very structure the worst since the war.

'This shows,' said Leonid Brezhnev in his report to the 25th CPSU Congress, 'that the present crisis is unusual. Now everyone can see that one of the main myths created by reformists and bourgeois ideologists has collapsed — the myth that present-day capitalism is able to avert crisis. The instability of capitalism is becoming more and more apparent.'

Soviet scholars have analyzed the inner causes of that instability. The work under review is a product of years of research by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations, by more than 50 of its leading economists, historians, sociologists and other specialists. A vast panorama of modern capitalism, it traces the more important trends and laws governing the development of the system over a long period and points to new developments due to the sharpening economic and political contradictions of capitalism.

The authors have devoted much space to the deep structural changes in the economy of state-monopoly capitalism, which lead to changes in the world alignment of class forces and in the position and

conditions of the working people. It is important to keep in mind, they stress, the causes of these changes and what they reflect: the objective requirements of modern productive forces in general or exploitation, which is only inherent in capitalism. The answer to these questions largely conditions the strategy and tactics of the anti-imperialist struggle; it helps to avoid stereotypes in assessing the real potentialities of the class enemy and makes the Communists' ideological struggle more effective. Although Communists see the evils and contradictions of capitalism, they are far from imagining that its forces will become 'deadlocked' and that the system will collapse of itself, for such a view would contradict Marxist-Leninist logic.

The book analyzes imperialism's historical place in the modern world, the main trends of industrial and agricultural development, of the productive and non-productive spheres, social relations and class structure and the role of the state in capitalist economy and politics. It gives an in-depth description of the imperialist system of international relations and examines problems of the class struggle and the global social conflict between the forces of reaction and progress.

The conclusions drawn by the authors are closely bound up with the requirements of today's world revolutionary process, the dynamics of the competition between the two opposed systems and the prospects of solving the problems of war and peace in the interests of humanity.

'. . . Whereas the industrial revolution of the late 18th and early 19th centuries due to the development of capitalism was propelled by bourgeois revolutions, today's scientific and technical revolution, proceeding against the background of the struggle between the two opposed systems, can develop to the full only if directed toward reorganizing society on socialist lines' (Vol. 2, p. 420).

The second edition of the book is, in effect, a new, independent treatise. It takes into account criticisms and suggestions made during discussions of the first edition in the Party and specific press, research centers and educational institutions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Many chapters and sections have been rewritten or substantially revised. Five years of efforts by a large team of scholars, between the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses, were devoted to a Marxist-Leninist generalization of the serious changes that took place within the capitalist system in those years.

V.S.

---

facts and figures

USSR and USA: competition in the economy and way of life

The bourgeois press often argues that in economic competition the USSR will never overtake the United States. In September the *U.S. News and World Report* magazine claimed that in overall living standards the Soviet Union could compare with the United States of the 20s and not the 70s.

Here are a few facts on the economic competition between the Soviet Union and the United States. See Table 1.

Table 1
Comparison of main economic development indices
(USSR in percentage of USA)

	1913[1]	1965	1975
National income		59	more than 66
Industrial output	12.5	62	more than 80
Agricultural output	65[2]	approx 75[3]	approx 85[4]
Electric power	8	41	50
Energy consumption in industry	13	62	79
Oil output	27	63	120
Steel output	15	75	128
Production of mineral fertilizer (in 100% nutrition units)	3	69	125
Cement output	13	111	188
Output of cotton fabrics	41	66	166

1. 1913 figures for the territory of former Russian empire. 2. Annual average for 1909-1913. 3. Annual average for 1961-1965. 4. Annual average for 1971-1975.

WMR survey based on official USSR and USA statistics.

The Soviet Union has been developing for just over half a century. It experienced four years of severe trials of the Second World War in which socialism clashed with imperialism's shock forces. Victory over fascism cost it 20 million lives, 1,710 towns and other com-

munities in ruins, over 70,000 villages razed to the ground. One third of the Soviet Union's industrial potential was destroyed. The economy of the United States, far from being harmed by military operations, boosted industrial output to its highest growth rate (an annual average of more than 10 per cent).

Needless to say, it required superhuman efforts by the Soviet people to restore and develop the national economy. See Table 2.

Table 2
Per capita increase in national income

	1975 in percentage of:		
	1950	1960	1970
USSR	493	221	126
USA	152	136	104

The tenth five-year plan was launched in 1976. The 25th CPSU Congress pointed out that in the ninth five-year plan the Soviet Union had achieved a higher growth of industrial output, capital investments and state appropriations for new measures to raise the people's living standards than in any other five-year period.

Today, the Soviet Union produces more steel, pig iron, oil, iron, manganese and chromium ores, coal, coke, cement, potash salts, mineral fertilizers, phosphates, tractors, diesel and electric locomotives, cotton, flax, woolen fabrics, leather footwear, granulated sugar, milk, animal fats and certain other goods than any other country in the world.

The USSR has still to catch up with the United States in manufacture of precision instruments, electronic equipment, plastics, synthetic fibres and a few other items, i.e., production connected with a high level of automation and use of computers. However, the tenth five-year plan, as the 25th CPSU Congress pointed out, will concentrate on higher quality and effectiveness and will make long strides in this area. For instance, output of instruments and automation equipment will increase 1.6-1.7 fold. See Tables 3 and 4.

The dynamic and all-round development of the national economy entails high priority in raising living standards. The CPSU program puts it this way: 'Everything for man and for the benefit of man.' So, the economic competition between the USSR and the USA also means greater satisfaction of man's daily requirements.

In comparing living standards in the socialist and the capitalist countries bourgeois propagandists (*U.S. News and World Report*, for example), often use as their criterion the number of work-hours required to purchase certain goods. Leaving aside the merits of this method, the question arises — what about those who have no work?

Table 3
Average annual growth rate, main economic indices, USSR and the USA, 1951-75

(percentages)

	USSR	USA
National income	8.1	3.1
Industrial output	9.6	3.8
Agricultural output	3.4	1.7
Freight turnover, all types of transport	8.3	2.4
Capital investments	9.2	2.4
Social labour productivity	6.7	2.4*
Industrial labour productivity	6.2	3.2

*For 1951-1974

Table 4
Per capita output

		USSR	USA
Total output of electric power (kw hours)	1950	507	2,692
	1974	3,871	9,684
Oil (including condensed gas) kg	1950	210	1,757
	1974	1,821	2,040
Steel (kgs.)	1950	152	593.3
	1974	540	637.1
Mineral fertilizer (in 100% nutrition units, kgs.)	1950	6.9	26.2
	1974	77	82.7
Chemical fibers and threads (kgs.)	1950	0.1	4.1
	1974	3.5	15.9
Cement (Kgs.)	1950	56.6	254
	1974	457	368
Cotton Fabrics, sq.m.	1950	15.2	56.3
	1974	26	22
Woolen fabrics, sq.m.	1950	1.1	4.0
	1974	2.9	0.5
Leather footwear, pairs	1950	1.1	3.4
	1974	2.7	2.1
Granulated sugar from domestic raw materials, kgs.	1950	14.0	19.7
	1974	31.1	21.9

official U.S. figures for 1976 place the number of unemployed at over 7.5 million with more than 25 million living on the edge of poverty. The Soviet Union abolished unemployment scores of years ago.

In the United States prices, particularly on food, are constantly rising. In the Soviet Union prices have been stable for many years, as the following table indicates. See Table 5.

Table 5
Food prices

(1974 in percentage of 1970)

	USSR	USA
Foodstuffs	100.8	141
Meat	100	140
Poultry	100	136
Fish	105	159
Butter	100	109
Vegetable oil	100	186
Milk	100	137
Cheese	100	145
Eggs	100	128
Sugar	100	249
Bread	100	146
Flour	100	174
Rice	100	224
Potatoes	99	189

To this could be added that in the last five-year plan ending in 1975, more than 75 million persons received wage increases, and incomes of approximately another 40 million were increased through higher pensions and stipends and other grants.*

The training of qualified personnel is an important part of this competition, for these are the future specialists who will develop the economy, advance technological progress and ensure a socialist way of life. See Table 6.

Of the more than 2.7 million doctors in the world today almost one third are in the Soviet Union.

Obviously the figures cited here do not and could not embrace all spheres of the economic competition between the USSR and the USA. A comparison of certain indices, for example in living standards is not always possible. This is a competition between two diametrically opposed social systems and, therefore, having different criteria.

* For further information on growing prosperity standards in the USSR see *WMR*, May, 1976.

Table 6
Engineers graduated in USSR and USA
(000's)

	1950	1965	1975
USSR	37	170	304
USA	61	41	57*

*1974

Take wages, as an example. In capitalist countries they are the sole source of subsistence. In socialist countries, besides wages, the people are assured many benefits from the social consumption funds, and, as seen in Table 5, prices on the main products remain stable and housing is the cheapest in the world, with rents not exceeding 4.5 per cent of the family budget. The cost of various municipal services such as city transport, electricity, remain at a steady level. Education, from secondary school through college, is free of charge just as are the medical services. There is an extensive system of children's pre-school establishments. A wide network of cultural and sport facilities are at the disposal of Soviet citizens, and the number of books published runs into a very high figure.

Material benefits in a socialist society, however, are not the only means of raising the individual's cultural level and encouraging creative endeavors.

In brief

West European Communists on the EEC's agricultural policy

Representatives of the Communist Parties of Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, San Marino, Spain and West Germany met in Ferrara, Italy, to discuss problems relating to the work and life of the peasants and working people generally in capitalist Europe, who are now worse off because of the present policy of the European Economic Community.

There was identity of views on the major aspects of a joint initiative to make the EEC change its policy and the trends of its activity. Confidence was expressed that the parties would continue to cooperate in various ways to frame other initiatives designed to improve the living and working conditions of the farmers and all workers and to promote, in their interests, democracy and economic growth in the capitalist states of Europe.

Costa Rica

The Communists are campaigning for the People's Vanguard Party to be officially included in the list of political parties that will contest the 1978 elections. The Party was illegal for 27 years. It started the election campaign after the recent abrogation of the constitutional ban on its activity. The Communists are holding rallies and setting up new branches throughout the country in order to enhance the Party's prestige among the masses.

Italy

The newly-elected mayor of Foligno, Umbria Region, is Antonio Ridolfi, a Communist. He heads the giunta (the executive body of the municipality) consisting entirely of Communists. Another left giunta has been formed in Foggia Province, and its elected chairman is also a Communist.

Martinique

The rally organized by the Young Communist League signified an important event in the country's political life. It was preceded by a great deal of preparatory work, including meetings of Young Communists and a campaign to distribute YCL leaflets and posters. As the newspaper *Justice* wrote, the rally confirmed 'the indissoluble ties existing between the biggest political organization of the Martinique youth, the working class and its Communist Party.'

The speeches made at the rally dealt with such issues as the struggle for democratic autonomy for the country, the strengthening of the YCL's ranks, exposure of the Trotskyist demagogy, the solidarity of the Martinique youth with the people's struggle in Guadeloupe. The General Secretary of the Martinique Party, Armand Nicolas, took part in the rally.

West Germany

The Board of the German Communist Party has addressed an appeal to the members and activists calling for the 1977 membership drive. The recruiting campaign, says the appeal, should include vigorous actions against all manifestations of anti-communism.

A bigger membership, the appeal says, would promote the Party's struggle for the vital interests of the working people, against the ban on the employment of Communists in the public services, and for peace, democracy and détente.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Contents for 1976

(Numbers 1-12)

FEATURES	No.	Page
Aczel, G. On the approaches to developed socialism	3	14
Arismendi, R. On the dialectics of peaceful coexistence and revolutionary change	1	3
Arismendi, R. The working class in the anti-imperialist alliance	5	18
Ashhab, N. For an overall settlement in the Middle East	12	25
Auersperg, P. Détente has to be fought for	3	31
Auersperg, P., Mitra, S., Pittman, J. Continuing the cause of the October Revolution	4	3
Axen, H. Formation of a socialist nation in the GDR ...	3	3
Chernenko, K. Leninist style in CPSU activity	8	35
Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe	8	3
Courtieu, P. France's future: socialism	6	28
Gautier, H. The people need socialism	7	23
Hall, G. The barometer points to stormy weather	4	20
Husak, G. Confidently and creatively along the Leninist road	6	3
Knutsen, M.G. The Communist Party will live on	1	28
Lamberz, W. New stage in the development of the GDR	7	13
Lava, J. A new era in the history of Vietnam	9	18
Longo, L. A powerful force for change	4	12
Mitra, S. The force of revolutionary example	4	32
Mitra, S., Sinclair, B., Soares, J. The CPSU and its historic importance	2	3
Mohammed, A. Tasks of the revolutionary forces of Iraq	9	10
Muhri, F. The Soviet Union and the modern world	7	3
Narochnitsky, A. Trends in twentieth-century international relations	11	21
Nørlund, I., Sinclair, B., Stanishev, D., Venetsanopoulos, V. The common cause of Europe's Communists	9	3
Pahad, E. Washington's 'new African policy'	11	29
Papaioannou, E. An alliance tested by history	11	3

	No.	Page
Pastorino, E. The 'supranational' mask of monopoly capitalism	12	15
Peace and problems of disarmament	10	3
Pittman, J. Behind the facade of U.S. democracy	2	20
Ponomaryov, B. International significance of the 25th CPSU Congress	5	3
Prestes, L.C. The Communists' historical optimism	10	27
Shundeyev, V. Internationalizing the advantages of socialism	1	37
Sinclair, B. Spring will come into its own	5	31
Stanishev, D. Confidence in the present, orientation on the future	7	33
Szydlak, J. Strategy of accelerated progress	2	10
Trapeznikov, S. Science and communism	1	16
Tsedenbal, Y. New frontiers in building socialism	8	24
Urbany, R. Genuinely revolutionary class	11	11
Vasquez, A. New horizons of popular movement	3	24
Zhivkov, T. Developed socialism: the immediate task	6	15
Zhivkov, T. Year of peace, year of struggle	12	3

PARTY EXPERIENCE

Afanasyev, V. Some aspects of scientific management of society in the USSR	9	47
Argenti, L. 'For your freedom and ours'	7	63
Baichinsky, K. A reliable beacon	11	54
Communists on the shopfloor. Round table discussion at Helsinki	12	42
Costa, C. The economic front of the revolution	6	38
Deras, Z.B., Handal, S.J. A life given for the people's cause	6	57
Dragoicheva, T. Origins of the Fatherland Front	10	47
Fava, A. The class character of a mass party	4	81
Fazio, H. Analyzing lessons of the past in the interest of the future	4	91
Ferri, F., Schleifstein, J. How research helps practical Party work	2	40
Fürnberg, F., Doig, M. Patriotism and internationalism of the Communists	1	59
Gervasio, A. The fight for land, part of the revolution	5	39
Hager, K. Reliable compass for the Party and the people	9	26
Hofer, H. The Party, the working class, left unity	3	87
Hoffman, H.J. Socialist society's spiritual potential	5	49
Ibrahim, B. The masses, the Party and the national front	8	49

	No.	Page
Karkabi, Z. A communist mayor for Nazareth	3	99
Kashtan, W. The situation in Canada and the Communists' tasks	10	38
Kukulu, R. An alliance of like-minded Communists	6	46
Kwiatowski, G., Sanchez, O. Rightist offensive in 'defense of democracy'	3	92
Leighton, B. We are for the unity of action of all democrats	6	53
Marin, R., Arismendi, R., Colle, J., Mancera, E.G. Terror cannot stop the march of history	5	59
Masherov, P. Educating the new man	10	27
Meeting of Central Committee secretaries of Communist and Workers' Parties of socialist countries	3	104
Meeting of representatives of Communist Parties of European capitalist countries	2	46
Mies, H. Upholding the people's interests	2	29
Mocuta, S. Toward social homogeneity	12	42
Mosquera, A. Reaction's left hand	1	79
Nemes, D. Lessons of the class struggle for power in Hungary	9	35
Party meetings	3	103
Perez, J.E. The freedom Mexico needs	7	40
Petrovichev, N. Party of the class, Party of the people	12	32
Pittman, J. The basis of political and ideological struggle	8	56
Rojas, M. Continuity, unity, internationalism	2	37
Rossi, M. The Party of the people in the battle for socialism	7	55
Safari, H., Didusenko, A. The great change in Greece	8	65
Section conferences in the Italian Communist Party	3	103
Sharma, Y. The source of strength of a revolutionary party	11	44
Sudiman, S. The key to victory over reaction	4	101
Tisch, H. Unity of the Party's economic and social policy	11	36
Urbany, D. Thirty years in Parliament. Reminiscences	1	83
Vasilyev, L. History repeats itself	7	68
Vieuguet, A. Vanguard role in the mass movement	7	46
Vilner, M. The struggle against Zionism is a class struggle	1	69
Warsaw meeting of Communist Party leaders of socialist countries	2	45
Wettengel, R., Stanishev, D. Soviet Communists' plans; an expression of the people's will	3	82

	No.	Page
Zapirain, S. A turning point in the struggle for democracy in Spain	10	59
COMMENT		
Abri, G. The Maoist concept of 'increasing factors for war and revolution'	6	132
Against repression and persecution	8	103
Ashhab, N. The balance of world forces and the Middle East crisis	3	116
Babiuch, E. Perspectives for Europe	10	80
Benabdelkrim, A. The agrarian revolution in Algeria	10	118
Cyrankiewicz, J., Kashtan, W., Goor, R., Schaffer, G. A year after Helsinki	8	77
Dansoko, A., Pahad, E. Difficult birth of a republic	1	122
Dansoko, A., Pahad, E. Maoism self-exposed in Africa	4	75
Davadorzh, T. How CMEA membership benefits Mongolia	10	105
de Castro, S. Fascism and the 'representative democracy' tactic	11	101
Diane, L., Bayith, B. Revolution on the march in Africa	8	106
El-Qassem, S. Discrimination: a bankrupt policy	10	112
Fantis, A. European security and the maneuvers of the enemies of Cyprus	3	125
Fazio, H. Results of junta rule	12	94
F.H. The junta is undermining the Andes Pact	8	100
Figueroa, H. International solidarity in action	11	89
Gaona, G.T. Our will cannot be broken. Letter from Chile	2	118
Gazmuri, J. Chile: the underground movement	1	124
Girginov, G. On the ideological evolution of Maoism	5	114
Gonzalez, S. Decisive prerequisite for the overthrow of fascist dictatorship	3	106
Hames, D. Democracy in the service of man	4	56
Hoppe, G. Way of life — a class concept	6	123
Irizarry, F. Internationalism and the fight for independence	8	95
Karkabi, Z. The problem of power in the transition period	5	106
Kempny, J. The main trend of mankind's progress	11	71
Keuneman, P. The policy of the non-aligned movement	11	61
Kohen, A. Argentina: light and shade in the South Atlantic	12	68
Kohen, A. Class alliances and the strategy of change	7	114

	No.	Page
Kwiatowski, G. Redundant people in the 'free' world. The condition of youth in West Germany	12	99
Lava, J. What I have seen in socialist countries	2	100
Meyers, G. Overlooked in the bicentennial celebrations	2	109
M.P. Freedom of information or freedom of ommission?	1	112
McLennen, G. Pressing problems of Britain	4	42
Nikitin, S., Pronin, S. What causes inflation?	7	107
O'Riordan, M., Sinclair, B. Irish Communists and terrorism	10	87
Perlo, V. Economics of détente	11	91
Prokopec, J. The right to health	1	114
Purton, J. Bourgeois and working-class views on the crisis of capitalism	1	94
Reynosa, L. Justified apprehensions. Letter from Honduras	12	97
R.S. Triumph of revolutionary strategy	2	116
Sardesai, S. Unholy alliance of India's right and left	4	66
Sen, M. Positive trends gaining the upper hand in India	8	86
Sheidin, L. The Nobel Prizes	2	120
Sierra, S. Fascist escalation in Uruguay	1	130
Sierra, S. International aspects of the Uruguayan drama	12	86
Sinclair, B. Laws to justify lawlessness	6	141
S.M. Collective rebuff to fascism	3	124
Soares, J. Does fascism exist in Latin America?	12	79
Svestka, B., Patirana, J., Clancy, P., Morgan, J., Urriola, O., Dube, J. Horizons of détente	1	102
Vavrus, A. Toward the Europe of tomorrow	12	60
Vilarigues, S. For Portugal's new role in the world	10	97
Vongvichit, P. Thirty years of struggle, second year of freedom	11	81

VIEWPOINTS

Alvarez, S. Spain at a historic crossroad	6	72
Ashhab, N. The developing countries and disarmament	7	84
Barcak, A. Trade as a factor for peace and social progress	5	97
Barre, M.S., Mendes, F., Gombe, J.-P., TANU & Afro-Shirazi parties, Rabesahala, G. The goal: a society without exploitation	5	68
Batista, A.B., Rabelo, J., Nzo, A., Moyo, J., Garoeb, M. After the victories of the peoples of Mozambique and Angola	6	91

	No.	Page
Bauermann, R., Geyer, K.-H., Julier, E. 'Marxology' versus Marxism-Leninism	10	71
Carrera, J. Venezuela: problems unsolved by nationalization	7	94
Contemporary imperialism in the light of Lenin's doctrine. International theoretical conference	3	40
Détente and the revolutionary process. International theoretical conference	9	55
Edelman, F. Reunification of a free people	6	80
Haba, A. Against the interests of the Arab peoples	5	95
Huszar, I. Problems of socialist economic integration	8	116
Iskra, W. CMEA and EEC: opportunities for cooperation	6	64
Kaddoumi, F., Maizar, A. The crux of the Middle East crisis	7	100
Karkabi, Z. The racist-Zionist alliance	7	104
Kianuri, N. Alignment of class forces at the democratic stage	2	92
Konstantinou, D. Program of courageous emergency measures	7	89
Langer, F. Israeli violation of human rights	6	118
Lektorsky, V., Safari, H. The development logic of theoretical knowledge	12	106
Lhamsuren, B. The peace front in Asia	7	79
Love of freedom cannot be killed	9	129
L.V. Who benefits by the assassination of Torres?	9	141
Mechini, R. The middle strata and the policy of alliances	10	65
Nørlund, I. Democracy and the class struggle in Denmark	12	117
Nørlund, I. The image of our own future	1	44
Paredes, M.R. What Honduran reaction wants to revert to	6	113
The peasantry in the struggle for social changes	11	108
Reinhold, O. Another metamorphosis of anti-Marxism	4	106
Rodriguez, E. Concerning a united front of the world's Communists	2	47
Safari, H. Myths and realities of the 'white revolution'	9	120
Santini, A. From dialogue to joint action	4	116
The scientific and technological revolution and the competition between the two systems. International symposium	2	60
Sinisalo, T. A new feature in bourgeois strategy and our experience	9	112
Sudiman, S. The power structure and the alliance problem	1	55
Szczepanski, J. Consumption under socialism	11	125

	No.	Page
Takman, J. From the first Stockholm Appeal to the second	6	87
Varela, T. Dialectics of the general and the particular	8	127
Wimmer, E. The social image of the intelligentsia	2	84
Winston, H. The burden of the Bicentennial	7	71
Winter, H.A. Whither U.S. foreign policy at the Bicentenary?	5	88
Zawadski, S. Does technical progress undermine democracy?	3	74
Z.K. Against 'Zionist socialism'	4	115

THE PRESS

A.K. Loyalty to revolutionary ideals	7	132
Cox, I. Nine brave days	7	130
Diehl, E. A loyal son of his class	3	130
Din, L. The biography of a class	5	123
D.P. Cultural exchange: fact or fiction	10	129
E.P. Communist integrity	2	133
Fazio, H. A citizen of Chile	3	136
Fazio, H. Documents calling for struggle	11	141
Hentges, P. Fighter and thinker	3	133
Jurgens, M. What path for former colonies?	8	139
Katona, I. With the Party, with the people, for the people	4	124
Lhamsuren, B. The truth versus fiction	4	137
Melendrez, S. The story of an underground newspaper	8	137
New books	7	136
	8	140
Pittman, J. The hawks reveal themselves	12	127
Pittman, J. 'She was hated and feared'	1	133
Pomeroy, W. 'The seven sisters' — oil and politics	10	127
Pronin, S. The collapse of illusions	11	134
Solodukhin, Y. In the cause of communism	12	125
Toll, A. U.S. professor vs. Academician Sakharov	5	126
Vladimirov, V. The experiment that failed	4	132
Vlasov, A. Credibility crisis in the news industry	2	126
Vorozheikin, I. In the name of peace and communism	7	123
V.S. The cause of capitalist instability	12	129
Wronski, S. New strategy of development	7	126
Zvyagin, V. U.S. farm workers against the monopolies	7	134

FACTS AND FIGURES

A break with the Maoist past	5	143

	No.	Page
Brief information about Communist and Workers' Parties		
Communist Party of Norway	8	142
The People's Revolutionary Party of Laos	8	143
The crisis and the strike movement	1	138
Growth of unemployment in capitalist countries	1	142
In brief	12	135
Notes on international organizations		
Edelman, F. Women's International Democratic Federation	5	139
Kovacs, Y. The World Federation of Democratic Youth	10	141
Pastorino, E. The World Federation of Trade Unions	5	141
The officially unemployed	10	140
Pittman, J. Political posters and visual propaganda of the CPUSA	5	144
Price growth in capitalist countries	2	140
The proletariat in developing countries	7	140
Rossi, M. Strikes and trade union struggle in Italy	2	135
Schneider, M. Migrant workers in capitalist Europe	5	136
The social gains of the Cuban revolution	3	138
Socialist Republic of Vietnam	9	143
Stoyanov, G., Kloster, H. Integration and the 'small countries'	10	135
USSR and USA: competition in the economy and way of life	12	131
What the five-year plan gave the Soviet citizen	5	131
The working class of the socialist community	4	139
IN MEMORIAM		
Fuad Nassar	11	143
Felix Ojeda	6	144

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 EDITIONS:

Papajanis Stephanos, Emanuil Benaki 25-6⁰ Athens, Greece.

People's Agency, Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus.

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, Bogotá, 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.

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.