WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Problems of Peace and Socialism

January 1978, Vol. 21, No. 1 $1.00



Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

January 1978, Vol. 21, No. 1

Features

3 To our readers

4 What has been done and what has still to be done to strengthen peace and social progress
J. Cyrankiewicz

13 The significance of revolutionary experience
C. Florakis, G. Vieira

25 Guarantee of freedom and human rights
H. Sindermann

Party experience

34 The lessons of Chile
L. Corvalan

48 Builders of developed socialism
S. Gaspar

59 Progress of socialist nations
W. Salgovic

69 Some lessons in combating opportunism
J. West

Exchange of views

78 The capitalist crisis and the communists
W. Kashtan

90 African panorama
International exchange of views

Viewpoints

111 Space research, peace, cooperation
M. Barrere, V. Sevastyanov, H. Fischer

117 Changes in Sri Lanka
K.P. Silva

The press

124 The political system of mature socialism
V. Kudryavtsev

Continued next page

Continued

128 The human rights hypocrites
P. Petersen

130 Materialist tradition in Indian philosophy
S.G. Sardesai

134 The party press
M. Paredes, J. Soares

Facts and figures

136 The Fatherland Front of Vietnam

139 Israel: the cost of militarism
E. Habibi

143 In memory of Knud Jespersen

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: Canada and U.S., $7.50 a year. Other countries, $11.50. Institutions, double rate.

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, 71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5V 2P6.

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

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published by PROGRESS BOOKS, 71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5V 2P6.

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

feature

To our readers

Dear readers,

This issue will reach you in the first days of 1978. The Editorial Board, Editorial Council and the whole multinational staff of *World Marxist Review* convey best wishes for the New Year. We wish you every success in your life, work and struggle. May your best hopes and expectations come true.

The past year witnessed a momentous event in the history of our journal: representatives of 75 fraternal parties held a conference in Prague last spring to discuss all aspects of the journal's work in the light of the new tasks that present-day realities put before communists and all fighters for peace and social progress. The conference expressed the clear wish that the journal should be even more effective in promoting the study of problems and dissemination of ideas of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism, the struggle against imperialism, and the strengthening of the international solidarity of the communists and all progressives.

These recommendations are binding for us and an inspiring stimulus in our work. With them in mind the Editorial Board and Editorial Council have approved a detailed plan of future publications that carefully takes into account the remarks and suggestions made at the conference. A large part of its provisions, we hope, will be fulfilled in 1978.

We hope that, as before, leaders of the fraternal parties, party functionaries, scientists and cultural workers will regularly contribute articles and other material on such pressing problems of today as the struggle for peace, further détente, the ending of the arms race, and disarmament; on problems connected with the development of the world socialist system, the building of socialism and communism, the specific features of the class struggle in conditions of the deepening general crisis of capitalism, the attainments and difficulties of the national-liberation movement, and the economic and social progress of newly-free countries. As before, we shall endeavor to promote the exchange of practical experience in the work and struggle of the fraternal parties.

In keeping with the suggestions voiced at the conference, we have planned for 1978 theoretical conferences, symposia and discussions on such subjects as 'The system of socialist states and the present-day revolutionary process,' 'Economics and politics in the struggle to establish the power of the working class and its allies,' 'The agrarian question and the role of the peasantry at the present stage of the national-liberation revolution.' In 1978 the journal also plans to publish several new series on the trends and forms of the struggle for social progress and socialism in our epoch, the role and new opportunities of world opinion in its struggle for peace and international security, the prospects of solving the global problems of today on the basis of a scientific and class approach, ways in which communists can influence the broad masses of the working people, the main trends in social development and the revolutionary process in the newly-free countries, and so on.

In 1978 our journal will complete its 20th year. This, too, will spur us on to improve *WMR* publications and increase its readership. As usual we shall be relying on you for assistance and constructive advice. We look forward to receiving your articles and letters.

Happy New Year!

What has been done and what has still to be done to strengthen peace and social progress

Jozef Cyrankiewicz
Vice-President, World Peace Council, Chairman, All-Poland Peace Committee

The year that has just ended, the year of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a year of further intensive efforts to deepen détente and strengthen peace, has confirmed and demonstrated even more clearly and impressively the ties between the momentous event that took place in 1917 and the entirely new situation of today, in which the possibilities of spreading peace throughout the world and for all time are beginning to prevail over the threat of a new war.

Karl Marx saw a simple and yet complex, a direct and yet indirect

connection between the cause of the workers fighting for social progress and socialism and the cause of peace when appealing in 1870 for effort to achieve a foreign policy that would be part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class. He also drew a picture of a future when the old world with its economic poverty and political madness would be replaced by a new world, '... a new society, whose international principle will be *peace* because all nations will have the same master — labor!'

Since October 1917 this picture has gradually begun to assume the shape of reality. Ever since it appeared on the historical scene existing socialism has shown that it is inseparable from human concepts of peace. Having taken power into its own hands in a huge country, the working class substituted for the rapacious military policy of the former ruling classes a policy of national liberation, of accord and cooperation between the great masses of the people. The Decree on Peace — one of the first acts of Soviet power — is rightly regarded as the great beginning, for it launched the epoch of the socialist strategy of peace. It was not only the answer that Lenin and his associates gave to the demands of the situation in which the world's first state of workers and peasants found itself. The Decree on Peace embodied the full depth of Lenin's thought, the traditions of Zimmerwald and Kienthal,[1] it was the birthright of the socialist forces that had not acquiesced in the right-wing Social-Democrats' voting (which betrayed their own decisions and promises) on war credits for the governments embarking on the world imperialist war.

The cry of 'War on war!' arose in the trenches of Verdun, in the Masurian marshes, in the mountain passes, and over the Marne and the Prut. Lenin transformed this cry into the anti-war strategy of peace and anti-imperialist strategy of the working-class movement. The truth expressed in the words of the Polish poet, 'It is the kings who declare the wars but the peasants who die in them,' formed the basis of the peoples' struggle for peace, which is organically connected with the class essence of history, which teaches that the ideas of peace are directly connected with the ideas of a new society of social justice. In October 1917 the Bolsheviks were able to achieve an epochal victory because, among other things, they combined in their slogans the socialist aspirations of the working class, the peasant dreams of acquiring the landed estates, the liberating energy of the peoples oppressed by tsarism and reaction, and the universal desire for a just peace. Each of these aspirations reflected the mood of a revolutionary current, the will of millions. In unison they became a force that could and did do something that history had never known before — establish and consolidate the power of the working people, the socialist system.

The echoes of the October Revolution, amplified by time, continue to reverberate down the generations and to all corners of the earth. Among the many vital truths of socialism is the truth that war is for humanity neither a natural form for the realization of their political interests nor the work of predestination. It is merely a product of a social system whose ruling classes are bent on territorial aggrandisement and the acquisition of profit, and who use force, oppression and exploitation in the belief that any means is justified to achieve their ends. With the new alignment of forces engendered by October and its direct and indirect impact on the whole world, Lenin's principles of peaceful coexistence, the whole socialist peace strategy have been able to make real headway. In the years since the emergence of the world's first socialist state, imperialism has forfeited for ever the possibility of deciding the fate of humanity unilaterally.

It is a fact that Europe, the scene of the outbreak of two world wars, is now experiencing the longest period of peace that it has ever known in modern times. It is a fact that the local wars that have broken out on other continents since 1945, despite the great danger that they might spread, never grew into worldwide conflict. And finally it is a fact that in comparison with the situation that existed 20, ten, five, or even two years ago, the foundations of peace have now become much stronger.

We can say without the slightest exaggeration that the new quality of the overall international situation is a derivative of the October breakthrough.

This is so because the first socialist state has become a mighty world power, which in putting forward constructive proposals for the good of humanity has placed on the scales of history its whole material and moral potential, all its economic and defense capability, all its ideological and political strength.

This is so because the socialist countries, linked with the motherland of October by an alliance based on the community of their socio-political structures and unity of aspirations and interests, are also contributing their already considerable and rapidly growing potential, their own activity, their own influence to this cause.

This is so because under the influence of the October Revolution, of both its universal and its specific elements, which also influence the minds and imagination of people living in different places at different times, the working class in the capitalist countries (not only its communist trend, but all its other contingents) has become incomparably stronger, more significant and capable of achieving greater things.

It is so because the revolution, which Lenin defined as the beginning of a new epoch in world history — the epoch of the supremacy of the proletariat — rejected every form of national and colonial oppres-

sion, and because in the years of the Second World War the Soviet Union made a decisive contribution to the defeat of Hitlerism, fascism and Japanese militarism; and also because the political support, material aid and moral solidarity it extended to the peoples fighting for their rights have helped to develop the victorious national-liberation movements over vast territories until recently oppressed by imperialism.

So far I have mentioned only the direct consequences. But this does not account for the whole impact of the Great October. A number of far more intricate connections have helped to create the current situation in which the slogan of stable and universal peace has for the first time in history become a practical possibility.

Besides the working class and the peasants there are many people of good will in the world. They are also to be found among people engaged in mental work, people of various professions, intellectuals, small and medium businessmen, clergymen of various denominations, and so on. While not fully understanding socialist ideas and sometimes even disapproving of the slogans proclaimed by communists, they often apply with complete conviction the concepts introduced by Marxism, the October Revolution and the communists. Under the influence of the ideas of October the whole range of problems connected with the stable and dynamic nature of the world, its economic, social, political and cultural laws has penetrated and acquired the right of citizenship in the thinking of millions of peoples of every language, race and color.

We believe that people who unconsciously perhaps but with profound conviction speak in the terms of the socially humane concepts of socialism are our potential allies in the struggle for peace. In the movement of supporters and builders of peace, in its geographical range which covers all the continents and is even wider than its already considerable organizational range, various people meet each other and work together. Many of them have committed themselves to the revolution, to the struggle for socialism. Others are guided by instinct or a wise pragmatism, others by various idealist philosophical or religious beliefs.

And if all these people are united by a vigorous desire to preserve peace on earth, that is, to preserve for man the elementary measure of humanity that he needs as much as he needs air to breathe, credit is once again due to the October Revolution and its cause. It was this revolution that first showed that peace could be won, and that first showed people with conscience and the ability to think the road toward thinking in global categories not only of the consequences but of the causes, not only of the fragments but of the whole, not only of history's manifestations but of its driving forces. And if, despite the

existence and constant growth of the arsenals of nuclear death, despite all the dangers, which have certainly not disappeared, if despite all our uncertainty concerning the future, every passing year marks for us some new, perhaps not very big, hard-won step forward on the road to peace, security and international cooperation, this too stems from all the direct and indirect effects of the breakthrough that occurred 60 years ago. The world scene has changed. The balance of forces has changed. The way people think, the way all humanity thinks about public and private affairs has changed. A change has come about in our total experience, which is of special importance because it is from this experience that we draw our wisdom and patience, our ability to judge fairly, choose wisely and act effectively.

These are trump cards for dealing with the vital task of asserting the principles of coexistence, of deepening the process of détente and promoting good faith. They extend the political, economic and cultural infrastructure that is needed for this, and the infrastructure of our relations simply as human beings. But the presence of these factors does not mean that we can automatically look forward to an idyllic and peaceful future. For such a future we shall have to make a stubborn and persistent effort. Take the arms race, for instance. We have got to prevent it from stifling détente, from tearing apart by its sheer weight the whole fabric of mutual confidence that is being woven with such difficulty.

It is for the sake of these values that we must not allow demagogic campaigns, which abuse great and pure words in the name of petty and sullied interests, to poison the atmosphere of coexistence of the two systems with the venom of reactionary fanaticism, obscurantism and overweening intolerance and to distort the meaning of the political and ideological rivalry that is natural to them.

The past year has reaffirmed that such landmines on the road to peace have not yet been removed or defused. In 1977, on the initiative of certain circles in the United States the now notorious 'human rights' campaign was launched. Welcomed by cold warriors the world over, it has threathened to poison the international atmosphere and disrupt the Belgrade meeting of representatives of the countries who signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, or turn it in a direction contrary to the spirit and letter of the great charter of peace.

The position of the U.S. delegation at the disarmament talks, which violated the principle of arms equality and good faith, threatened the realization of the existing SALT agreements and achievement of new accords.

This was followed by disclosure of the plans to produce the neutron bomb which, despite the false claims of its propagandists, could lower

the ceiling of use of the nuclear weapon and put the atomic button at the fingertips of low-ranking officers, which among other things escalates the danger of nuclear war.

To this list of dangerous phenomena must be added the fact that opposition on the part of the military-industrial complex to the concepts of disarmament has been stronger and more aggressive in the past year. The military element in this complex tried to pursue its interests by exerting ever greater pressure on the policies of the capitalist countries as a whole, while the industrial element defended its right to super-profits, which were to be the highest in the whole history of monopoly capital.

The distinctions that many social groups make between the categories of war and peace, on the one hand, and the categories of the arms race, on the other, oblige us to proclaim even louder a truth that may be formulated as follows: a situation that has not yet reached the dimensions of a global confrontation — and such a situation is an invaluable achievement in itself — still does not warrant the great name of peace. As these lines are being written, there is fighting in Ethiopia. By the time they are printed some new conflict may quite possibly arise in another part of the world. Any such conflict could spark off a big war because the world is living on mountains of armaments. So our moral and indispensable duty is to patiently and constantly make all peoples aware of how utterly abominable the policy of militarism is, how dangerous the arms race is, and how much these armaments cost, although the sum almost defies imagination.[2] And we must also tell them about the social and psychological cost as well, the cost of keeping more than 50 million civilians and soldiers at work day in and day out doing nothing but make more and more sophisticated weapons for the extermination of human beings, doing nothing but learn how to kill. Even to kill people many times over, although all of us, including the advocates of aggression and those whose cynical self-interest encourages the arms race have only one life.

In assessing the negative factors on the world scene over the past year we must also record the election victory of the Israeli 'hawks,' the intensified activity of the racists in Rhodesia and the USA, and the latest paroxysms of neo-colonialism.

The national-liberation struggle should not be ragarded apart from the problem of lasting, universal and just peace.

For today it is a truth tested by humanity that the fate of the world is bound up inseparably with the final abolition of what is left of the inhuman imperialist colonial system, which wholly determined the face of our world up to 1917. There is not nor can there be any such thing nowadays as a world of the secure and satisfied on one side, and

oppression and slavery on the other. If peace is to be stable, universal and indivisible, a change must be brought about in the status and condition of the peoples who are still subject to barbaric oppression and economic coercion, the demands of those still asking for elementary freedom must be satisfied.

It is all the more important, then, that despite various negative tendencies 1977 has ended and 1978 begun under auspicious stars. The campaign purporting to be in defense of human rights but in reality aimed against the socialist countries has boomeranged against its initiators, who have themselves been found obviously wanting on this score in the eyes of the world.

The past year demonstrated once again — to friends and enemies — the essential ties between peace and socialism, the humaneness of socialist international and internal policy.

By the look of things the Belgrade conference may well reach a constructive conclusion. Humanity has a right to expect that Belgrade will continue and develop the cause of Helsinki.

Hopefully the intensified Soviet-American dialogue will lead to a SALT II agreement and other important accords.

The widespread public protests in nearly all the countries of Europe and many other countries have forced the U.S. Administration to defer its decision on production of the neutron bomb.

The opposition to the arms race and support for disarmament and the proposals made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on this score is gaining impetus across the world. There has been approval for the new initiatives of the USSR, announced by Leonid Brezhnev at a celebration meeting of the CC CPSU, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, on simultaneous cessation by all countries of production of nuclear weapons, and also that along with the banning of nuclear tests for a definite period a moratorium should be declared on the use of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. The special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament that is to be held this year could represent a considerable step forward along this path.

For the first time in many years there is a likelihood of resumption of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East.

There are growing signs of the inevitable collapse of the racist status quo in Rhodesia and the RSA.

In short, we have every reason to state that the course of the fight for peace in the past year — the year of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution — yielded results that were all the more worthy of this jubilee and all the more important for humanity in that they were achieved in a decisive confrontation between the forces of progress, good will, realism and reason and the forces of

those who despite the lessons of history either would not or could not draw any conclusion from the successive failures of the various cold war concepts.

These successes, all the more valuable for having been achieved in difficult circumstances, confirm the assessments and bear out the truth of the predictions voiced in the memorable speech by Leonid Brezhnev, that outstanding champion of the socialist peace strategy, at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow in 1973, and also in the message addressed by the leader of the Soviet people to the meeting of peace builders in Warsaw in May 1977. From this city that is of such significance for the peace movement,[3] in that significant year — the year of the Great October jubilee — the voice of the world's peace supporters rang out with special force and conviction.

The movement of the defenders, supporters and builders of peace is drawing conclusions permeated with realistic optimism based on its work and struggle in the past year. This movement has become one of the most important and generally recognized currents of public opinion, an influential ally of the United Nations Organization in the realization of the appeal contained in the UN Charter for the salvation of mankind from the calamity of war. It has become one of the factors that by mobilizing public opinion can influence the course of events in the modern world, thus building up more and more convincing arguments in favor of effective collective action by people of good will.

The communists do not claim a monopoly in the defense of peace. On the contrary the peace movement respects various positions and views. The decisive criterion is a person's attitude to the cause of peace and international security. Everyone who sincerely, at the call of heart and conscience, opposes war, aggression, imperialism and colonialism, can and should take part in the work of building up the potential of peaceful ideas and actions, no matter what his general view of the world may be.

We representatives of the socialist countries in the ranks of this broad movement, whose very unity lies in its diversity, do not expect any automatic approval of our position. What we postulate is an objective assessment of the intentions and principles of the socialist strategy of lasting peace. This strategy is based on the indisputable fact that socialism — whether it be existing socialism or socialism as a program, even socialism that is some distance from achieving its goal — does not need war. The leading force of socialism — the working class — is a creator of material values and war destroys them. Socialism is performing the historic mission of transforming society and bringing into being a new, more human kind of person, and war not only reduces man to the condition of an animal; war, particularly modern, nuclear war, threatens humanity and human society with

total destruction. We are confident — and we have thousands of instances to prove it — that objective understanding and appreciation of this fact lead to acknowledgment that we are right, to approval of our proposals and at the same time to their enrichment and supplementation through the friendly exchange of opinions. This was characteristic of such important peace movement events of 1977 as the January forum in Moscow, the May assembly in Warsaw, the September meeting of the Bureau of the Presidium of the World Peace Council in Berlin, the October meeting in Rome, and a number of other seminars and assemblies.

In our movement we do not avoid confrontations of opinion and positions. Such confrontations multiply the forces opposed to another kind of confrontation, the kind that would signify nuclear death.

Awareness that the fight is for the highest stakes ever placed in the history of humankind obliges us to persistently and patiently build the bridges and pathways that will lead to agreement, mutual confidence and joint action on the part of the various contingents and currents in the peace forces.

Our movement's main weapon is words, words of truth, words that can reach hearts and minds, awaken the noblest human feelings and weld together all who cherish the future of humanity and hate war and destruction.

We must be still more dynamic, vigorous and effective in building up a body of opinion capable of pressuring the politicians and governments, so that important state-to-state and international agreements will pave the way for disarmament, strengthen and deepen détente and promote fair international cooperation.

We must create a political atmosphere in which there is no room for poisonous militarist, racist, fascist propaganda, for hangovers of the cold war, and which will at the same time favor the realization of a constructive program for building a new world without wars and weapons.

We believe that our common victory, which we do not doubt and for which we are working tirelessly, will create vital opportunities for progressive, rational and just solutions to the problems facing the individual, the peoples, humanity as a whole.

We can state with satisfaction that these opportunities are taking shape and developing under the influence of the ideas and accomplishments of the Great October Socialist Revolution. To these ideas we owe the formation of the objective foundations of stable and just peace in the form of a new map and new balance of forces in the world, and also the constant strengthening of the subjective factors that serve this great cause — the consciousness, activity and determination of millions of people.

The past year has been a year in which all these factors and tendencies have come steadily to the fore. It is our duty to do all we can in the coming year to make them even stronger. 'This will require,' as was stressed in the resolution of the Seventh Congress of the PUWP, 'action to counter the continuing attacks on the policy of détente by reactionary and imperialist forces. This will require consistent action to counter anti-communism and all anti-Soviet trends, manifestations of fascism, and racial and national discrimination. We are building peace in Europe and the world in a struggle against the forces that destroyed it in the past and threaten it today.'[4]

So in the new year, 1978, may the great, time-tested ideas of peace, democracy, social progress and socialism be embodied in specific actions and specific political decisions and triumph with renewed force.

1. The reference is to the Zimmerwald (1915) and Kienthal (1916) international socialist conferences in Switzerland, where under Lenin's direct influence a socialist-internationalist left wing was formed that fought for revolutionary withdrawal from the imperialist war and for dissociation and breaking away from the leaders of the Second International, who had put themselves at the service of the national bourgeoisie. — *Ed.*

2. See *WMR,* December 1977, 'What the arms race costs humankind.' — *Ed.*

3. At the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw, November 16-22, 1950, the World Peace Council was founded. — *Ed.*

4. *Nowe Drogi,* No. 1, 1976, p. 152.

The significance of revolutionary experience

Dialogue between *Charilaos Florakis,* First Secretary, Communist Party of Greece, and *Gilberto Vieira,* General Secretary, Communist Party of Colombia.

In considering revolutionary experience as a part of man's social practice two CP leaders discuss:

— the relationship between history and contemporaneity;

— the significance and methods of using the experience accumulated by the communist movement;

— the possibility and necessity of studying and generalizing collectively.

Does history teach us anything?

Florakis. Obviously there is a lot of point in discussing the use that can be made of revolutionary experience. The new conditions, the

new phenomena of social life that we have to deal with call for creative analysis and evaluation. We have to be scientific in making political decisions. The process of getting to know and understand the new and formulating one's policy accordingly naturally implies a study of the 'old,' the lessons of history. Hence we are bound to become involved in judging the acceptability or degree of acceptability of the experience accumulated by the revolutionary movement in the past.

Sometimes the question is put more widely: Does history teach us anything? It is asked not only by scholars but also by politicians, who in doing so are guided by differing, often vastly different aims. Or to put it more simply: some want to find out the truth, while others want to obscure it. So for communists, as I see it, it is important to state their position on this issue as it bears on contemporary conditions and to draw conclusions regarding revolutionary practice.

Vieira. Of course, we have all been faced with this question before today. The fundamental question of the relationship between history and contemporaneity, of the possibility of judging the present by discovering regular features in social development through a study of the past and taking decisions that will affect the future was asked by philosophers down the ages. But it took the genius of Karl Marx to put the study of it on a proper scientific basis and to make its solution a truly creative force. The most convincing and indisputable example is the proof of the inevitability of the birth of the new social system of socialism, based on Marx's detailed study of history and the capitalist world of his day, its trends of development.

In every epoch, however, in every specific historical situation certain special circumstances take shape that sometimes appear to negate the very idea of the usefulness of past experience. As we know, there is a common enough opinion that in the complex, dynamically developing world or, as Hegel put it, 'in the chaos of world events' the 'general principle,' the 'memory of similar circumstances' is of no help; the past carries no weight in comparison with the vital necessity of the present. Controversial though this point may be, one can appreciate the grain of truth in it. In my view, awareness of the objective dialectics of this situation prompts one not to reject the existing means of cognition (which include the discovered laws of social development), but to make a deeper analysis of the actual situation and its connection with the past.

Referring to Marx's outstanding ability to analyze contemporary phenomena, Engels stressed that such ability was based on two prerequisites: first, his splendid knowledge of history ('events therefore never took him by surprise') and, secondly, a correct theoretical

interpretation of reality. This is probably where we whall find the key to the problem we are discussing.

Florakis. Our conclusions on the significance of revolutionary experience are also based on our own experience. I can give you a concrete example.

Imperialism and the Greek financial oligarchy have three times since the war interrupted the development of the democratic process in our country. Unfortunately, it was made easier for them by some serious mistakes made by the leaders of the popular movement. First we had the intervention by the British imperialists in 1944, then the intervention of American imperialism, which was initiated in 1947 by the Truman Doctrine and the Marshal Plan. This intervention, which hinged on the cooperation of the internal Greek reaction, and also the civil war that the imperialists imposed on the Greek people, resulted in the defeat of the popular movement and the establishing of economic, political and military domination by the imperialists in Greece. The very darkest forces came to the forefront of the political stage. But what was it that made this possible?

By the end of 1944, when the defeat of nazism by the forces of the Allies, and above all the Soviet Army, was quite certain, Greece had been completely cleared of nazi troops. The Greek National-Liberation Army (ELAS) and the National-Liberation Front (EAM) — the mass organization of the resistance movement set up on the initiative of the Communist Party in September 1941 — had fought heroically against fascism. At that time, in 1944, EAM had a membership of 1.5 million, 400,000 of whom were communists. The king and the government were in exile, having fled to Egypt on the outbreak of war, and the country was virtually ruled by the people. The foundations of people's democratic rule — people's councils, elements of a people's militia, and elected courts — had been laid already in 1943. But what happened after that? What we have just spoken of — the Greek communists and the popular movement were defeated. I should like to emphasize that this defeat was not inevitable, although the situation at the time was difficult. There was a possibility of a different, victorious outcome, if a number of serious mistakes had not been made.

With the great majority of the people on its side and a well equipped army controlling three-quarters of the country, EAM agreed in negotiations with the bourgeois parties and the government in exile to form a government of national unity in which it would have a mere 25 per cent of the cabinet seats, and the minor ones at that. We gave the bourgeois politicians the posts of Prime Minister, minister of defense, the interior, foreign affairs, and all the other key positions. But this was not all. We agreed — and this had the most serious consequences

— to allow British troops, who were regarded as allies to land in Greece. Allegedly they were to help in the liberation. And this was at a time when Greece had already been virtually liberated by the national-liberation forces.

What was behind these mistakes?

First, an incorrect understanding of the question of unity and cooperation with other political forces, of political alliances, although the experience of the revolutionary movement would seem to have made it amply clear that alliances are not an end in themselves, but a means to the achievement of one's goal. What is the alliance for? That is the main question. Cooperation with the bourgeois parties should have been built on the basis of a clearly thought-out program. It should have reflected the real balance of forces, which tended to be in our favor.

Secondly, the EAM leadership failed to draw any conclusions from the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the essence of imperialism. It disregarded historical experience and misinterpreted British policy on the Greek question. The EAM leaders wrongly assumed that the very fact of Britain's participation in the anti-Hitler coalition predetermined London's readiness to promote democratization of state and social life in Greece. After all, the British were members of the anti-fascist coalition alliance and allies of the USSR. They had fought against fascism together. This seemed to be a fundamentally new phenomenon, so new that the old concept of the essentially imperialistic nature of British government policy was completely eclipsed. The main thing was confused with the transitory, with things that depended on the specific conditions of the struggle against Hitler.

As subsequent events showed, this agreement did irreparable harm to the democratic movement in our country. Not only had we virtually helped the bourgeoisie to regain power; we had also set the stage for loss of our national independence. The disastrous consequences were not long in taking effect. In September 1944 the British General Scobie was appointed commander-in-chief of all Greek forces, including ELAS. About a week later British troops landed in Greece and international reaction, backed by British bayonets, launched the mass terror that was to grow into civil war.

EAM was very strong indeed. It can safely be asserted — and this was subsequently emphasized by our party in its decisions — that in such circumstances there was a possibility of defending the interests of the masses. And not only because of the obvious superiority of our forces, but because the clearly expressed will of the majority of the Greek people in the international situation as it then was, would have ruled out any further intervention by British troops, who were the

only substantial force opposed to the National-Liberation army. But this did not happen either.

In the period when the left bloc, EAM and the Communist Party were urgently confronted with the choice of forms of struggle against the offensive of national and external reaction, we were not fully aware, as I have said, of the reactionary implications of the plans of the British imperialists and were slow in reorganizing all party work for armed struggle. Lenin pointed out that in such a situation is should either be admitted that 'there can be no talk of a real revolution,' in which case we must say so openly, so as not to mislead ourselves or the people, or else it should be admitted that 'we can and must talk' of revolution, in which case we should increase tenfold the party's efforts to organize armed struggle. Or, as he put it, 'In that case, we should regard civil war as having been declared and in progress, and the *whole* of the party's activities should be guided by the rule: "In war as in war!" ' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 10, p. 144). As we know, this is how the Bolsheviks acted in Russia and won the day. We, on the other hand, wasted time, gave reaction the chance to regroup its forces, gradually tip the balance in its favor and ultimately organize the physical extermination of members of our party and its supporters.

If our party had taken real notice of the experience of past revolutions, it would have deduced the inevitability of desperate resistance on the part of reaction inside the country and its support by international imperialism; the party could have reached a more mature decision in the moment of trial if, for instance, it had considered how during their civil war the people of Russia defended the gains of their revolution against the attacks of the interventionists, including the British; and in that case it would also have reached a correct decision regarding political alliance.

As regards the major conclusions we have now reached concerning our own experience, I would stress the danger of opportunism in building a Marxist-Leninist party. Between 1958 and 1968 the opportunist group that gained the upper hand in the leadership of our party decided not even to consider the question of increasing the ranks of the CPG, of creating and building up a network of party organizations and committees. The CPG organizations within the country were disbanded and the communists were told to join the coalition of left organizations (EDA). The idea was that they would influence the coalition and steer it toward the political platform of the working class. In the event this policy did great harm to the party. It led to what amounted to the self-disbanding of the CPG. It also harmed EDA, which had in its time done a lot of good and could have done even more. After the disbandment of CPG organizations, the com-

munists lost all opportunity of exerting any systematic influence on EDA, while relying on the strength, experience and prestige of their own party. It also crippled resistance to reaction.

Having survived these difficulties, the party has taken steps to strengthen its organizations.

So we have learned the necessity of learning from history and learned it the hard way. And since Hegel has already been mentioned, I should also like to quote something that Engels had to say on this score. He wrote that history is all and everything to us communists and we hold it more highly than any other philosophical trend, 'more highly than even Hegel,' who after all used it 'only as a case against which to test his logical problem.'

How can we learn from history?

Vieira. Certainly history teaches us to heed its lessons, to evaluate them. But as soon as we acknowledge this we are faced with another question: how can we learn from history? You must agree that this is a very complicated business.

Marxist philosophy never concocts a metaphysical scheme of historical development. The communists are well aware of its diversity and complexity, all the difficulties that arise, particularly when one examines any specific material, whether related to a past epoch or to modern times. In other words, when one attempts a scientific analysis.

I would cite the following example. In Colombia and other Latin American countries, as you know, numerous groups of ultra-revolutionary young people have appeared on the scene. These groups are in favor of terrorism, of actions by 'heroic individuals,' and tend to undervalue the actions of the masses. We see that they are making the same mistakes that were made back in the 19th century by members of the Russian revolutionary 'People's Will' organization, and we realize that this is a past stage of the struggle, that revolutions are not made by hole-and-corner methods. But they, learning nothing from the experience of the past, though still trying to score historical points, criticize the mistakes made by our party and accuse it of 'never having made a revolution' in all the time it has existed. Moreover they completely ignore the fact that there must be suitable objective conditions as well as the subjective factor for a victorious socialist revolution.

Recognition of the dialectical interconnection between past and present, of the fact that historical experience is a component of contemporary social practice, still does not guarantee success. I am inclined to think that revolutionaries have more often tripped up

through being unable to utilize historical experience than through denying or distrusting it.

Florakis. You mean there is some sort of methodology for using experience ...

Vieira. Yes. Of course, many of the problems involved have been studied fairly well. For instance, Marxists have thoroughly investigated the question of the dialectics of the general laws of revolution and their specific manifestations in various countries, the question of the general and the particular in politics. And much has been tested in practice, in the process of applying the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks in subsequent socialist revolutions. But all these and other problems take on new aspects today. This is due to the nature of world development and its influence on political processes. We communists, our theoreticians, the intellectuals who are fighting in our ranks still have the job of producing a consistent set of methods for applying the experience that has been accumulated.

On could attempt to formulate certain principles that are relevant to present-day conditions. Take, for instance, the question of mistakes. For the 30th anniversary of our party, in 1960, we prepared and published a special study entitled 'Thirty Years of the Struggle of the Communist Party of Colombia.' This book concentrated mainly on analysis of the party's mistakes and defeats in previous years. It played a big part in developing the working-class movement in our country. But now the extremist and leftist groups are trying to get it republished — for the sole purpose of condemning the party. We are not afraid of admitting our mistakes. When I argue on this question, I recall an old Spanish verse:

You are proud of your gleaming weapons.
But my armor is battered. And why?
Because it has been in battle
And bears the marks of cruel blows ...

And yet the problem still faces us in all its complexity. On the one hand, the party should, when analyzing its experience, study its mistakes carefully. Without that it cannot advance. On the other hand, the enemy tries to make use of the communists' frank admissions and turn them against us. How can we get the maximum benefit and do ourselves least harm in this case? The idea of passing things over in silence is unacceptable because it could lead to a repetition of mistakes. So probably there is only one alternative: to get to the bottom of one's mistakes and draw such complete and well grounded conclusions that there will be nothing left for the enemy to say. What I mean is that we must be ahead of him and go deeper than him in analyzing our own experience. Although this is not so simple in practice, this is what we aim to do. But we don't want to waste our energy

on self-recrimination and we don't intent to let others pile recriminations on us. We give the masses clear answers to the questions: What did we do wrong in the past? What do we intend doing in future?

Florakis. Yes, you have a good point there. Analysis of the past should never be one-sided. The interconnection of positive and negative results in research is an acknowledged fact. Presumably the same thing is true of the history of the class struggle.

Vieira. The ultra-revolutionaries who criticize our party do not take into consideration the fact that the communists have been brought up on the basis of negative as well as positive experience. This was one of the reasons for our success, for instance, in the 1974 general election. Experience, taken as a whole, armed us with a knowledge of the laws of history and with optimism. After the publication of the book I have just mentioned we did not make the same mistakes again. And this is very largely connected with the fact that we realized their original source, that we stopped trailing along in the wake of the liberal bourgeoisie.

Florakis. But this, I think is only one side of the question of method. The example I have given, like your example and other lessons drawn from history, teaches us that in charting party policy it is not enough to rely entirely on one's own national experience, knowledge of the historical development of only one's own country. Nor is it enough to know only the current situation in one's own country, although this is the most important thing.

As many researchers have noted, the special feature of the present situation is that global connections are forming between economies, cultures and peoples before our very eyes. In the present situation of rivalry between the two social systems and vigorous scientific and technological advance we see a process of interaction and deeper interconnection of social phenomena that is quite unprecedented in scale and character. So it is not enough to know only the trends of development in one's own country. One must know the present state of the integral revolutionary process and its conditions and one must be able in this situation to make a forecast of the possible consequences of one's decisions without entrusting this to the bourgeoisie, which was what, in fact, the leadership of our party did at the end of the war. The national experience alone is a poor standby in that respect.

I would stress that no matter how hard the bourgeois ideologues try to distort the history of the socialist countries, elevating the shortcomings and difficulties on this path almost to the rank of inevitability and a general law, for communists the experience of these countries, and particularly that of the Soviet Union, should not be belittled because it helps us to think deeper and with a greater sense of

responsibility, and to solve complex problems creatively. We study this experience not to copy the models of the past, but to gain an understanding of the present and more freedom and support in the present. We also try to make creative use of the experience of the fraternal parties operating in capitalist countries.

The actual interconnection and content of the various aspects of the whole, that is to say, the process of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism can, in my view, be understood today only through understanding of the inner unity of this whole. It seems to me that one of the key methodological aspects of utilizing experience is to see the revolutionary process in its unity and interconnectedness with all the processes of world development, to take into account on the basis of experience both the trends of its development on a world scale and the manifestation of these trends within one's own country.

Vieira. Since we have ventured to formulate some of the methodological principles of using revolutionary experience of the communists of our countries, I would like to draw attention to yet another of them, one that has a bearing on the dialectics of the old and the new in the revolutionary struggle.

We know that the laws of revolution are not 'laid down' arbitrarily, for each new set of specific circumstances. They are, so to speak, the 'resultant' of rival tendencies (traditional and novel), of the interaction, the clash of all the forces contributing to historical movement; they are the result of the interaction and combination of various social phenomena and processes. They express the predominant trend in a transitional period, the unique character of which at different times and in different places is conditioned by the rich specific content of social life, the action of the laws of development of economics, intellectual life and human psychology. And all this tends to blur or even block the very possibility of distinguishing the 'old' from the 'new,' and consequently makes it more difficult to understand whether or how far one can apply deductions made from past experience.

I will cite another example from Colombia. Right now we are observing a curious historical coincidence, and one that is by no means harmless from the point of view of the class struggle. Colombia has had a two-party system for more than a century. Two strong bourgeois-landowner parties, the Liberals and Conservatives, appeared soon after the country's liberation from the Spanish yoke in the first half of the 19th century. From the outset the Conservatives took a reactionary stance, expressing the interests of the big landowners and relying on the support of the upper echelons of the Catholic Church. Their program in the 19th century amounted to

preserving intact all the political and social institutions of Spanish colonial times in republican conditions. The Liberal Party emerged as the party of the Colombian bourgeoisie, which held progressive, democratic views. It campaigned actively for abolition of the slavery of the black population and its campaign was successful. The intense rivalry between the parties through the 19th century was responsible for the constant civil wars and coups d'état.

Our party was founded in 1930, during a period of upswing in the class struggle, when the Conservatives were in power and the sympathies of many were naturally on the side of the Liberals, who soon replaced the Conservatives in office. The Liberal government of Alfonso Lopez, eager for popular support, introduced new progressive labor legislation and the law on agrarian reform, passed in 1936, did to a certain extent benefit the peasants. And this was when the Communist Party was able to emerge from the underground. Although the government was bourgeois, it was an anti-fascist government and hence for its time, progressive. The support that the communists gave it in that period was correct.

But it should not have been forgotten that when the politicians of the ruling classes are settling accounts and fighting for power, this may affect the working people and their party. This was what happened in the postwar period in our country. The antagonism between the traditional parties sparked off a period of violence and led to a civil war that cost the Colombian people 200,000 lives. And it was this that forced us to take a long hard look at our own experience of struggle and to start doubting the reformist demagogy of the liberal bourgeoisie.

Today a member of the Liberal Party is again president of Colombia. What is more, he is the son of the former President Lopez whom I have just mentioned, and his name is also Alfonso Lopez Michelsen. Recalling the recent past and its outcome, we have naturally taken a critical attitude toward him, although there was a time when he was in opposition and the Communist Party supported him in the struggle against the so-called 'party system.'* But Senor Lopez has since made peace with his class and is entirely on its side, and not on the side of the masses.

This change in the Communist Party's attitude was not understood by some of our comrades. They believed that we were taking a

*The 'parity system' was proclaimed in 1958, after the overthrow of the Rojas Pinilla military dictatorship. Under a treaty concluded between the two traditional parties, up to 1974 the post of President was held alternately by Liberals and Conservatives, regardless of election results. This was what Colombia's ruling circles called 'representative democracy.' In fact, this form of state ensured domination of the big bourgeoisie and landowners. Lopez Michelsen organized and led the movement against this system. — *Ed.*

dangerous line in openly criticizing the Lopez government. Such criticism might mean that the government would be overthrown and the military would again come to power. But the Communist Party has not set itself the aim of overthrowing the existing government. It only wants to prevent Lopez's reformist demagogy from harming the working class. As for the possibility of a putsch, we resolutely expose any ideas or actions in that direction.

So I would stress that today support for the Liberals and for Lopez Junior would mean something quite different from support for the Liberals in the time of Lopez Senior, and that despite the apparent similarity the situation is essentially different; but some people are deceived by this outward similarity.

Florakis. You mean there is always a danger of identifying a new situation with an old one, of failing to understand its newness? But both extremes have to be avoided. On the one hand, one must not be blind to the new revolutionary opportunities that the present offers and think only in the dogmatic terms of past experience. On the other, one must not be beguiled by the tempting pictures generated by the dynamism of contemporary life, overestimate the newness of phenomena and throw aside the well-tested weapons of the past. It is important to be able to distinguish between what is relevant and irrelevant in experience. As history has shown, failure to note this aspect of using experience can also lead to errors. One tends to divorce politics from real life.

And another point. In my view, repetition of the mistakes of the past is often due to a failure to see things as a whole. Uninformed or misinformed people in the capitalist countries, particularly the younger generation, often have a confused idea of the past owing to the biased presentation of events in the bourgeois press. As we know, the mass consciousness that has been conditioned in this way often provides favorable soil for various reactionary ideas. The neo-fascists, all those who are now trying to idealize the 'order' maintained by fascism while ignoring its barbaric methods, deliberately work to create and exploit this kind of mental climate.

But if one takes an objective, all-round view of the past there is less danger of being misled or being unable to trust the facts.

Common concern for the common heritage

Vieira. I want to go back to your idea of interconnections. The modern world may be compared to a lake. A single stone thrown into the water may cause ripples across the whole surface. Any step by the communists of one country may today have repercussions on an international scale. All this places a special responsibility on communists for their decisions, for making them well balanced. Knowing

the whole wealth, the whole value of the revolutionary experience of many countries gives every party a bigger potential. This naturally leads to the conclusion that generalization of historical experience is a responsibility that communists should share.

Florakis. That is certainly a relevant point. Each party undertakes full responsibility for the future of its people, for the fate of the revolutionary process in its country. Each party is conducting an independent policy. So it is particularly important to find forms consonant with the present level of development of the communist movement for generalizing the experience of the various parties operating in the specific conditions of their countries. I think that as a conclusion to our dialogue we should point out the need to search for ways of generalizing from revolutionary experience that would suit present-day conditions, take more account of the needs of each party and further the interests of the world revolutionary movement. As was rightly noted at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, practical experience is the only criterion of the correctness or incorrectness of any proposition. But this does not rule out preliminary testing of propositions by theoretical discussion and comparing the views of experience of different parties in a comradely way in order to avoid mistakes. And we believe that the *WMR* does and should do quite a lot in this respect.

Vieira. Yes, I agree. And I should like to make one more point. Freedom of revolutionary creativity is inseparably linked with awareness of necessity, that is, of the general laws of revolutionary development. But I feel it is important to overcome the view peddled by bourgeois propaganda that the general laws of the class struggle are nothing but repetition of the same pattern of events in different countries. Or to put it another way, recognition of these laws means recognizing the necessity of acting in exactly the same way as someone else acted in the past. This has nothing at all to do with the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the historical laws and their manifestations. It is not a matter of repetition but of tendencies, of general principles that work in different conditions in different ways, through zigzags, as Marx said, but nevertheless work 'with iron necessity.' And if we are speaking of the strategy of the communists based on recognition of historical laws and relying on them, this certainly does not prevent us from being flexible in our work. Even less does it prevent us from studying the new. On the contrary, it helps.

Going back to the main point, I would put it this way: the question of how best to make history is a question of knowing the lessons of history. That is why it is so important to investigate them and generalize from them scientifically.

Guarantee of freedom and human rights

Horst Sindermann
Member, PB, SUPG CC,
President of the People's
Chamber of the GDR

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany has always devoted close attention to improving and promoting socialist democracy, to involving ever larger numbers of people in the adoption of key decisions affecting their lives. 'The main orientation of the development of socialist state power,' declares the SUPG Program, adopted at the party's Ninth Congress in 1976, 'is the further extension and improvement of socialist democracy. Diverse citizen participation in the administration of the state and the economy is increasingly becoming a distinctive feature of life under socialism.'

Our state has no interests save those of the people. Its policy, which has won international prestige for our republic, pursues the aim of ensuring peace and cooperation among nations and is based on alliance with the USSR and the other socialist countries in opposition to the attempts of the enemies of détente to encroach on the sovereignty of our state, on the frontiers of our socialist homeland. The socialist state implements the party's policy of combining economic growth with the promotion of the people's welfare and gives all citizens the guarantee of social security and extensive opportunities for obtaining an education, broadening their knowledge and raising their cultural level. This policy is entirely consonant with the interests and requirements of the working class, the cooperated farmers, the socialist intelligentsia and other working strata and calls for the steady promotion of the people's democratic activity and the wider exercise of their rights and freedoms.

State power of the working people is most strikingly embodied in mass elective bodies representing the people and vested with important powers to direct social development. As organizations of the people, the representative bodies personify the democratic essence of the socialist state system. They are set up by the people and are accountable and responsible to them. They are, therefore, the core of state power. 'The people's representative bodies,' states the GDR Constitution, 'are the foundation of the system of state organs.'

However, socialist people's power is exercised not only through a system of representative bodies but also through various forms of direct democracy, for instance, referendums, mass movements and organizations such as the trade unions, the youth, women's and other associations, and also the committees of the National Front of Democratic Germany. Nationwide discussions of key draft laws before they are passed by the People's Chamber of the GDR, the highest representative organ, nave likewise become part and parcel of political life. For instance, the trade unions sponsored a broad discussion of the draft of a new labor code lasting several months in 1977. In that discussion some six million people stated their considerations and views. They tested the provisions of the draft against the current situation and their own notions about the further development of working and living conditions and proposed thousands of amendments and additions to the text of the draft.

There was a similarly active and creative discussion of draft standard rules and regulations of agricultural producer cooperatives. At the more than 14,000 meetings members of the cooperatives and farmworkers submitted nearly 15,000 proposals and requests. This eloquently illustrates how people engaged in agriculture have a hand in guiding the social and economic development of their cooperatives.

It is indicative that discussions of this kind encourage the activity of the voluntary mass organizations and movements such as the movement of production innovators and rationalizers, which involves over 1,500,000 factory and agricultural workers, and the more than 2,000,000-strong youth movement for initiative under the slogan of 'Advanced Workers of Tomorrow.'

The creative activity of the working people, of the mass movements, all of which have been and are initiated by our party, vividly pinpoints one of the basic features of socialist democracy, namely, the participation of millions upon millions of people in charting the destiny of their country. Lenin noted: 'That is corroboration of one of the most profound and at the same time most simple and comprehensible precepts of Marxism. The greater the scope and extent of historical events, the greater is the number of people participating in them, and, contrariwise, the more profound the change we wish to bring about, the more must we rouse an interest and an intelligent attitude toward it, and convince more millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 498).

The picture of socialist democracy would consequently be incomplete if it were confined to the work of elective representative bodies of the people. Socialist democracy spells out the broad participation of the people in the administration of the state and a great diversity of

forms and institutions ensuring the subordination of all state activity to the interests of the people.

Ever since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* 130 years ago, in which Marx and Engels wrote that 'to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class' and 'to win the battle of democracy' (*Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 126), was the two-in-one task of the revolutionary movement, virtually armies of bourgeois ideologists have tried to prove that socialist revolution signified the 'end of democracy.' In championing bourgeois democracy they have to this day essentially one aim, that of preserving the existing power relations, in other words, the political and social domination of an insignificant minority over the overwhelming majority of society. However, Marx and Engels scientifically proved that a fundamental modification of established social relations, notably the socialization of the means of production and the abolition of oppression of the majority by a minority, was both necessary and inevitable. The proletariat, they said, uses the political supremacy it has won 'to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class, and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible' (*Ibid.*).

From this it follows that the question of the nature of democracy is always preceded by the question of the character of ownership of the means of production. Where capitalist ownership and the exploitation of man by man prevail democracy is bound to be curtailed and limited, serving the interests of the propertied.

The situation changes radically when the working class takes over political power and is thus able to make unrestricted use of the means of production. It then faces the enormously important task of organizing production and distributing the results of labor more and more consciously and by plan. But is it possible to fulfill this task without the broadest participation of the working class and the entire people in the exercise of political power in all areas of society's life and in the most diverse forms? Above all this is a matter of organization of material production and the rapid multiplication of social wealth.

Moreover, political creativity by a free people generates fundamentally new institutions and forms of democracy that are implicit only in socialism. 'It would be sheer nonsense,' Lenin wrote, 'to think that the most profound revolution in human history, the first case in the world of power being transferred from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority, could take place within the time-worn framework of the old, bourgeois, parliamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy, new institutions that embody the new conditions for applying democracy,

etc.' (Vol. 28, p. 464). These words were spoken at the First Congress of the Comintern in March 1919 and they convincingly show the need for a qualitatively new type of democracy that takes shape on the basis of the new, socialist relations of production. Lenin also showed the profoundly democratic essence of the socialist state that comes forward after the revolution as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At our Ninth Congress, in keeping with the guidelines laid down by the classics of Marxism-Leninism on the role of the state in the period of transition from capitalism to communism, we characterized our state as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The workers' and peasants' power exists in the GDR for more than 30 years now. The former exploiters have been stripped of power, the means of production belong to the people, and farmland, to producer cooperatives. Under the leadership of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat the country is building and pefecting a developed socialist society. At the same time, the conditions are maturing for a gradual transition to the building of the foundations of communism. Socialist democracy is gradually evolving into democracy for the whole people, with all members of society enjoying equal rights and freedoms.

The basic right of each person is the right to work. In the GDR this right is not only recorded in the Constitution; it is fully implemented. It covers the right to remuneration, which is effected through nominal and real wages, through personal and social consumption. In our country wages are rising steadily; consumption is growing correspondingly, while the prices of goods and services and rents remain unchanged. Real wages and real incomes, of which the social consumption funds form a substantial part, are particularly important for the growth of the people's living and cultural standard. These funds cover free medical care, including medical attention at health resorts, free education at secondary schools and institutions of higher learning, paid leaves, holiday accommodation provided by the trade unions at a considerable discount, free retraining courses, including courses for young people, and professional training of young men and women in all industries. A major social gain of our system is also that women enjoy equality with men in remuneration for labor, that the doors of vocational schools, institutes and universities are open to the children of workers and peasants, that all the people have free access to cultural values, and so forth. All this — the list can be lengthened — is a feature and huge advantage of socialist society. Is capitalism able to provide even one of these basic human rights?

True, in some bourgeois, particularly industrialized, states the working people have been granted various rights and freedoms. How-

ever, first, this was done not because the ruling classes desired it but, on the contrary, against their will, as a result of a powerful democratic movement in which the working people, led by the working class, compelled the ruling circles to make some concessions. Second, while easing the condition of the people all these gains in no way modify the essence of power. Under capitalist relations of production even the seemingly 'most democratic' democracy remains a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, which, as the entire history of the international working-class movement teaches us, immediately sheds all its democratic garb as soon as the foundations of the existing social order are threatened. The bourgeoisie and its parties do not stop at aggravating the class struggle and using parliament to strip the people of the rights they have won and preserve capitalist rule by means of anti-democratic laws.

The bourgeois theory of the state and law extols bourgeois parliamentarism as the acme of democracy. The multi-party system and pluralism, the free market economy, governments that are preoccupied with maintaining the stability of the regime, and the opposition which pursues the same purpose, are skillfully intertwined under capitalism and prevent the people from endangering the powers that be. This system even makes allowance for reforms provided they do not question the power and profits of monopoly capital; it even provides for social programs if anything is left in the budget after the deductions for military needs; it makes allowance for activity in art and culture if these serve business; it proclaims the right to education, which many working-class families cannot afford. In other words, both the theory and practice of the bourgeois state and law are founded entirely and solidly on class positions.

The same may also be said of bourgeois parliamentarism. In *The State and Revolution* Lenin wrote: 'Marx grasped this *essence* of capitalist democracy splendidly when, in analyzing the experience of the Commune, he said that the oppressed are allowed once every few years to decide which particular representative of the oppressing class shall represent and repress them in parliament!' (Vol. 25, p. 461). Such also is the essence of bourgeois parliamentarism. This does not, of course, exclude the fact that representatives of the revolutionary masses may and do regard the bourgeois parliament as a rostrum, that they may and do use it to organize and educate the masses. A fact that should not be underestimated is that where there is a strong revolutionary party the possibility exists of forcing the exploiters to make various concessions to the people.

This does not mean, of course, that the bourgeois parliament ceases to serve the interests of capital. Nevertheless, the monopoly circles seek to reduce the already curtailed role of parliament and pare

down its legislative powers, thereby demonstrating their inherent hostility to any democratic forms. This explains the mounting tendency to strengthen the executive apparatus, which is closely bound to the monopolies.

When it assumes power to further the interests of the working people, the working class turns parliament into a representative organ vested with all legislative and executive power. The creative and democratic character of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is seen here in all its diversity and depth. Socialist representative organs of power not only consider and pass laws but also carry them out and supervise their observance by other organs of power. Representative institutions are thus being converted from 'talking shops,' as Lenin sarcastically called bourgeois parliaments, into 'working bodies' (see Vol. 25, p. 423). The Paris Commune, it will be recalled, was the first representative institution of the new type in history. 'The Commune,' Marx pointed out, 'was to be a working, not a parliamentary, body, executive and legislative at the same time' (Vol. 2, p. 220).

This is precisely the character of all our representative institutions: the People's Chamber of the GDR, the district councils (these two levels of representative organs have 3,340 deputies) and the people's representative bodies in the regions and municipal boroughs, to which nearly 200,000 persons are elected. Their work is centered on safeguarding the vital interests of the people, on fostering their creative energies and abilities, on steadfastly improving their labor and living conditions and on protecting the environment.

The principle of 'working body' is seen vividly in the effective work of the commissions set up by the People's Chamber. Decisions passed by them are preceded by a painstaking and comprehensive discussion. They play a large part in supervising the fulfillment of laws and other acts. For this purpose they conduct on-the-spot checks and organize meetings with the personnel of enterprises and with the people at the place of residence.

The government's accountability to the supreme representative organ and the responsibility of all other executive and administrative bodies to the relevant people's representative organs are tested principles of socialist democracy.

In order to extend and enhance the competent participation of the people in the administration of the state, the economy and other spheres of social life we accord an important role also to the standing commissions of district and local people's representative bodies. Today there are about 52,000 of these commissions with more than 357,000 citizens taking part in their work. In addition, there are 166,000 citizens in the bodies set up by the standing commissions to

tackle specific tasks, while 335,000 people help to conduct the social work of the National Front committees. All this comprises a broad democratic basis and powerful potential for conducting state and social affairs at local level.

The extent to which socialist democracy is being realized depends in many respects on the personal qualities of deputies, on, to quote Erich Honecker, their energy and efficiency. The social composition of the people's representative bodies is an important factor helping them to discharge their functions. In the GDR today 69 per cent of the deputies are factory or office workers, and 25 per cent are cooperative farmers. This is entirely consistent with the class structure in our country. This social composition of our representative bodies constitutes an important factor in their high level of activity and competence. Profound knowledge in the economic, scientific, technical or cultural fields, vast experience of life and understanding of the people's requirements and needs are qualities inherent in representatives of the working class, cooperative farmers, intellectuals and other strata of the people of the GDR. They are well aware that material production has always been the foundation of social life and that in its entire socio-political work the party is guided by economic reality. The people's deputies have extensive experience of intensifying production, considerable knowledge of the ways and means of boosting labor efficiency and long years of association with their comrades in work. This helps them to deal confidently with all questions related to the needs and requirements of citizens.

Moreover, strict supervision of the fulfillment of acts of legislation (large numbers of citizens are drawn into the supervisory work of the state) and observance of the principle of accountability and check-up are likewise inseparable components of our understanding of democracy. For instance, the heads of industrial enterprises must regularly report to the people on progress in the fulfillment of plans for economic and social development, on how far the indicators of economic growth conform to the required gradual improvement of the working and living conditions of industrial, office and professional workers.

The aforesaid allows us to draw the conclusion that the hallmark of social life in the GDR today is the broad appreciation of one of Lenin's most profound precepts, namely, that true democracy is as inconceivable without socialism as socialism is inconceivable without the implementation and steady improvement of democracy.

One of the most striking features distinguishing socialist from bourgeois democracy is that in a socialist society citizens do not merely go to the polls on the designated day, but long before and after the elections they take part, in all sorts of ways, in carrying out the

tasks which they themselves set their representative bodies. This participation begins as soon as deputies are nominated by the collectives in which they live or work and in which they can show that they champion the interests of the working people. Then follows a long, all-sided public discussion of the nominations, in the course of which the constituents decide whether a given candidate will justify the name of people's representative. After the elections contact between constituents and a deputy is not cut short. He must periodically give an account of his work to his constituents, who have the right to recall him before the expiry of his term of office.

It may be said that a member of a bourgeois parliament likewise addresses his constituents. However, a fundamental distinction is to be observed here as well. A deputy of a socialist representative organ addresses constituents not in order to ensure his re-election. Since he is not a professional and since he lives and works among the people he cannot tear himself away from the masses, he cannot use one language during an election campaign and another in a work collective. For that reason when he meets his constituents his preoccupation is not to 'catch votes' but to check his work with the views and wishes of working people.

One will appreciate that a people's deputy bears an enormous responsibility. He cannot confine himself to talking about the specific features and advantages of socialist democracy. As a deputy elected by the people he must make this democracy accessible and comprehensible to every person. Naturally, this is not achieved automatically. In the relations between a person holding an elective office and the constituents disagreements may and do arise, for personal and collective interests do not mechanically conform to the interests of society as a whole. For that reason when citizens go to their deputy with complaints or suggestions he has the task not only of satisfying justified individual requirements and needs but also of meeting the interests of the whole of society.

It is said that he who has authority also has cares. The life of a deputy spent amid and in view of the people is replete with cares and requires selfless dedication of all his intellectual and physical strength. At the same time, it is a life in which democracy and optimism are inalienable features, a life filled with a deep purpose, a life that brings tremendous satisfaction.

A society in which socialist democracy has been established is bound to be a consistent champion of world peace. It is common knowledge that all the major peace initiatives and proposals on disarmament, the destruction of weapons of mass annihilation, the renunciation of the use of force in inter-state relations, the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and much else have come from the

Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This is no historical accident. Our policy of peace is based on the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. This policy pursues the unswerving aim of the international working-class movement of delivering mankind from the threat of war once and for all. Today we can say with gratification that through the efforts of socialist countries the policy of peaceful coexistence and easing tension in the relations between countries with different social systems has become predominant on our planet. However, reactionary imperialist forces continue their desperate resistance to mankind's noble aspiration for peace. Their violent ideological assaults on the socialist countries and the process of détente acquire increasingly new forms. This is evidence that imperialism is indifferent to the destiny of the peoples, to the aspiration of the masses for peace.

The provocative campaigns in 'defense of human rights' that allegedly are being violated in socialist countries continue unabated in the capitalist West. However, it is hardly necessary to prove that the greatest right is the right to live and work in peace. If bourgeois democracy is indeed 'pure' and 'genuine,' why cannot the warmongers be bridled in the capitalist countries? If there is any respect for human rights in this 'pure' democracy, why has the military-industrial complex the right to place an ever heavier burden of military expenditures on the people? What explains the fact that no bourgeois parliament has considered the World Peace Council's Stockholm Appeal, which bears more than 400 million signatures?

The apologists of bourgeois democracy are unable to answer questions of this kind. There is good reason for this; it is now becoming increasingly clear that foreign policy is closely bound to a country's social system. The ruling working class and its allies neither have nor can have the intention of subjugating other peoples and unleashing wars of conquest. Socialist democracy opens wide the door to the development of features of social life such as friendship among nations, peaceful and good-neighbor relations, and solidarity with class brothers throughout the world. The striving for durable peace is intrinsic to socialist society. For that reason, in keeping with the standpoint that there can be no alternative to peaceful coexistence, the parliaments of the GDR and the other socialist countries seek to expand contacts with parliaments and members of parliament in capitalist states. To the deep satisfaction of the peoples of the world this view is gaining the upper hand throughout our planet.

The socialist countries, as distinct from capitalist states, thus do not confine themselves to words about freedom, democracy and peace. The ruling working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard are successfully turning these great ideals of humankind into reality.

Party experience

The lessons of Chile

Luis Corvalan
General Secretary, CP Chile

THE UNARMED ROAD OF THE REVOLUTION: HOW IT WORKED OUT IN CHILE

Eleven years after the Cuban Revolution, which put the people in power, a revolution was carried out by the Chilean people, who won a part of the political power. These positions were held for three years by the Popular Unity government, which put through the basic structural transformations of an anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic revolution with a socialist vista. There was interest all over the world in the changes brought about in that period, and especially in the fact that the revolution took the peaceful road, which we Chilean communists prefer to call the unarmed road (because it is, in practice, not all that peaceful). This interest was further increased by the fact that the government headed by President Allende had been created by a popular movement involving several parties and different democratic trends rallied round a common program.

It was Marx who first predicted the possibility of a peaceful revolution. In 1917, the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, twice brought up the question of the revolution's peaceful development and acted accordingly. Lenin gave it much attention, although he believed that in the conditions of the period such an eventuality would be extremely rare. Because of the new conditions which have now taken shape, the international communist movement believes that it is more probable today. In Chile, following the Popular Unity bloc's victory in the 1970 presidential elections, the possibility became a reality. Whereas in the course of some other revolutions taking the peaceful road, the process was short-lived or went forward in specific conditions, directly after the rout of fascism, in our country the real possibility of such development was borne out by the experience of three years.

The Chilean revolution has suffered a temporary reverse, but such an outcome does not refute the assumption that in other countries, and perhaps even in Chile itself, the working class and its allies will be

See the series of articles by CP Chile leaders analyzing the lessons of the events in Chile: *World Marxist Review,* for Jan., Feb., March, May, June, July and Aug., 1977.

able to win political power and carry out their revolution without resort to the use of arms.

That is why revolutionaries in many countries have been making a close study of the Chilean experience. We, for our part, believe it to be our duty to draw substantial conclusions from the whole development of the revolutionary process, which we successfully promoted over a long period, and to analyze the causes of the defeat.

The Chilean people won a part of the state power, securing the post of President of the Republic, instead of a 'solid majority in parliament,' as suggested, for instance, by the 1960 Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, when formulating its thesis about a peaceful road for the revolution. While remaining fully convinced of the significance and relevance of that Statement, I recall what it says merely to emphasize that the reality is richer and more varied than any theses, however basically correct these may be, and to stress the multiplicity of the forms, methods and ways of the revolution, of which Lenin spoke in his lifetime when showing the great scope of the Marxist doctrine.

But essentially our experience consists in something else. It has confirmed that the working class is capable of carrying out a revolution along any path, provided it promotes the development of the class struggle, concentrates fire on the chief enemies, and helps to accelerate the changes which have matured in society, thereby rallying a majority of the people, and creating a balance of forces which enables it to defeat reaction and to tie its hands.

A plenary meeting of our party's Central Committee in August 1977 reached this conclusion: *the Chilean experience testifies that the question of 'who beats whom' depends above all on who succeeds in isolating whom from the masses, and who ultimately turns out to be stronger: the working class and its allies or reaction and its allies. All the problems of the Chilean revolution, both those it did and did not solve, were linked up with this question.*

The working class and its allies, the Popular Unity bloc, took the first step to power — the winning of the post of president of the republic — in the 1970 elections, when they gained a majority, but only a relative majority. The fact is that Salvador Allende won with 36.3 per cent of the poll, that is, a larger percentage than the other two candidates for the post. This did not in itself settle the matter of filling the Presidential post. For one thing, in a situation in which none of the candidates managed to win an absolute majority, the final decision rested with parliament. And secondly, and this is the most important point, the 36.3 per cent showed that the working class and its allies had to win over fresh social sections and to enlarge the framework of their alliance to achieve a correlation of forces that would make it

possible for their candidate to fill the presidential post and to get down to bringing about the changes outlined in the Popular Unity Program. This became an urgent need when it transpired that imperialism and Chilean reaction were planning to prevent Salvador Allende from assuming the post of head of state.

This was clear to all the Popular Unity parties and they began to act accordingly. Masses of working and other people thronged the streets. Everywhere efforts were made to establish contact and mutual understanding with the democratic circles which, while not voting for Allende, were still inclined to accept his victory. These circles were motivated by various considerations: some held to the tradition of backing the man who had won a majority, others feared the people, who were not inclined to give up their victory, but most found the Popular Unity Program congenial and preferred Allende to the right-forces candidate, who had come second. Consequently, in practice the relative majority was converted into an absolute majority. The balance of forces had tilted in favor of Popular Unity, preventing the isolated right-wingers from strangling the revolution in its cradle. Their sorties in that period failed militarily mainly because the right forces had been routed politically.

A report to our August plenary meeting said: 'The successes scored within the 60 crucial days, from the Presidential elections to Allende's assumption of the post of President of the republic, and also the successes scored within the whole initial period of about a year, were due, on the one hand, to the broad nationwide support for the immediate goals of the popular movement, the rallying of the masses to attain these goals, and Popular Unity's solidarity and cohesion in that period on the main issue, and on the other hand, they were due to the fact that Popular Unity had sought and found agreements and compromises with other forces that proved to be objectively necessary.'* Such agreements were reached with the Christian Democrats. The first of these was the constitutional guarantees pact. Later, an agreement was concluded on a constitutional reform relating to the nationalization of the major copper mines.

Some left-wingers at home and abroad took a dogmatic and even anti-communist stand and denied the very possibility of the Chilean people's winning without resort to arms. Others held that our victory had been the result of a mistake by the right in running a candidate of their own in the 1970 Presidential elections, something they had not done in 1964. The truth is that the popular victory in 1970 resulted from a long and intense political battle for the unity of the working class, for mutual understanding between the socialists and the com-

**Partido Comunista de Chile. Boletin del Exterior.* No. 26, November-December, 1977, pp. 20-21.

munists, for unity of the popular parties and joint action by the broadest democratic circles. The victory was also due to the political and ideological struggle against the 'left' and right trends within the Popular Movement, to the correct understanding and definition of the character of the Chilean revolution and its stages, the precise formulation of program goals, and the identification of the chief enemies and of the principal and secondary contradictions in Chilean society.

The change in the correlation of forces in favor of Popular Unity following Allende's election sprang largely from that protracted and intense struggle, which had helped not only to unite the broadest sections of the people round Popular Unity but also to bring it closer to other social and political forces. During the presidential campaign, the Christian Democrats, like Popular Unity, had advocated important goals such as the nationalization of the major copper mines and completion of the agrarian reform. Many Christian Democrats, in view of their own experience, also believed that it was necessary to deepen the transformations, and their candidate, Radomiro Tomic, even declared that capitalism was incapable of solving the country's problems. That being so, it became possible, after the elections, for the Christian Democrats and Popular Unity to reach agreement and establish mutual understanding among the broadest democratic circles, thus tilting the balance of forces in the people's favor.

The Chilean working class and people worked hard, taking creative initiatives and carrying on a selfless struggle for the success of the popular government and implementation of its program. The working people, the young, the women, and workers in the arts displayed heroism in their labor effort, in organizing the new order, in the distribution of food, of which there was a shortage, and in combating reactionary attacks. The revolution showed once again that it helps to release much creative energy and that the people are capable of great exploits for the sake of a better future. To the very end, millions of Chilean men and women worked for that purpose.

It is well known that any revolution is fraught with the danger of counter-revolution, which breaks loose whenever the revolutionaries lose the initiative, whenever the revolution begins to mark time and goes over to the defensive and when the correlation of forces eventually changes in favor of its enemies. In Chile, this occurred after the period of upswing in the popular movement and large-scale democratic transformations, after a period of successes and advances, in the course of which the popular government's policy enjoyed considerable support among the masses. The situation changed under the impact of various factors. Some of these — like the excessively high prices of imported goods and the substantial fall in the price of exports — were beyond the control of the government and Popular Unity.

These factors, and especially the plans of the enemy, which was still doing its worst, were objectively the overriding ones. But the main thing for us revolutionaries is to analyze the deep-going causes of the people's defeat, to study our own mistakes, which enabled imperialism and reaction to reach their objectives.

Popular Unity brought together in its ranks — and still does — forces which differ in social substance and have different ideologies: Marxists, rationalists, Christians. This has been and continues to be a positive fact, reflecting the scope of the alliance that has been built up round the working class. The people's strength lay in the unity of such a coalition. But for that unity to be firm it has to rest on a common program and also to have a united and correct political leadership, which is firmest of all when the working class has the prevailing role within it. Everything on the whole went well so long as such leadership was provided and so long as a resolute struggle was carried on to fulfill the program. When these requirements were met only half-heartedly, things began to fall apart.

We participants in the popular movement were not in agreement on all the issues. As the revolution began to run into difficulties unity of plan and action became even more imperative. But this was precisely when the discrepancies tended to become most acute. Within Popular Unity, differences on a number of problems tended to grow, and this jeopardized the policy of uniting the whole people round the working class. As a result the real force of the process was undermined. The program gradually lost its edge. Instead of using all the available forces of the popular movement to deal resolute blows at imperialism, the monopolies and the land-owning oligarchy, a struggle was also started against the middle strata, a part of which had been won over to our side, and another, neutralized at the initial stage. Reaction was able to mount its offensive when — largely because of the mistakes in political leadership — it managed to escape from its isolation and to set up a front together with these middle strata, spreading its influence even to some groups of workers. Not everyone realized that the strength of the government and Popular Unity lay in the fact that it had its own program, a strategic basis for correct political leadership. When this correct line won out, the people found the strength to isolate and rout the enemies. But when departures from the program, in effect, turned into a second program, the differences on the main issues largely hampered the activity of the government and Popular Unity. This was when the situation began its rapid deterioration, which culminated in the coup.

In our view, from the day of the 1970 presidential elections right up to the final minute of popular government, the struggle for the revolution was a struggle to change the balance of forces in favor of the

people. Let us note that the favorable-balance-of-forces concept does not imply winning a majority in general, but above all an active majority. The urge to win a majority is always important, but a mere majority is obviously not enough, and may even temporarily be lacking at this or that moment. That is why there is much more to the complicated concept of the favorable balance of forces. Alongside the other factors, it takes account of the militant spirit, level of organization, capability of the masses to muster their strength, homogeneity of views within the coalition and a relevant military component.

The outcome of our revolution was not, of course, fatally inevitable. The differences, which evidently exist in any coalition, need not necessarily prevail. They can be overcome, and this requires, besides a correct program and correct political leadership, sustained participation by the masses, because the revolution is their own creation.

In Chilean conditions, the main issue in the revolution — the winning of complete power — depended on the capacity of Popular Unity to isolate the enemy and create a superiority that would make it possible to go on from the winning of the presidential post to the assumption of control over the whole state apparatus and a profound transformation of all its institutions.

Reaction seeks to depict the revolutionary goal of winning complete power by the people as sinister, totalitarian and anti-democratic. In fact, the very opposite is true. When setting ourselves such a task, we revolutionaries act for the sake of highly noble and democratic goals. Such important components of the bourgeois state as the courts, the armed forces, the prosecuting agencies and the key instruments of economic direction are beyond real democratic control, for the people have no say in their formation or activity. Consequently, the whole point is to secure for the working class and the rest of the people access to every organ and institution of the state so that they will eventually pass into the hands of the people. This is not some devious plot, as the reactionaries claim, but the people's use of democratic forms, methods and ways, chosen and supported by the people themselves. One could say that the winning of complete power is the only true way of giving body to the idea of democracy which was so aptly expressed by Lincoln in his 'government of the people, by the people, for the people.'

In Chile, it turned out to be possible to isolate the enemy and prevail over its forces in order to achieve a number of revolutionary objectives: nationalization of the major copper mines and the large monopolistic enterprises and banks, completion of the agrarian reform, and establishment of control over virtually the whole of foreign trade. But no such superiority was achieved in tackling the revolutionary tasks of winning complete power, and this happened mainly

because the majority of the people had pinned their hopes on the issue of control of the government rather than on control of all the power.

Broad masses of people were unaware of the need to win complete power, which was due to the inadequate political education of the masses over a period of many years, and for this we communists feel a special responsibility. As a result, we did not have at our disposal the relevant active force capable of mustering its strength for the complete solution of this problem. When we proposed, say, the establishment of popular tribunals, which was a limited measure but would have in effect served partially to democratize the judicial machinery, or when we intended to set up a unified national system of education, which would have helped to democratize it, the enemy used the absence of any clear notion among the masses about the necessary institutional transformations, so that we were forced to retreat and abandon these initiatives. The intention which informed these initiatives was laudable but if they were to become a reality, the majority had to understand their substance. In that concrete situation, it was a mistake to put forward tasks that would have divided the government-support front. Subsequent events clearly showed the masses the class character of the parliament, the judiciary and the military institutions. But by then the correlation of forces had deteriorated, and this made it impossible to undertake fruitful efforts — although by then the majority had come to realize the need for them — to solve the problem of power (including, of course, the democratization of the military institutions, within which there were some supporters of change, however few).

The working class and other forward-looking forces strove to create a new type of state. Some new forms of power emerged: administrative, production and vigilance committees were set up at the enterprises which the state had taken over; the trade unions had united in industrial belts; and consumers had set up supply and price-control councils. But these embryos of the new power — and such experience is highly valuable — were not properly developed. At that time, the development of the situation was altered by the reactionary escalation. The real popular power was also weakened and the enemy moves facilitated by the acts of the ultra-leftists, who sought to turn the emergent organizations into a power alternative to the Allende government.

Meanwhile, the popular government's successful activity was exceptionally important for the development of the revolutionary process. There was a need to show that the emergent system was opening the floodgates for the development of the productive forces, for economic growth, for a better distribution of the national income and for raising the people's living standards, that is, for the country's

progress and for social justice. Confirmation of this came from the running of the industrial enterprises at full capacity, the growth of production on that basis, and the rising incomes of the working people, the small and middle businessmen, and the traders. However, there came a point at which higher labor productivity became crucial. The working people, guided by our party's line, had launched many valuable initiatives and expended much effort to win the battle for production at the enterprises taken over by the state and also in the countryside. The Popular Unity government's full victory in tackling the economic problems would have attracted most of the people even more broadly and firmly to its side. This would, in turn, have helped tremendously in successfully solving the problems connected with the winning of complete power. But reactionary sabotage in production, the policy of destabilization pursued by U.S. imperialism, and also neglect of economic problems and the lack of any genuine direction of the economy ultimately tipped the scales against us.

That is the light in which the question of power appeared in Chile.

The Chilean revolution shows that, whatever direction the process takes, the hegemony of the working class and the leading role of its vanguard are the crucial factors.

The hegemony of the working class is secured in struggle and is recognized by other classes and social sections only when it exists in fact. This is achieved whenever the working class pursues a consistent policy of alliances and is successful in this field.

Winning over the petty bourgeoisie, the middle strata and the semi-proletarians has become one of the main factors in the struggle to build up a balance of forces favorable to the revolution. In a country like Chile these social forces are numerous and important. They are by no means homogenous. The main element is the peasants, along with the impoverished sections of the population, the small traders and businessmen, craftsmen, professional people, intellectuals, students, and so on. We may also include wage workers who do not come under the heading of proletarians. At a time of revolutionary change the tendency of these strata to waver between the positions of the proletariat and reaction becomes strikingly apparent. Some of them sided with the popular movement throughout the revolutionary process in Chile, but it was a constant struggle to win over the majority of these strata. From giving a certain degree of support for, or remaining neutral toward, the government, as was the case in the initial period, most of them went over to the counter-revolution in the final period. This prompted the general conclusion that such negative shifts are inevitable. It has been claimed that as soon as the intermediate strata come up against the real possibility of radical changes, most of them fall back into the arms of reaction in order to

preserve their 'relative privileges.' So, it is argued, Popular Unity should not try to better its previous achievement and should content itself with the support of the minority of these strata.

This conclusion is incorrect. It is clear that the conditions of life of the majority of peasants and also people compelled to migrate to the towns (a particularly intensive process in Chile) and therefore obliged to live on casual earnings, and the conditions of life of other strata of the population are comparable to those of the proletariat, and sometimes worse. Only in joint action with the working class can these strata gain a fitting place in society and improve their prospects. Only the victory of the working class can finally solve their problems. Hence there is always a possibility of achieving an alliance and mutual understanding with them.

Certain contradictions exist between the petty bourgeoisie and the working class. There can be no doubt, however, that the petty bourgeoisie is also a victim of the policy of the monopolies and the concentration of capital in the hands of the financial oligarchy. The contradictions between the petty bourgeoisie and big capital tend to deepen and this makes the possibility of its mutual understanding with the proletariat all the more likely. So the question is to achieve such an understanding.

In the course of the Chilean revolution this should have been achieved by strict observance of a program that took into consideration the interests of the intermediate strata and indicated the direction of the main blows of the popular forces — against imperialism and the oligarchy. And in the first period of the popular government, when it kept to the program, the attitude of these strata toward the revolution was positive. On the political plane establishing mutual understanding meant finding channels for agreement between Popular Unity and Christian Democracy, whose supporters came from the middle strata. This was particularly important because such a policy tended to strengthen the unity of the working class, where the Christian Democrats had and still have considerable influence. In our view the proletarian line of making broad alliances, far from increasing bourgeois influence on the working class actually liberates it from such influence.

The successful realization of this line requires patient work on the part of the proletariat and its organizations. They must be fully aware of the complexity of the problem and also the ability of imperialism and reaction to influence these strata.

At the same time the actions of the ultra-lefts against the small and middle property-owners, actions that were not opposed by all of Popular Unity, evoked a negative reaction that was far greater than the actual number of actions or the real weight of the instigators

warranted. This was due to the fact that Popular Unity had no clearly defined understanding of the character of the given stage of the revolution and some people believed that this was already a full-scale socialist revolution. Moreover, they failed to realize that even in a socialist revolution one must pursue a policy toward the middle strata that allows them to contribute to the development of the process. This policy must be broad, flexible and at the same time firm. It must be carried through by combining the material interest of these strata with persuasion and simultaneously with greater popular pressure by the masses to stop the petty bourgeoisie from wavering.

The fact that we openly proclaim our socialist goals does not in itself restrict the scope of the working class for making alliances. In the present period, in conditions of state-monopoly capitalism that has made its appearance today even in the undeveloped countries, the contradictions between imperialism and these countries, between the financial oligarchies and the peoples are becoming more intense. The point is to reveal these contradictions and use them, as Lenin did in the setting of the Russian society of that time. This means finding formulas for broad mutual understanding and attempts to win the middle strata over to socialism by satisfying their legitimate demands, ensuring them a level of income and developing forms for their participation in the new society that will induce them to make their choice in favor of this society.

All the parties of the Popular Unity helped to prepare the ground for the victory of 1970 and the installation of President Allende's government. But it is also an indisputable fact that the Communist Party was the main force in making the Chilean revolution. It was the Communist Party that saw the possibility of setting up a popular government without resorting to the use of arms, and that evolved practical measures for pursuing this alternative. For this it deserves credit. Our party worked tirelessly for many years to rally the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy forces round the working class, taking into account the urgency and necessity of the changes that were long overdue in Chilean society. The Communist Party correctly defined the nature of the revolution and the policy of alliances. It reached the conclusion that the peaceful path does not rule out certain forms of coercion (such as the seizing of land by the peasants in the rural areas, and by settlement dwellers on the outskirts of cities), and that unity and the constant, active mobilization of the masses are a prime necessity. In the campaign for realization of this policy, which practice proved to be correct, the Communist Party consistently opposed leftist sectarianism, which cast doubts on its policy and refused to accept the tactics of broad alliances. The Communist Party also opposed the rightists, who stood for conciliating the enemy.

The Communist Party acquired very great influence over broad sections of the working class, particularly the industrial proletariat, the miners and also the construction workers. In those years its influence quickly spread to the rural areas, particularly among the agricultural workers. The Communist Party was very strong among the young people: the country's biggest political youth organization was communist. Our influence was substantial in university circles and among people working in the cultural field. It was considerably less among other middle strata. From the organizational standpoint the Communist Party was the most numerous: at the time of the putsch it had 195,000 members with various degrees of political training, and a communist youth organization with 87,000 members. We were a powerful force that given mutual understanding with our allies was quite capable of setting the broad masses in motion, even granted the fact that in the revolutionary process the masses means not hundreds of thousands but millions of people. And they could have been roused, above all for dealing with the country's major problems, which from the point of view of the mass consciousness was already ripe for solution. However, in situations when it proved impossible to achieve mutual understanding with other forces the Communist Party's scope for mobilizing the people was limited, with the result that it mobilized only the strata that were under its direct influence.

There was a pronounced tendency toward political stratification in the period of popular government. The political parties carried considerable weight in the national life and their decisions guided the actions not only of their members but also of the greater part of the circles that were under their influence. It is a significant fact for an appreciation of our possibilities that during the elections the ratio of votes to party members was lower in the case of our party than for other parties (only just over two votes per party member or member of the youth organization). So the Communist Party considered that it was fulfilling its vanguard mission not only by strengthening its ranks, not only by increasing its influence over the masses, but also by finding ways toward mutual understanding with the socialists and other parties of Popular Unity. Although some changes have already occurred and others may be expected, we still seek and shall go on seeking unity with all democratic and anti-fascist (including non-fascist) forces. This means that our primary aim is to achieve mutual understanding with the Socialist Party and all other parties of Popular Unity.

In the situation as it was at the time not everything depended on us. Our scope for performing the leading role was objectively limited. We

were not always able to be the acknowledged vanguard of the working class and the people as a whole.

As Leninism teaches, the party's firm line, its inflexible will — particularly at crucial moments — are also factors that stir the masses. In this field, too, we had our failings. For instance, we did not do everything to defend the cabinet of General Prats. His resignation was provoked in March 1973, just at the moment when reaction had set course for a putsch and the popular government should have maintained contact with the sections of the armed forces that were prepared to cooperate with it. In the specific situation that prevailed in the Chilean revolutionary process it was not enough for the party to be inflexibly resolved to emerge from this or that critical situation with its honor intact. Initiative and revolutionary determination are essential and sometimes of vital importance, but only when seen through the prism of objective, concrete conditions. Otherwise there is a danger of falling into voluntarism, wishful thinking and even adventurism.

Whatever the specific features of the Chilean revolution — and like any revolution it has many — not one of the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism can be placed in doubt in the light of this experience. On the contrary, our experience confirms them. A deep-going and thorough analysis of the Chilean process as a whole indicates that the general laws of revolution remain valid. The successes we achieved were due rather to the application of these laws, and our failures, to their underestimation. These outweighed any successes or miscalculations in assessing the specific features, which of course must not be underestimated either. This is clear. At the same time it would not be serious to assert, for example, that the fall of the Popular Unity government was simply due to the fact that certain laws were not taken into account. Nor would it be a scientific explanation merely to say that we did not solve the problem of winning complete power, that we did not switch in time to armed action or to make other similar assertions that ignore the actual difficulties and pitfalls of the situation at the time, that do not treat the question objectively, as a whole. We should recall yet again Lenin's words that the truth is always concrete.

The August plenary meeting of our Central Committee revealed our actual mistakes and omissions and singled out two in particular. First, the party did a good job in charting its political line for the whole period that led up to the partial winning of power, and for the first period of popular government. It is clear today, however, that our line for winning complete power and moving on to the next stage of the revolution, which would have enabled us to reach socialism, was not well enough worked out. Second, we did not evolve a proper military

policy. Since 1963 the party had been giving its members military training and making efforts to acquire enough arms to defend the government that we were confident the people would set up. But this was not enough, because our activity in this direction was not accompanied by the main thing, namely persistent and sustained propaganda to give the popular movement a correct attitude to the military. This was essential to dispel the military's incorrect, slanderously inspired notions of the working class and Popular Unity, to bring the ideas of Marxism to people's minds in an undistorted form. It must be admitted that the enemy, on the contrary, was continuously active in the armed forces.

People learn by their mistakes. Our party, like other parties of Popular Unity, has already learned many lessons. The analysis is not yet complete. It is still going on and there are more lessons to be drawn from it and systematized. The people and working class of Chile are learning and will continue to learn as they assimilate this experience, and also the experience of other parties and peoples, the experience of struggle and revolutionary theory.

Some things have already become apparent. Popular Unity, which among other things has to its credit the fact that it has stood up to the test of defeat without giving way to a split, has at present formed a clearer and more definite notion of the character of the revolution, of the need to distinguish between its stages without walling them off from one another, the need to develop a policy of broad alliances, to unite all anti-fascist and non-fascist forces, including the Christian-Democrat and democratic sectors of the armed forces — all this in the name of overthrowing the dictatorship and building a new democracy, forming a popular civilian-military government and again taking the road of change in the direction of socialism.

At the present time the Chilean people are becoming even more convinced that freedom does not exist as something over and above class. This is a class concept. The people have fought for it since the days of the Araucian wars against the Spanish conquistador. The working class, which aims at liberating not just itself but the whole of society, is fighting consistently for the freedom of the great majority and ultimately of all. But it cannot be said that in the three-year period of popular government this basic problem was tackled correctly in every way. Our government was a major advance on the road of democratization. It enlarged the people's freedoms and gave the working people rights and opportunities that they had never known before, such as the right to manage the enterprise where they worked. All this is undoubtedly to the credit of the popular government. But it made a grave mistake in allowing the forces of counter-revolution to

enjoy almost unlimited freedom, so that they could ultimately put an end to freedom.

Popular Unity advocated and still advocates a pluralist regime that recognizes guarantees also for an opposition as long as it stays within the bounds of laws passed sovereignly by the people in accordance with the norms of a legal state. We Chilean communists stand firm on this. We advocate a concept of pluralism in which there is no room for fascism, for a regime that is a synonym for crime, that contradicts freedom. As was stated at our plenary meeting, we believe that the revolution should give the people more freedom, but none to their enemies. Our own grim experience has taught us this.

And one last question. For a long time the Chilean revolution was able to develop without resort to arms not only thanks to the efforts of our people but also thanks to the new international conditions, to the changes in the balance of world forces. Until quite recently not everyone fully appreciated the historical significance of the October Revolution, the role of the USSR and the countries of the socialist community, and their policy of peaceful coexistence. The advocates of decisive action sometimes showed signs of anti-Sovietism and acquired misconceptions; the policy of détente, for example, was treated by some people as a hindrance to the peoples' struggle. Today there has been a considerable evolution in their views. They have been convinced by the facts. Today, as in the past, we continue to enjoy the invaluable support of the USSR and the socialist world. The movement of solidarity with the people of Chile has spread across all continents. Broad democratic forces are taking part in it. But there can be no doubt that the most consistent supporters are the socialist countries, with the regrettable exception of China. On the other hand, during the years of brutal repression in Chile the world has seen such important events as the victories of the peoples of Vietnam and Angola, the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal and the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire, the fall of the dictatorship in Greece and the disintegration of Francoism in Spain. All this has given not just some but the whole people of Chile the chance to appreciate the significance of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, the significance of proletarian internationalism and international solidarity. These events have convinced the mass of the Chilean people that the world is marching forward and not back.

It is on this and, of course, above all on their own struggle that the Chilean people base their confidence in victory. Our people will smash fascism, build a new, democratic system and again take the road leading to socialism on which it had already set forth in the time of President Allende.

Builders of developed socialism

Sandor Gaspar
PB member, CC HSWP,
General Secretary All-Hungary
Council of Trade Unions

HUNGARIAN TRADE UNIONS IN ACTION

With a membership of over four million or nearly 40 per cent of the population, socialist Hungary's trade unions form the broadest mass organization of blue- and white-collar workers. It is an organization that brings together people of different degrees of consciousness, of political and ideological maturity, in the cause of building a developed socialist society. Guided by the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, our trade unions play a full and authoritative part in deciding all questions concerning the life of society and the position of the working people. They have all the necessary financial, material, legal and moral opportunities for exercising their functions.

In the course of their work the Hungarian trade unions deal with problems that confront the trade unions of other socialist countries (always, of course, in their own specific forms determined by a country's actual historical and national features). In view of this we should like to share some of the experience gained by our trade unions in performing their main functions and express our opinion on certain problems that arise in the process.

Thanks to the winning of power by the working class and the formation of new political and socio-economic relations, the role of the trade unions in our country has undergone radical changes. They have acquired a number of new features which they did not possess in capitalist society. The most fundamental change is that the unions have become an organization of a class that commands state power. This does not mean, however, that they have become a state organization. While participating in the exercise of working-class power, the trade unions use the methods of education and persuasion that are characteristic of a voluntary public organization; they thoroughly consider the social and human aspects of their tasks; their activity is based mainly on the initiative of the working people. Whereas in capitalist conditions the trade unions are called upon to oppose state power and the organizations connected with it, in socialist society the

working class uses the trade unions to consolidate its power and, consequently, the socialist state, to broaden its mass base. What do we Hungarian communists see as the meaning and purpose of trade union activity under socialism?

Guided by the spirit of Lenin's theory on this question, the HSWP has always taken a class approach in defining the main spheres and functions of the trade unions. We are convinced of the correctness of the view that in a society building socialism the role of the unions is determined by their relationship to the power of the working class, a relationship which Lenin described as follows: '... dictatorship cannot be exercised or the functions of government performed without a foundation such as the trade unions ... the trade unions are a *link* between the vanguard and the masses, and by their daily work bring conviction to the masses, the masses of the class which alone is capable of taking us from capitalism to communism' *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 32, pp. 20-21)

As our country's experience has proved, in socialist conditions the trade unions come into their own, their rights and the range of their activity are constantly expanding. It is in the socialist countries that participation in the management of production has become one of the major spheres of trade union activity because only highly productive labor and a fully developed economy can ensure a steady rise in the standard of living. Our trade unions are constantly alive to all matters concerning the economy and are very much concerned to see it grow.

At the same time we believe that the building of socialism does not abrogate what might be called the traditional function of the unions, the function of defending the interests of the working class and other categories of working people. As we know, Lenin was of the opinion that the state of workers and peasants was not proof against bumbledom* and all its works, and that supervision of its agencies by the mass organizations would be a useful way of fighting them. Socialism is also subject to certain non-antagonistic contradictions in the sphere of social-class interests. In our view this makes it incumbent on the trade unions even in socialist society to protect the day-to-day professional, social and cultural interests of the working class and white-collar workers, and, be it noted, not only the interests of the working people as a whole, or of certain groups and strata, but also those of each individual industrial or office worker.

The Hungarian trade union movement's experience indicates that socialism affords the unions far greater opportunities for protecting the interests of the working people than even the most advanced bourgeois democracy, because our socialist state personifies the

**Bumble,* the pompous beadle in Dickens' *Oliver Twist.*

power of the Hungarian working class and the supreme aim of its activity lies in concern for the well-being of the workers, of everyone who works. At the same time we have experienced a good many disappointments, which remind us that in the process of determining their place, role and function in the political system of socialist society the Hungarian trade unions have not always been immune to difficulties and mistakes, some of which were extremely serious.

At a certain stage during consolidation of working-class power in our country the organizations reflecting its interests in the system of dictatorship of the proletariat began to overlap. This manifested itself particularly in a confusion of the spheres and functions of party, state and trade union organizations. The people at the head of the party before 1956 departed in practice from the Leninist premise that the party guides the trade unions without taking their place, that in socialist society, too, their essential function is to protect the interests of the working class. This weakened the role of the trade unions as one of the main channels of communication between the party and the masses, the working people as a whole. The political line evolved by the HSWP after October 1956 gave our trade union movement the opportunity of correcting its mistakes and coming to grips with the tasks of consolidating working-class power, development of the economy, defense of the interests and improvement of the conditions of the working people. 'If all state agencies and public organizations,' it was noted at the 11th Congress of the HSWP (1975), 'work in accordance with their specific qualifications and duties, and with a growing sense of responsibility take part in determining and carrying out the political line, this will strengthen and consolidate working-class power and add to the effectiveness of socialist construction.'

Our basic position is that socialist society should be just and considerate toward everyone. Socialism and injustice are incompatible. Under socialism, too, one can and does encounter cases of arbitrary action, restriction of rights, red tape, and so on. This is what our trade unions are fighting against. This is how they protect the individual, group and class interests of all working people. But in this work we proceed from the fact that if interests are properly coordinated, precedence is given to the interests of the state, society as a whole, because under socialist conditions they express the long-term, fundamental and most important wishes, aspirations and needs of the people as a whole and each individual in particular. Respect for the interests of society, of the whole people, is the main criterion that guides our trade unions in their work of protecting the legitimate interests of each individual member, the working class

and the working people in general ... We are convinced that everything we do in the interests of society ultimately benefits all social groups and strata and every individual.

However, the coincidence of basic interests, the fundamental unity of aims between the socialist state and the trade unions does not mean that state and trade union bodies have identical approaches to every question. For example, the government has a thorough knowledge of the economic potentialities and also the financial and other resources at the disposal of society. In making decisions it considers the problem on a nationwide scale. The trade unions also have information on the country's economic potentialities and are well enough informed to take decisions. At the same time they are constantly and directly in touch with and able to express the real needs and moods of the working masses, the various strata of industrial and office workers. They are well aware, from both the political and practical standpoints, of the effect the measures that are being taken will have on the mass consciousness. In other words, the trade unions have a good feeling for and view of the situation 'from below.' The comparing and coordination of this bilateral experience helps to achieve the common aims and provides favorable soil for drawing up optimal decisions from the standpoint of the whole of society.

We act jointly in working out measures concerning the life and labor of the working people. The government, its ministries and departments take into consideration the opinion and proposals of the All-Hungary Council of Trade Unions (AHCTU) and the affiliated unions. Systematic bilateral conferences have become regular practice. Moreover, the unions do their best to see that the positions of the economic bodies and enterprises are not purely 'utilitarian,' that social problems involving the interests of millions are not lost sight of amid the problems of production.

This approach runs right through the wide range of activity of our trade unions, particularly those in such 'classical' sectors as insurance and wages, protection of labor and pensions. People who know the history of the trade union movement do not need telling that this is where the toughest battles used to be fought — and are still being fought today in capitalist society. In socialist Hungary not a single question connected with, for example, wages can be decided without the participation of the trade union either on a nationwide scale or in relation to any individual. This holds good for other basic questions of the life and work of the working people. Incidentally it helps one to understand why the unions in Hungary, and in other socialist countries too, never have to resort to such a means of protecting the working people's interests as the strike. The rights

and powers of the unions in this sphere are so great, their prestige so formidable that in practice a situation never arises when they would be unable to regulate their relations with the socialist state except by striking.

The cooperation between the government, the state agencies of the Hungarian People's Republic, on the one hand, and the All-Hungary Council of Trade Unions, on the other, proceeds according to the appropriate norms and is protected by legal and political safeguards. In Hungary there are laws ensuring that no management or state body can take any decision concerning the interests of the working people without the participation of the trade unions and the working people. Moreover, the trade union is an equal partner with full rights: the right to its own opinion, the right of agreement or veto, the right to take decisions and supervise their execution. State agencies are legally bound to observe trade union rights and to help to put them into effect. The trade unions legitimately expect administrators and managers to consider the political consequences of any measures they may take and to make proper plans for improving the working people's conditions of life and work.

On the other hand, the trade union bodies are bound to take a responsible approach in their activities and decision-making and to make a thorough study of whether the material resources for satisfaction of their demands are available, and whether the level of social consciousness is high enough. It is the trade unions' duty to help the state get its priorities right in matters of socio-economic and cultural development. They must have an eye to strengthening the material and technical basis of society as an essential condition for satisfaction of the working people's expectations, to strengthening order and discipline at enterprises, to improving the organization of labor and production in such a way as to promote balanced economic development.

Hungarian trade unions have access to governmental bodies at all levels and can see to it that any justified demand on the part of their members is put into effect. For example, at our 23rd Trade Union Congress in 1975 we discussed the need for increasing material incentives. It was suggested that people working in difficult conditions, on the multi-shift system, and at enterprises engaged in round-the-clock production should be paid more for their work. The unions made an appropriate proposal and in the first half of 1977 a government decision raising wages for shift work was duly published and has already come into force. Or another example. It was suggested at the congress that trade unions should be given more rights in determining individual wages and salaries. This too

was acted upon. Now a manager must get the agreement of the trade union group organizer before he can raise the wages, give a bonus or provide any other incentive for staff members.

The attitude of economic management, expressing as it does the same social interests, plays a no less important role in socialist society. This is also a stimulus for the trade unions to use their rights. Everyone at the 'negotiating table' is guided by essentially the same main aims; but each side has its own approach, conditioned by its position in the institutional system of socialist society. Working together, they seek and find solutions that satisfy individual and group interests and the interests of society as a whole.

The foundation on which the relations between the trade unions and the party are built is also fundamentally new. From the start the HSWP developed its connections with the trade union movement on the basis of Leninist principles and kept well in mind the fact that political and social goals could neither be formulated nor achieved without the active participation of the trade unions.

In the capitalist countries the unions tend to hide their political allegiance in the belief that they can maintain unity and dedication to the workers' cause only if they — formally, at any rate — remain uncommitted to any party's policy. We, on the other hand, have never tried to hide the fact that the Hungarian trade unions develop their activity on the basis of HSWP guidelines. We approve and support its line because the HSWP proceeds from the interests of the working people, is the leading force in our society and is working for the good of the whole people. All the same, however, the trade unions are independent public organizations of the working people and act strictly by the decisions of their members and elected bodies.

The party's leading organs take a lively interest in our activity and help us with their advice. This help has nothing to do with any sort of interference in trade union affairs. Organizationally we are quite independent. It depends on us how successfully the unions express the interests of the working people and to what extent they promote the building of socialist society in our country. So the independence of the trade unions does not imply political indifference or neutrality; under our system this would be tantamount to disassociating ourselves from class interests, to breaking away from the working class.

The party's guiding, vanguard role in relation to the trade unions, and the responsibility of party members should not be misconstrued to mean that all questions are decided by the party or party organizations. All elements in the system of political organization of

our society, including the trade unions, are closely coordinated. The party makes every provision for the trade union movement to be independent in fulfilling its tasks, for we are all serving the common cause of the working class, of all the people, but, in different ways, according to our specific functions. This enriches the life of society, making it more meaningful. In dealing with common problems the independence of the trade unions becomes increasingly apparent.

The party's guidance of Hungarian trade unions is founded on ideological and political methods. Influence is exercised not through binding decisions, but through party members working in the trade union system, whose duties and responsibilities are thus increased. This requires a good knowledge of the special features of trade union work and the ability to weave them in with party policy. Such methods ensure trade union independence and help increase the effectiveness of elected bodies and trade union collectives. They are also a help in party work, enabling party members to study public opinion and providing a touchstone to test the correctness of party policy. In other words, the trade unions help the party enrich and develop its own policy by drawing on the opinion of organized working people.

When the trade unions insist on strict observance of the law, when they defend the legitimate interests of union members, when they criticize and make realistic demands on economic and government leaders — they are implementing party policy and strengthening working-class power and the bonds between the party and the working people.

The program for building a developed socialist society places much higher demands on the trade unions than ever before. It means that we must raise the level and effectiveness of our activities, increase our influence among the people. We realize that the tasks in the HSWP program require smooth functioning and better quality work in all spheres and maximum use of the opportunities and reserves of the socialist social system. These tasks, goals and demands were supported in the decisions of the 23rd Congress of the Hungarian trade unions.

A few words about trade union activities that have the greatest bearing on our development.

First, there is the *development of democracy*. The political life of our country is such that the working people are well aware that their opinion carries weight, that their criticism and their proposals are needed. It is a particularly important fact that our trade unions are effective vehicles of democracy in production.

The work of the trade unions, their various forums and bodies provides the direct opportunities and organizational basis for the

working people to participate in public affairs, in the country's economy, in management of production. At the same time the unions, by expressing the working people's interests, act as instruments of democracy in the production sphere and represent the workers at all levels of economic management.

Today when life is no longer a matter of toiling from dawn to dusk, when people are not just concerned to earn a livelihood, when reality has changed so radically, we are making much faster progress in all spheres of social life. Nevertheless, we are very far from perfection in many respects. For example, we have not yet brought it home to every worker that he is master of his enterprise and of his country. This is a much slower process than we supposed. What you have to do is not just to make everyone aware of the social and production targets. They must come to regard them as their own and be interested enough to think hard about the best ways of achieving them. This is what we are aiming at because we can expect people to be really active only when we all share the same interests and anxieties.

We believe that compared with preceding decades the goals and means of production democracy gradually change in the period of building a developed socialist society. Production meetings, conferences of socialist labor team leaders and many other institutions are much more developed nowadays. They give the working people broad opportunities to make proposals and suggestions.

This is the direction to follow. And here is an example of how it works. Our enterprises may use part of their profits as they see fit. The practice so far had been for the economic management to plan, down to the last detail, exactly where and what amount of this money is to be used. The party committee had its day, followed by the trade union committee, and then the plan was discussed in the union groups or at general meetings, where the people were fully informed of what part of the funds would be allocated for wage increases and how much would go for collective needs. This seemed to be a sufficiently democratic process. By today's standards, however, this method has its shortcomings. The economic management, party and trade union committees can no longer alone be wholly responsible for these decisions. A substantial part of the responsibility must be taken by the working people. Experience has shown that they are most responsible when they are entrusted with serious tasks and when the interest in their opinions is sincere and not just a formality. Interests vary among different groups at factories and offices and as society develops the scale of requirements broadens and in satisfying them priorities may also vary. This is where the whole production team should have a very big say.

What, then, is the essence of the new system? The trade union committee summarizes the proposals that have been made and passes them on to the group secretaries. They are then discussed at group meetings and returned to the committee with any new suggestions or amendments that may have been made. After that they go to the party committee, where, if necessary, they are examined jointly with the management. And, finally, all the material is brought up for approval at a production meeting or a conference of the trade union activists, where the final decision is made.

Another important aspect of trade union activities is *mobilization of the creative potential of the production teams*. This is particularly important today when the human factor in economic development is noticeably growing. The trade unions value such qualities as initiative and eagerness to make innovations. The trade unions promote a regular exchange of views between the working people and the administration and cultivate a healthy spiritual and moral climate at work. They initiate labor competition and encourage innovators' movements and professional training. In other words, they are the mobilizing factor at the enterprise. They encourage all undertakings that help develop production, they smooth out haphazard organization, fight violations of discipline, infringements of the public interest or violations of the principles of material incentive.

An important internal reserve of growth is the further improvement of labor competition. This has not yet been fully developed, which is largely the fault of its organizers. Some plants may treat these labor competitions as an emergency measure, thus taking advantage of the working people's self-sacrificing initiative to surmount unexpected difficulties or a production lag. We are against such practices because, for one thing, they create the mistaken impression that such competitions are a movement indentified with a certain period in the building of socialism, an instrument to be used solely when dealing with difficulties. The conclusion would seem to be that perfection of management and scientific and technological progress eliminate the need for such competitions. Our experience, however, prompts the opposite conclusion — that labor competitions represent a qualitatively new movement expressing the new, socialist approach to labor, reflecting the working people's direct interest in development of production. All this is a factor in the formation of the new individual. In the course of these competitions people produce over and above individual plans, and profitable and effective solutions are often found. Socialist competition is an objective necessity at all stages of socialist construction and will become more widespread as we progress.

A formal, bureaucratic approach is no good at all. The terms of the

competition often do not extend beyond ordinary, everyday duties and do not stimulate creative thought. Such clauses as: 'I shall not be late for work,' or 'I shall not produce defective goods,' etc., are no more than what is normally required of a worker and for which he is paid wages. It is the duty of everyone to work conscientiously, but more is expected of a participant in socialist competition.

Initiative, enthusiasm and inspiration are the heart and soul of a mass competition movement and it should not be cramped by formalities. When organizing these competitions we must take into account not only production tasks and possibilities, but also the interests of the workers. This is what will help determine pledges and, in the course of the competition, develop abilities and civic activity.

A trade union is not just a professional organization. Lenin wrote: '... It is not a state organization; nor is it one designed for coercion, but for education. It is an organization designed to draw in and to train; it is, in fact, a school: a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism' (Vol. 32, p. 20).

The trade unions are a school of the working people whose mission it is, among others, to explain the interrelationship of political, economic, social and cultural issues; they are a school that mobilizes the masses for voluntary social activities. And in the conditions of building a developed socialism the trade unions are afforded ample opportunity to function as such many-sided 'schools of communism.'

How do the unions carry out their functions? They are 'schools' of a special type where the teaching and training is conducted not in classrooms but in the production process, in the course of daily activities. This work cannot be confined to only one sector, it must find expression in the work of the entire movement. At the same time, it now goes beyond cultural or political education. Perfecting the system of wages and salaries, work safety, social maintenance, participation in management — all these are important factors in the formation of the working people's intellectual and spiritual world. Not only the leadership and activists, but hundreds of thousands of rank-and-file members are involved in this work. Educating and training must also be closely coordinated with the country's economic and social progress, with our main tasks. In other words, it involves tremendous efforts whose goal is the triumph of socialist morals, educating people whose consciousness and actions are up to the tasks of building a developed socialism and a communist society.

The principle moral standard of a bourgeois society has always been 'live for yourself' with all that this implies in acquisitiveness and consumerism, indifference to others and putting private above public interests. Our socialist society rejects such standards just as it rejects asceticism and wage-levelling. Our ideal is constant improvement of

material and cultural standards and a situation where individual prosperity depends on labor input, where conditions favor spiritual and individual development. Free labor is the basis of progress for it ennobles man and educates him in a communist spirit. The task is to encourage independent thinking, to prepare people for an active public life, serious and dedicated to work.

Of course, all this requires time and effort. After all we are dealing with millions of people with varying degrees of social awareness. And besides there are the preachers of bourgeois ideology in capitalist countries always trying to influence our society and implant alien views. But the fact is that every year our life is improving and becoming richer and socialist values are steadily gaining ground.

In accomplishing this task the trade unions rely mainly on the working class, a truly collectivist class which, because of its social being and place in the system of production relations, plays a key role in the formation of progressive social views. We have many people cast in the true socialist mould at our plants and factories. The workers respect their opinions and emulate their example.

The trade unions strive to develop the class consciousness of their membership, particularly the younger workers who are just starting out. We want them to make progress, we help them to improve their skills and develop self-discipline and a collectivist spirit. We strive to educate them in the traditions of the workers' movement, sharpen their class consciousness and broaden their Marxist-Leninist outlook. A prominent feature of these 'schools of communism' is the internationalist education of the working people, the assertion of international solidarity and the ideas of proletarian internationalism.

To sum up, we can say that the Hungarian trade union movement is what it should be under socialism. In recent times the internal and international climate has been favorable for its development. Not that our work has become easier. At the stage of building a developed socialist society the problems facing the trade unions become more complex and more is expected of them. However, our working people, the activists and rank-and-file of the trade unions have the will to deal with these tasks and problems. They find energy and inspiration in the clear-cut policy of the HSWP, in friendship and cooperation with the trade unions in the socialist countries and in the growing mutual understanding between us and trade unions in the non-socialist part of the world.

Progress of socialist nations

Wiliam Salgovic
Member, CC CP Czechoslovakia,
Chairman, Slovak National Council

NATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE CSSR AT THE STAGE OF BUILDING DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

The national question continues to agitate the world. Peoples are insisting on their right to free and distinctive development, and their struggle is not an easy one. Sixty years have passed since the Great October when the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia was adopted, the first legislative act in history declaring the right of nations to self-determination and to free and independent development; a fair settlement of the national question guaranteeing all nations genuine equality and all-round progress, has been achieved on socialist lines in the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries; the UN has passed important resolutions on equal rights for all peoples and the removal of racism and racial discrimination. Nevertheless, there are peoples still lacking equal rights.

The solution of this big problem, as realities show, hinges on social and political conditions. There is the graphic example of socialist Czechoslovakia, where the years of building a new society under the leadership of the working class have seen deep changes in the living conditions, mutual relations and very character of the Czech and Slovak nations and of the other nationalities of the CSSR. The Czechoslovak example is, we believe, all the more important since between the two world wars the Czechoslovak Republic was a developed capitalist country with a bourgeois democratic political system. Advocates of capitalism hold that such a system makes it possible to settle all social problems of vital importance, including the nationalities problem. Yet bourgeois Czechoslovakia proved unable to settle this problem, a fact which imperialist reaction exploited to put pressure on the country and liquidate it as an independent, sovereign state. The inherent inability of capitalism to solve this problem is also betrayed by the painful conflicts over relations between members of different nationalities which are plaguing Britain, Belgium, Canada and other capitalist countries classed among the most advanced.

This article deals with the more important results of the evolution of national relations in postwar Czechoslovakia, and with the main tasks and problems confronting the CPCz and Czechoslovak state at this stage of building developed socialism.

The nationalities question is part of the problem of abolishing capitalism and changing every aspect of public life by revolutionary means and on socialist lines. This is why the CPCz directly linked the settlement of this question to the establishment of the new system and to creative application of the general laws of the struggle for socialism and to build it in our conditions, taking strict account of the nature of each stage through which the revolution and socialist development passed. As a result, all political, economic and ideological conditions for settling it were created.

In the political sphere these conditions were the party's fundamental policy of uniting the working people of all of Czechoslovakia's nationalities in support of socialist goals and ideals, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, whose essense is internationalist, and building up a national state guaranteeing the equality of all the peoples, which had united of their own free will in one state, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

A requisite of solving the nationalities problem in the economical sphere was to abolish private ownership of the means of production, put an end to the exploitation of man by man, establish public ownership of the means of production and organize cooperation and mutual assistance of the peoples of the CSSR in the economic field.

The ideological prerequisites were a socialist cultural revolution and the gradual formation of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in people's minds and in every spiritual sphere, education of the masses in the spirit of proletarian, socialist patriotism and internationalism, actual adherence to them, and uncompromising struggle against bourgeois nationalist ideology.

With the socialist transformation of the economic, political and social system and the ideological superstructure of Czechoslovak society, the social type of the peoples of our country also changed. An essential change came about in their national consciousness, interests, culture, mentality and traditions, which acquired a new content born of the new system. Conservative or frankly reactionary survivals in this sphere, a legacy of previous social and economic formations, are gradually disappearing never to return.

To be sure, a change in the social type of a nation and the nation's assumption of a socialist character do not imply a complete break with its past history. CPCz policy is prompted by the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nation and the nationalities question, and in striving to reshape relations between nations on socialist principles,

the party has always remembered that even after the victory of socialism the Czechs, Slovaks and other peoples retain many historical ethnic features tracing back to their centuries-long history. The Czechoslovak communists' effort in this field has always been aimed at supporting progressive changes naturally taking place in the ethnic sphere under socialism, drawing on all that is progressive, revolutionary and humane in the history of our peoples.

A further, highly important Marxist-Leninist principle of the CPCz in settling the nationalities question, a principle which our entire practice has proved fruitful, is that socialism does not at all mean a levelling down of nations, let alone initiate their withering away as a distinctive historical community of people. While it is true that in terms of the historical outlook, of the communist ideal, there will ultimately develop one human community without national distinctions, socialism does not yet provide all prerequisites of the withering away of nations. Indeed, it affords the greatest opportunities for their progress, for the complete materialization of their progressive potentialities in every material or spiritual sphere, and hence for closer mutual bonds. This means that a policy prompted by national nihilism can only prejudice or complicate the building of socialism in a multinational state.

We now know both theoretically and by experience that the progress of socialist nations does not isolate them from one another but draws them closer together and asserts features common to every member of socialist society irrespective of nationality, features which manifest themselves in labor, political and other public activity, everyday life, cultural pursuits and moral principles. They develop on the basis of the goals, ideals and aspirations of the working class, an internationalist class which operates as the leading force of socialist changes and hence as a force moulding socialist nations. It is a socialist revolution, Lenin pointed out, that alone can firmly and everywhere ' ... liberate oppressed nations and effect the coming together and integration of nations, not on the basis of force but on the basis of the equal rights and consent of the proletariat and working people ...' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 36, p. 382). The experience of building socialism in multinational states shows that the ruling communist parties' correct, internationalist policy makes it possible to achieve unity among the workers and then among the working people of all nations and ethnic groups in the struggle for socialism and communism. The peoples' growing unity, friendship and brotherhood are the dominant trend in the development of relations between nations in socialist society.

These, then, are some of the Marxist-Leninist principles which have guided the CPCz in settling the nationalities question. We are

convinced that they have proved their worth by bearing tangible fruit in the form of fraternal friendship and close cooperation between the peoples of the CSSR, in the form of their free and all-round development. We have solved the problem of relations between the Czech and Slovak nations as well as the problem of members of other nationalities, whose rights were ignored more than anyone else's in bourgeois Czechoslovakia. 'Our achievements in nationality policy, the unity and international brotherhood that have been achieved between the Czechs, Slovaks and people of other nationalities living on the territory of our country are among the most important gains of our revolutionary working-class movement, our party and our people.'[1] This is the conclusion drawn by the 15th CPCz Congress (1976).

The development of relations between the peoples of the CSSR was particularly dynamic at the stage of building a developed socialist society, which the CSSR entered after the 14th Party Congress (1971). Priority was given to raising the efficiency of production management and the quality of output, combining the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, strengthening every aspect of the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party, raising the living standard and socialist consciousness at a rapid pace and firmly establishing the socialist way of life. It became more imperative than ever to carry forward economic integration and strengthen the alliance with fraternal socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union. All this also had its effect on the evolution of relations between the peoples of the CSSR; it furthered the progress of our socialist nations and ethnic groups.

The 14th CPCz Congress pointed out that the pace of industrial and agricultural production in the Slovak Socialist Republic must be quickened, chiefly by using the republic's own potentialities. 'This approach enables us to make headway in equalizing the economic levels of the Czech Socialist Republic and the Slovak Socialist Republic and at the same time to bring about optimal overall progress,'[2] to assure the development of the Czechoslovak Federation and at the same time to promote the unity and strength of the whole state, work for its all-round progress, strengthen the internationalist unity of the working class and all the peoples of the country, combat survivals of nationalism and continue fostering all citizens' consciousness in a Marxist-Leninist spirit.

Hence the CPCz regards continued equalization of the economic and social development of the Czech and Slovak republics as a program goal. Decisive results in this respect were achieved under the fifth five-year plan (1971-75). Only some slight distinctions linger still

between the two republics, which are on an equal level in so important a field as education.

CPCz policy guarantees the actual accomplishment of this task by enabling the SSR to develop at a higher rate than the state as a whole. With the steady growth of the economic potential of the entire CSSR, economic and social distinctions between the two republics are gradually disappearing. For instance, the gross national product of the CSR in 1975 increased by 27.9 per cent over 1970 and that of the SSR, by 42.1 per cent. National incomes went up 24.4 and 37.7 per cent respectively. In the same period the share of the SSR, (with roughly 30 per cent of the country's population) in the gross national product of the CSSR rose from 25.9 to 27.7 per cent, and from 25.5 to 26.6 per cent in the case of the total national income. The tremendous changes these figures symbolize will be readily appreciated if it is recalled that in the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic Slovakia was a backward agricultural region whose share in the republic's industrial output fell short of eight per cent, while poverty forced a good third of its population to emigrate.

The 1976 congress of the Communist Party of Slovakia had every reason to put it on record that the fifth five-year period 'was both a quantitative and a qualitative step forward in growth of the economic potential of Slovakia, the commissioning of new production capacities, progress in science and research, an overall rise in qualifications and increasing use of the resources and potentialities of all Slovak regions.'[3]

The current five-year plan is continuing that line. In 1976-80 the social product should grow by 25 per cent in the CSR and 35 per cent in the SSR. The material basis for equalization will be a further restructuring and development of progressive industries, a rising technological standard, increasing concentration of production and also, in full measure, socialist economic integration.

The extent and nature of equalization are objectively indicated by changes in the class and social composition of both nations and other ethnic groups. There are no more exploiting classes in the CSSR. The population consists of working people and their families. The working class, which exceeds 60 per cent of the population, is the core and leading force of the Czech and Slovak nations and members of other nationalities, and the mainstay of the CPCz in implementing the party's nationalities policy. The evolution of the workers, cooperative farmers and other social groups is characterized, in particular, by steadily rising general educational, professional and qualification standards, increasingly similar ways of using free time, equalization of the amount and pattern of incomes, expectations and the means of satisfying them, and up-to-date living conditions. All citizens, irres-

pective of nationality, have equal opportunities to use their knowledge and abilities. Female employment is increasing; women's share in material production and the service industry is identical in the two republics. Young Czechs and Slovaks of either sex, as well as young members of other nationalities, enjoy equal rights and opportunities to shape their future.

Increasingly close unity of the two nations and other nationalities of the CSSR in the period of building a developed socialist society is an objective process based on the changes listed above. At the same time, the growing role of the party and the working class is vastly important for this law-governed process. The CPCz abides unfailingly by the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism. It unites communists of both nations and all members of other nationalities living in the country. Functioning within the framework of a single CPCz is the Communist Party of Slovakia (CPS). We Slovak communists have our own press and carry on political work, propaganda and agitation among the masses not only in Slovak but in the languages of our other ethnic groups. The principles of internationalism find reflection in congress documents and other party decisions. However, the CPCz as a whole, even though operating in a socialist federal state, is not federalized.

In 1969 the CSSR became a socialist federation based on the voluntary union of two equal sovereign national states, the CSR and SSR. The change was prompted both by our own experience and the Soviet Union's experience of building national states on federal principles. Nine years after, we have every reason to say that socialist federation in our conditions has proved its worth. It has strengthened the unity of the Czechs, Slovaks and other peoples of our country, drawn them closer together and made it possible to combine national and internationalist interests, that is, the interests of Czechoslovak statehood, in the wisest manner. The federal system makes it possible to focus the attention of working people of all nationalities on common goals and tasks in building a developed socialist society and contributes to closer cooperation with other countries of the socialist community.

The Czechoslovak socialist federation was established with due regard to the right of nations to self-determination, on the principle of voluntary association in a common socialist state. Democratic centralism is another principle of building and advancing our federation; it creates the best opportunities for combining centralization in governing socialist society with maximum use of local initiative. From the point of view of relations between nations and other peoples, this principle ensures optimal links between the federal state, the CSSR, and the two national republics, the CSR and SSR. It is both an

organizational principle of building up the state in either republic and a principle underlying the political status of nations, for it is instrumental in delimiting the exclusive jurisdiction of the federation, the joint jurisdiction of the federation and the two republics, and the exclusive jurisdiction of the republics.

The highest state authority of the CSSR, the Federal Assembly, is composed of two chambers having equal powers, the Chamber of Nationalities and the People's Chamber. The equality of peoples is a principle applied throughout the system of elected government bodies. It is guaranteed both legally and in terms of appropriate social-class and national composition of the representative assemblies. These embody the power of the working class, which exercises it in alliance with the cooperative farmers and the intellectuals. They also express the interests of the Czech and Slovak peoples and other ethnic groups. Let us look, for instance, at the outcome of the general election held in October 1976. The 200 deputies elected to the People's Chamber include 131 Czechs, 59 Slovaks, six Hungarians, two Ukrainians, one Pole and one German. The Chamber of Nationalities comprises 72 Czechs, 64 Slovaks, 10 Hungarians, two Ukrainians, one Pole and one German. The Slovak and Czech National Councils as well as the National Committees, or local organs of state power and administration, have a similar national composition. On the National Committees of the SSR, for instance, 83.1 per cent of the deputies are Slovaks, 12.5 per cent Hungarians and 3.4 per cent Ukrainians.

The working class plays a decisive role as a unifying, internationalist factor in our multinational state. 'In its capacity of leading class,' said Gustav Husak, General Secretary of our party, presenting the Central Committee report to the 15th Party Congress, 'it increasingly influences every sphere of public life. Its militant political activity and its labor show qualities which are gradually becoming typical of the activity and social consciousness of all working people. First among them are a conscious and creative attitude to labor, awareness of one's civic responsibility, organization, devotion, collectivism, perseverance in overcoming difficulties, and a sense of the new and progressive.

'The working class is increasingly characterized by a new way of thinking and a new approach to the task of changing conditions of life as its role in socialist society grows and its creative energies develop. It is transforming itself and is also transforming the way of life of society as a whole.'[4]

We have said that the cultural revolution was a most important condition for settling the nationalities question in the CSSR; it resulted in equalizing the cultural and educational levels of the Czech,

Slovak and other ethnic groups. After the socialist revolution had been accomplished in our republic, education, science, culture, literature and other fields made considerable progress, for which substantial material facilities had been provided. Today Slovaks active in socialist culture make an appreciable contribution to the spiritual life of the CSSR and many of them have won recognition abroad. Cultural development now is by no means restricted to unilateral influence on the part of the historically more advanced and mature Czech people as in the past, for what we have is active mutual relations. Closer links between the Czech and Slovak peoples connote interaction in the cultural field, and mutual enrichment leading to the formation of a common Czechoslovak socialist culture. The creative effort of the other peoples of our country also makes an increasing contribution to this progress.

A public opinion poll conducted in 1975 revealed that three-fourths of the Slovak population greatly appreciate the role of Czech socialist culture in their lives. Similarly nearly three-fourths of the population of the CSR give due credit to Slovak socialist culture and to its contribution. Thus the experience of the CSSR shows that the solution of the nationalities problem under socialism is logically accompanied by the development and convergence of the peoples and that this convergence is promoted not at the expense of the national cultures of the less numerous peoples but thanks to them and through their mutual enrichment.

We owe it to a correct nationality policy in the period of building a developed socialist society that while the traditional influence of the Czech language in Slovakia is growing, the prestige of the Slovak language among the Czechs shows a strong increase for its part. To be sure, the two languages are very close to each other. But we have positive experience of growing linguistic mutual understanding and bilingualism also in areas inhabited by, say, Slovaks and Hungarians. The two languages are entirely different and yet up to 70 per cent of the Slovaks in a number of communities speak Hungarian and a knowledge of Slovak is spreading fast among the Hungarians. Under socialism, national languages, like national cultures, serve as a vehicle of closer relations and not disunity. (These relations are certainly not limited to spiritual culture but extend to the material sphere.)

The profound social changes that have occurred in Czechoslovak society find reflection in people's national consciousness. The ideology of the working class and its natural components, socialist internationalism and socialist patriotism, have been accepted by the vast majority of the population. This is seen at every turn. Between the 14th and 15th party congresses, as a result of society's dynamic economic and social progress and the party's ideological work, values

such as socialism, internationalism, relations of unfailing friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist allies, or the home and foreign policy of the CSSR, gained notably in prestige. All this made for still stronger socialist patriotism. It entitled the CPS congress to state that 'under the federal system of government, our peoples have shown greater initiative and activity in using untapped resources and providing new opportunities for the dynamic development of Czechoslovak socialist society, of its economic basis and its superstructure.'[5]

Between the 14th and 15th CPCz congresses the socialist character of people of other nationalities living in the CSSR became more marked. The CPCz invariably concerns itself with their further progress although they do not exceed six per cent of the country's population. Socialist federation has made it possible to take greater account of the interests of these ethnic groups in organizing our state; the responsibility of government bodies and National Front organizations for their comprehensive development in every field has grown. We maintain that the Czechoslovak socialist state is a state of all the nations and peoples of our country and that they are all its builders. In regard to members of other nationalities, everything is done to guarantee their civil rights and meet their distinctive national requirements. The principle of equal status for every nationality is applied in the CSSR as part of an integral political system. This produces good results. The party gives much attention to the complicated work being carried on in nationally mixed areas, rural communities, cities, enterprises, cooperatives, schools, etc. This work is carried on in several languages and helps citizens to participate on an equal footing in the activity of government bodies, among other things in decision-making on language or educational problems, as well as on steps to equalize social and qualification patterns, conditions for the development of culture and education in the various languages, and so on.

To guide relations between members of different nationalities is no easy task even when building a developed socialist society. It is dangerous to underestimate nationalist survivals and bias, the more so since anti-communist and bourgeois propaganda is doing its utmost to revive them. We had an instructive experience when, in 1968-69, right-wing opportunists contrived to raise a wave of nationalism. This trend was defeated by the correct class and nationality policy of the CPCz, the ideological education it carried on, progress in building a developed socialist society, closer relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist allies, a steadily rising standard of living, and advances in socialist democracy and the socialist way of life. 'The primary task in ideological work,' the 15th Party Congress stressed, 'is, now as before, to systematically educate people in the spirit of

socialist patriotism and proletarian and socialist internationalism. Its essence is to inspire our people with legitimate pride in our achievements, the great deeds accomplished in the course of socialist construction, pride in our country, our being part of the socialist community, our contribution to the strength of the forces of socialism, progress and world peace.'[6]

The 15th CPCz Congress proudly noted that relations between the peoples of the CSSR are based on the Leninist principles of equality, equal rights and proletarian internationalism. It called for effort to cherish this achievement as the apple of one's eye and resist every attempt to loosen our unity. The CPCz will continue, while fully respecting national features, to proceed from what unites the peoples, and will encourage people of different nationalities to further the process of establishing closer mutual relations and enriching one another. Increasingly effective socialist federation and economic progress of the CSSR as an integral whole will make the masses more and more aware of their common, Czechoslovak socialist statehood. The internationalist attitude of the Czechs, Slovaks and members of other nationalities to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries will be strengthened. This will go hand in hand with a strenghtening of the bonds linking Czechoslovak working people of every nationality with the national contingents of the working class of capitalist and developing countries, with the international working-class and communist movement.

1. *XV. sjezd Komunisticke strany Ceskoslovenska.* Prague, Svoboda, 1977, p. 62.
2. *XIV. sjezd Komunisticke strany Ceskoslovenska.* Prague, Svoboda, 1971, p. 40.
3. *Zjazd Komunistickej strany Slovenska.* March 25-27, 1976. Bratislava, nakladatelstvo Pravda, p. 14.
4. *XV. sjezd Komunisticke strany Ceskoslovenska.* 1977, pp. 59-60.
5. *Zjazd Komunistickej strany Slovenska,* p. 37.
6. *XV. sjezd,* pp. 80-81.

Some lessons in combating opportunism

James West
Member of PB, CPUSA

The ideologists of imperialism are actively intervening in the class struggle with the aim of polluting, diverting, damming and dividing the revolutionary tides. In the USA, the most aggressive, venturesome circles of imperialism, spearheaded by the Rockefellers, established some years ago the Trilateral Commission,[1] a super think-tank for elaborating imperialist strategy and tactics and for ensuring U.S. imperialist supremacy in today's world.

This Commission issued a report of which Gus Hall said, '. . . at the very center of that concept is aggressive use of the coordinated economic power of the industrialized imperialist nations, directed against the less industrialized and less developed countries, but in the first place against the socialist countries.'[2] In short, the economic might of the USA, Japan and West Europe is to be used as a carrot to reward those who yield to imperialist demands and as a club to punish those who do not.

This is the policy being pursued by the Carter Administration. It will be recalled that at the invitation of David Rockefeller, Jimmy Carter, then governor of Georgia, served on this commission. Serving with him were James Schlesinger, the hardline 'hawk' now in Carter's cabinet; and that long-time Kremlinologist, Brzezinski, now the President's national security advisor.

Now facts are coming to light showing that the Trilateral Commission, the Pentagon and the notorious Cold War Senator Jackson dictated the SALT II proposals which Vance tabled in Moscow in spring 1977, proposals which were so one-sided and preposterous that the Soviet Union had no alternative but to reject them.

Brzezinski has long been a hunter for weaknesses in the armor of Marxism-Leninism, for possible sources of dissent and conflict in socialist countries and in the USSR in particular, as well as in the various communist parties. This activity is intended, of course, to serve the aims set out by the Trilateral Commission. Thus, in the past period, various organs of Big Business, including the *New York Times*, have been writing of 'good communists' and 'bad communists,' so to speak. There are 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' social-

ism, 'reasonable' and 'hardline' communists and communist parties, etc. They have laid down criteria, guidelines by which to determine 'acceptability.' These are:

Disassociation from the Soviet Union and, as they put it, its 'dictates'; some demand slander against the USSR;

Renunciation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and promotion of 'democracy' as defined by Big Business, and of 'socialism with a human face';

An end to democratic centralism;

Advance policies which correspond to the national traditions of your country and mute the class struggle;

Don't criticize U.S. policies of aggression; if you feel you must do this, then equate the U.S. with the Soviet Union.

As we see, these 'guidelines' laid down by Brzezinski and his associates represent an imperialist effort to reverse the existing relationship of world forces which is unfavorable for imperialism. It is an effort to split the forces which have brought into being this new relationship of world forces and are its mainstay.

The CPUSA has had much unhappy experience with combating opportunism in its ranks. In the U.S., over the last five decades, the pressures for accommodation to imperialism have continuously intensified. From our experience we know that the 'criteria' set up by the Trilateral Commission brain-trusters are a prescription for the party's suicide.

In the late 20s, awed by the high prosperity attained by U.S. imperialism in the wake of World War I, Jay Lovestone, then General Secretary of the CPUSA, put forward a theory of American exceptionalism to justify breaking with Marxism-Leninism and accommodation with capitalism. It turned out to be a short-lived prosperity and the last one in conditions of a peace economy for U.S. imperialism. But Lovestone's opportunism cost our party dearly, and his service to the Meany leadership of the labor movement and to the CIA caused much harm to the cause of peace and democracy.

Less than 10 years later, Earl Browder, then General Secretary, raised the slogan, 'Communism is Twentieth Century Americanism,' in an attempt to gain acceptability.

But a few years later Browder's right opportunism led to the liquidation of the Communist Party as the vanguard party of the working class and the racially and nationally oppressed minorities. In its place an amorphous, loose educational organization, the Communist Political Association, was established. This was preceded by the liquidation of the Young Communist League and of Marxist-Leninist work among the youth, resulting in a generation gap in communist ranks which has taken many years to overcome.

The justification for this liquidation was Browder's theory that U.S. imperialism had changed its character and that postwar collaboration with the USSR was practically guaranteed, that class peace would prevail, opening a peaceful, non-struggle path to socialism.

The fraternal help rendered us at that time by the communist parties which warned American communists of the dangers of opportunism played a tremendous role in our struggle to overcome liquidationist trends. But a decade later, under the pressures of the McCarthyite repression, a new revisionist assault was launched which again almost destroyed the party, something that the McCarthy attack alone could not do.

This struggle between true communists and the opportunists reached a climax at the 16th party convention in 1957. The right opportunists demanded disassociation from and sharp criticism of the Soviet Union; abandonment of the principles of proletarian internationalism and democratic centralism; formal acceptance of 'minority rights' (factionalism); and acceptance of the idea that Leninism did not apply to the United States.

Again, the good advice of our overseas friends played a tremendous role in preventing the right opportunists from splitting the party and from having their anti-Marxist-Leninist positions prevail. In a letter to the convention, written on behalf of the CC FCP, Jacques Duclos wrote:

'The class struggle was and remains the motor of history and it is only a Marxist-Leninist party which can extract its laws and make the working class victorious in its struggle against capitalism . . .

'The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism could not be denied by any true communist. It is not true that the Leninist principle of the building of the party and socialism would only be valid in the Soviet Union, that the socialist system would not have permanent worth, taking into account national characteristics which, in particular, Lenin advised should be carefully taken into account. To deviate from these basic conceptions is to slide into the morass of social-democratic opportunism; it is to fall into liquidationist revisionism, that is to say, to turn one's back on the revolution, on communism, the class struggle . . .

' . . . "revisionism" pretends to question everything and, instead of fighting with greater intensity and firmness against capitalism, imperialism and reaction, leads the revolutionary movement to "democratic reformism," to the deception of "democratic liberties," to have confidence in the bourgeoisie to achieve a "democratic socialism."

'The French communists consider that they must not modify their program, but make more precise its class character and make their

tactic of struggle more flexible. They consider that the class struggle is sharpening on the international scale in proportion as the camp of socialism is strengthened ...

' ... the strengthening of international solidarity of the proletariat — thus of the national parties of the working class — is considered by us as one of the categoric imperatives of the present period of the international class struggle, which implies solidarity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union corresponding to the essential interests of the international proletariat, of peace and socialism, to the interests of the independence movements of the oppressed and dependent countries in the world ...

'That is why any penetration of the echoes of the anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign in our ranks must be answered by an unrelenting resistance and pitiless rebuff ...'[3]

While the Marxist-Leninists in our party warmly greeted Comrade Duclos' letter as the help which a brother gives a brother, our right-opportunists angrily and arrogantly rejected it as 'gross interference and a violation of the right to independently make our own decisions.'

In our history, we have had several major struggles with the attempt to abandon Marxism-Leninism. And often we had to confront and defeat opportunism and secretarianism from the 'left,' which sought to move in while the struggle against right opportunism was being waged. This could not but have a negative impact temporarily on the size of our party. We paid a heavy price. But each time we found the strength to recover in our working-class cadre, in our Marxist-Leninist intellectuals and in proletarian internationalism.

And, at various critical times in the life of our country, our party has played a decisive role in the forward march of the working class and the oppressed masses. We are proud of our history of class struggle.

Out of the crucible of these struggles, which are part and parcel of the international class struggle, our party has produced the best leadership in its history in our General Secretary, Gus Hall, and our National Chairman, Henry Winston, two giants of the international working class.

We have learned, among other things, that the theoretical premises for opportunism can vary. In the case of Lovestone, it was overestimation of the strength of imperialism and underestimation of the strength of the working class; overemphasis on the national at the expense of the universal.

In the case of Browder, it was lack of confidence in the working class and a concept which foreshadowed the convergence theory in relation to the U.S. and the USSR, and carried over to the class struggle at home — in other words, a prospect of class peace. A

concomitant of this class peace outlook was a departure from Marxist-Leninist positions on the national question and from militant struggle against racism.

Today, when the three component parts of the world revolutionary process are in the ascendancy while imperialism is in decline, in an advanced state of the general crisis of capitalism, the opportunist pressures on the communist and workers' parties do not diminish but increase. Some in our country might say that this comes into conflict with the proposition that the super-profits which imperialism derives from colonial super-exploitation is the material basis for opportunism; that since imperialism has lost its various colonial empires and the reserves and advantages that go with them, therefore the material base for opportunism has shrunk or disappeared.

We communists of the United States reply: this ignores the existence of neo-colonialism and the fact that imperialism still has many, although reduced, reserves, and the super-profits of the monopolies are greater than ever. At the same time, ideas and concepts can be a material force; and the influence of opportunism is all around us, for opportunism is the very essence of imperialism. It is a virus which seeks to infect all it comes in contact with. As old viruses are defeated, they rise again in new forms.

In our propaganda we explain that the very weakening of the foundations of imperialism can induce some to let down their guard, to conclude that imperialism is too weak to resist; that it is no longer capable of barbarous offensives against the working class and oppressed masses or of unleashing a devastating holocaust. This can give rise to ideas that 'we have it made,' that the class and mass struggles are no longer as urgent as before.

We show that these conclusions can lead to the illusion that the bourgeoisie would quietly accept its defeat in an election and accede to the coming into power of the working class and its allies. We say that to accept this idea, one must embrace a non-existent above-class concept of democracy and place one's trust in the imperialists to abide by the democratic decision of the majority. This would mean that the exploiters have changed their character and ceased to be exploiters. The example of many countries shows this is a fantasy which conflicts with reality. But, as Gus Hall has said, all opportunism is based on fantasy. In the last analysis, this fantasy of underestimating the will of imperialism to fight to the end is also an expression of overestimation of its readiness to abide by the verdict of history. To the extent that opportunism places any reliance on such readiness, to that extent it also expresses a lack of confidence in the working class and oppressed masses.

The overestimation of the strength of imperialism draws new strength from ideas which hold the working class in contempt, from ideas that the scientific-technological revolution gives imperialism new trump cards while working-class power, including working-class state power, is too unsophisticated, not literate enough in the uses of technology, science, statecraft and interstate relations to overcome its problems. This is the tendency which sees only, or primarily, weaknesses in socialism as it exists and which sees only backwardness in the working class.

It is a form of acceptance and accommodation to the time-worn propaganda of the bourgeoisie aimed at denigrating the working class in general. It has always been the purpose of the ruling class in the United States to prevent the development of working-class confidence in its own power and strength, to prevent its unity. It uses national chauvinism to destroy confidence in and unity with the working class in power, creating myths about the 'inherent backwardness' and 'technical incompetence' of the workers of this or that socialist country. It consistently prevents knowledge of the achievements of the socialist working class, the people of the socialist lands, from coming to the attention of the working class in capitalist lands and the masses in the newly-independent countries. At the same time, it maintains a ceaseless propaganda barrage aimed at convincing its own working class that it is not qualified to manage the affairs of government, pointing to 'mistakes' and 'weaknesses' in socialist countries as 'proof' and going to all lengths to denigrate their stupendous achievements.

All of this, of course, is directed at arresting the development of class consiousness, class confidence and pride, proletarian internationalism. When communists succumb to these pressures — and defensiveness and apologetics in the face of anti-Sovietism is the first sign of opportunist capitulation to this pressure — it shows that they have lost sight of the woods for the trees.

The idea that there is less need today to popularize the achievements of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries than there was when socialism existed in only one country encircled by capitalism, is false. The need is greater, not less, and precisely in the interests of defeating the efforts of the bourgeoisie to negate the role of the working class, in the interests of developing the class consciousness and confidence of one's own working class and of the international working class.

As our experience has shown, the pressures from nationalism, national chauvinism, arising from the efforts of U.S. imperialism's allies and rivals to maintain and advance their positions in the face of U.S. imperialist encroachment is another source of modern oppor-

tunist tendencies. This tendency minimizes or negates the struggle against one's own imperialism.

The other side of this coin is a tendency to 'come to terms' with U.S. imperialism by holding out the prospect of a special position for it in the future and on the basis of anti-Soviet concessions to it, in the expectation that the danger of intervention by this most rapacious imperialism would thereby be minimized or nullified. This tendency has little or no confidence in the U.S. working class to restrain and check U.S. imperialism, let alone confidence in the international working class and, first of all, in the socialist countries. Ignored is the lesson of Vietnam, in which proletarian internationalism was decisive in mobilizing the worldwide international solidarity which helped bring victory of the courageous Vietnamese people over U.S. imperialism.

The well-known Leninist thesis that the struggle for socialism is successfully waged by the struggle for more and more democracy has been distorted and contorted by opportunism to rob it of its class content. Disregarded is Lenin's warning, 'If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of "pure democracy" as long as different *classes* exist; we can only speak of *class* democracy' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 28, p. 242).

Some have even gone so far as to falsify history to make it appear the Lenin and Leninism opposed democracy! They place the question of the existence of one party in the Soviet Union as though this were a purely subjective decision of Leninism and not the logical result of developments and experiences which led masses to turn their backs on all parties but the Bolsheviks. They falsely attribute to Leninism the idea that there is only one path, the violent one, to socialism, ignoring the fact that Lenin saw the possibility of a peaceful path at a certain time between February and July and also in late August-early September, 1917, and that the Bolsheviks did all in their power to materialize it. This did not happen, primarily through the fault of the opportunists — the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries, who refused to cooperate with the Bolsheviks. Yet, as we all know, because the latter had the support of the masses, the October uprising in Petrograd was practically bloodless. It was the Civil War let loose by the counter-revolutionary forces and the intervention of capitalist states against Soviet Russia which brought violence and bloodshed.

Opportunism, as we have seen on more than one occasion, identifies the working class with the nation and the nation with democracy to the point of negating the existence of the class struggle. Once this is done a vacuum is created which can only be filled by nationalism and bourgeois democracy. For in real life neither the nation nor democracy exist in a vacuum. Denial of the existence of the class struggle by

abstract, 'above-class' talk of nation and democracy leaves the social, political and economic status quo intact and becomes accommodation and capitulation to capitalism.

The 'human rights' campaign of the Carter Administration also has as one of its objectives the obliteration of the class content of human rights and the substitution of bourgeois morality for proletarian morality in the international class struggle. When one abandons Marxist-Leninist class concepts and standards of analysis, it is easy to get hooked by this tempting bait.

It was a favorite device of Browder to paraphrase Goethe to the effect that theory is grey but experience is green. Misusing poetic license, he used such thoughts to justify departure from the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism.

I recall my party district leader saying (when I was in the YCL): 'How can we even begin to achieve our goal in the campaign to sell Lenin's *Selected Works* when Browder tells us the old theories no longer apply?' Do we not hear echoes today of this claim about the non-applicability of Leninism?

I often hear the phrase 'disdain for theory.' To be accurate, it is disdain for the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism that opportunists have. For those who reject it embrace other theories in the name of the search for new solutions to new problems. What they come up with is 'new' only insofar as they may be new variations on old themes: social democracy, bourgeois reformism, liberalism, Trotskyism, anarchism or what have you. So long as Marxism-Leninism is not used and developed to analyze and divine the new, to project solutions for the new, the outcome can only be retention of the status quo and set-backs for our class.

All opportunism, old or modern, must, sooner or later, come to the point of revising and rejecting Marxism-Leninism. The process often starts with disdain for Leninist theory and denigration and disdain of the role of the working class in general and of the basic industrial workers in particular. As our experience has demonstrated, the two go hand in hand.

From the foregoing, it appears that modern developments give rise to new ways in which opportunism and revisionism can find expression. Yet underlying each and every new expression of opportunism are, we believe, some common, basic features:

— Underestimation of, and lack of confidence in the working class, in and out of state power;

— Overestimation of the strength of imperialism or, conversely, confidence in its readiness to accept its demise without a fierce struggle;

— Rejection of Marxism-Leninism (often on the pretext of reject-

ing Leninism 'only') and its fundamental principles of proletarian internationalism, the leading role of the working class culminating in the dictatorship of the proletariat and the need for a vanguard party based on the principles of democratic centralism.

Our history teaches us that the struggle against opportunism and liquidationism becomes more — not less — necessary, the closer imperialism comes to its end.

1. It included representatives of the U.S., West European and Japanese ruling élite. — *Ed.*

2. *Political Affairs,* December 1976, p. 9.

3. *Proceedings. 16th National Convention, Communist Party USA,* February 9-12, 1957, pp. 43-44.

New Rates for

World Marxist Review

Effective January 1978

Single copy $1.00
Canada and U.S. 1 year $7.50
Other countries $11.50
Institutions double rate

Write to:
PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE
71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P8

exchange of views

The capitalist crisis and the communists

William Kashtan
General Secretary, CP Canada

October 1917 has entered history indelibly. The socialist revolution in Russia smashed the chain of successive exploiting systems and opened the road to a world free of oppression and tyranny, a world cleansed of the blights of destitution, ignorance, disease and war. In what was achieved by the proletariat of Russia the working people of all countries saw, to quote Lenin, 'something — and something highly significant — of their near and inevitable future' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 22). The epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism commenced on a global scale.

Only six decades have passed, but even that twinkling of history proved sufficient to resolve in the motherland of October and countries that had broken the chains of capitalism the crucial question of 'who will win' irreversibly in favor of socialism. Faced on the international scene by a vigorous system with an inexhaustible socio-economic potential, by a system entirely consonant with the laws of material and social development, capitalism has suffered defeat time and again in its attempts to crush socialism by force. Capitalism is losing one position after another in the economic competition and in the battle for people's minds and hearts. The battle is not yet over, but to anyone with a sense of historical perspective it is clear that socialism is here to stay, that socialism is the pivot on which human destiny depends.

Nobody will deny that capitalism still has reserves for absorbing the impact of objective economic factors and thereby slowing down its steady decline. These reserves enable it to maneuver in the social sphere as well. Lastly, attempts are being made to refurbish ideologically this last system that lives off the fruits of the labor of others. However, whatever the subterfuges of the practitioners and theorists of the capitalist mode of production, they cannot surmount the immanent contradictions between the productive forces and relations of production, contradictions that tend to deepen and grow increasingly acute, shaking and eroding the very foundations of bourgeois society. 'Imperialism can neither regain its lost historical initiative nor reverse

world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces.'[1]

This conclusion, so vital to the future of the revolutionary struggle, was drawn by the international communist and working-class movement at the close of the 60s, and it is being borne out by all the developments of the present decade. Only people who are politically color-blind and those who prefer to live in a world of illusions fail to see that the consolidation of world socialism, the eclipse of colonial empires and the increasingly apparent untenability of state-monopoly capitalism in all areas of economic and social life are leading to qualitative changes in the advance of the general crisis of capitalism.

In the 70s crisis situations surfaced practically simultaneously in nearly all the industrialized states of the capitalist world. To one extent or another they have hit all the major spheres of material production, generating inflation and unemployment unprecedented during the past few decades. Economic disorder is accompanied by serious financial difficulties. A currency and tariff war has broken out between the leading capitalist powers and their alignments. There has been a sharp aggravation of the contradictions between the metropolises and the developing Asian, African and Latin American countries. The shadow of a raw materials shortage hangs over the capitalist world. The ecological equilibrium has been upset.

All these factors are the external signs of the inner, organic changes in modern capitalism's structures and they have disorganized the mechanism ensuring the functioning of the capitalist system. Without making any claim to an exhaustive and profound analysis, it would nevertheless be useful to delineate some characteristic features of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism.

First, the transition of the crisis of 1974-75, after an extremely short period of upsurge, to a phase of stagnation is convincing evidence that the levers of state-monopoly regulation created after the Great Depression of the 30s, have broken down. The production decline or stagnation coupled with inexorably developing inflation (a phenomenon now known as 'stagflation') sow confusion among the ruling circles of the capitalist world and finally explode Keynesianism. A crushing blow has been sustained by the theories of 'crisis-free.' 'regulated' capitalism that have been spread zealously by bourgeois ideologists not without the aid of the reformists. As realists we can and must, of course, assume that the capitalist economy will surmount the present stagnation and enter a new phase of upsurge. But the consequences of the structural crisis are so far-reaching and have brought about such irreversible changes in society that they have finally buried the myth that capitalism is eternal. Essentially, the point

is that capitalism has finally shown its historical untenability as a social system.

Second, more than ever before capitalism has displayed its inability to resolve the social problems, problems that have been exacerbated by economic disorder. The bourgeois governments have shown themselves powerless to dissolve unemployment and halt inflation, or even to check their steady growth. Today, any manipulation of inflation and unemployment, which in the past yielded some results, only deepens both the one and the other. The drop in real wages at one pole and the rise of monopoly profits at the other widen the gap between rich and poor. The problem of promoting the development of economically backward regions has entered an impasse. The nationalities question has assumed unparalleled proportions in some capitalist countries.

Third, the crisis of bourgeois culture, literature and art, and the distortion of intellectual values predetermine bourgeois society's further moral degradation, which is now eroding the top of its social pyramid. Today it is not only a matter of spiralling crime, drug-addiction, pornography and alcoholism. Bribery, the use of intelligence centers and punitive organs, and even criminal elements for the private, mercenary interests of various groups of the ruling class have now become a norm and way of life in the Western corridors of power.

Fourth, despite the hopes of the capitalist world's leaders, it has not been possible, as was formerly the case, to use the reserve army of labor brought into being by the decline to blackmail the working-class movement. The strike struggle has not abated under the influence of the deteriorating situation in the labor market. The strike curve has ceased to follow the ups and downs of economic indicators. Instead of the fluctuations of the class struggle that were to be observed in the past, that struggle is now steadily mounting. The increased pressure brought to bear by the monopolies is broadening the basis of social actions, which are becoming increasingly political. State-monopoly capital is finding it harder to end the crisis at the expense of the working people.

Fifth, the qualitatively new alignment of forces in the world in favor of socialism has predetermined the commencement of détente, tied the hands of the most adventurist elements in the capitalist states and drastically limited their recourse to wars or war preparations as a means of solving or cushioning economic problems. On the other hand, peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-economic systems reduces the obstructive impact of the cold war on the course of the class struggle in capitalist countries, paves the way for more effective influence by existing socialism, which is proving its advan-

tages over the capitalist method of economic management, and, lastly, makes it difficult to use the most overt and crude forms of imperialist interference in the class struggle in capitalist countries.

The unfolding picture thus allows us to speak of an explosion of contradictions in bourgeois society. This explosion is shaking its material and intellectual life, undermining both the basis and the superstructure of modern capitalism. We are witnessing a steep turn, a definite qualitative change in the development of the third stage of its general crisis.

However, it would be wrong to limit oneself to this observation. The communists are not weathermen, who only record atmospheric phenomena or try to forecast changes in the weather. Canadian communists do not merely reveal the evils of modern capitalism and write it off as bankrupt. We are active participants in the socio-economic process and strive to influence its development effectively. Our task is not merely to note the appearance of new conditions but to decide how to act in crisis conditions so as to be able to take yet another step toward our ultimate goal — the replacement of capitalism by socialism in Canada. Thus, at their 23rd Convention in the autumn of 1976 the Canadian communists noted that 'new possibilities exist for our advance' and, at the same time, pointed out: 'We must seek them out as we must seek out new ways, new forms and new methods of struggle to advance the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.'[2]

But to achieve this it is not enough simply to study the character of the crisis, however detailed and accurate that study may be. Our experience shows that innumerable factors must be taken into account when the strategy and tactics of the class struggle are being worked out. Here success can only be ensured by a dialectical approach, which rejects any direct, so to speak automatic, link between a crisis situation and the preconditions of a social explosion. That is why we, Canadian communists, appreciate Lenin's appeal 'to keep a careful finger on the pulse of the country's whole political life, and especially the state of the movement and of the mood of the mass of the proletariat' (Vol. 15, p. 278).

From this angle, the weakening of the political structures engendered by the cold war and the political spectrum's recent shift to the left in many of the industrialized nations must be regarded as the most important. The character of this process differs in accordance with the specific situation in each country. Fascist and military-fascist regimes have collapsed in some countries. In others, the parliamentary positions of the conservative forces have weakened as a result of pressure from bourgeois-reformist and social-reformist groups. Lastly, the infleunce of proletarian revolutionary parties is

growing in breadth and depth in some leading capitalist states against a backdrop of reformism in crisis.

The influence enjoyed by the communists in non-socialist countries can be gauged by the fact that while they have a total membership of over 4.5 million, they invariably poll more than 40 million votes in elections. Communist and workers' parties are represented in the supreme legislative bodies of 25 non-socialist countries. About 30 communist parties hold strong positions in local organs of power. In some countries there is now a real possibility that the communists will ascend to the leadership — either independently or in alliance with other left-wing parties.

These changes in the alignment of strength on the inner-political scene of a number of capitalist countries reflect above all the strengthening of the global positions of socialism, its enhanced influence on the economic, social and political processes at work in the world. They also reflect a broadening of the social base of the anti-monopoly struggle, of the democratic movement as a whole. Ever larger segments of the population are joining the struggle in response to the monopolies' attack on the people's vital rights. Alongside the urban and rural proletariat, intellectuals, small and medium proprietors, civil servants, the military, and foreign-born workers are taking an active part. Coordinated actions by the working people of different countries are today not infrequent.

The preconditions have thereby been created for an effective political alliance of the working class with other social forces. If it is borne in mind that the anti-monopoly struggle is being waged over an ever wider range of problems, that it is gradually spreading beyond a purely economic framework, it will be seen that the alliances being moulded by the communists are increasingly acquiring a political character. More than ever before, the stability of such alliances now depends on the ability of the working class, as stated by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto,* to become the 'national class' (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 24). In other words, this depends on how far it is able to express and champion the interests of all the working people.

Lenin called upon the proletariat not to confine itself to the 'narrow framework of craft interests' (Vol. 31, p. 193), seeing in this two dialectically interrelated processes. On the one hand, the proletariat's emergence on the national scene is the earnest of its own revolutionization. On the other, support by the only fully consistent democrat, the proletariat, for all inconsistent democrats is what allows the proletariat to put into practice the idea of its hegemony.

The Canadian communists have adopted the Marxist-Leninist strategy of political alliances of the proletariat with other working

strata of town and country. At their 23rd Convention they evolved a democratic alternative to the present policy of big capital and called for an alliance of the Communist Party of Canada with the New Democratic Party and the farmers' organizations. Moreover, they proposed the program of the Canadian Labor Congress, the national trade union center, as the basis for discussing the formation of this alliance, thereby reaffirming that the strengthening of links with the organized section of the working class, i.e., the trade unions, is their cardinal aim. Without such links, as was noted as early as 1969, at the 20th Convention of the Communist Party of Canada, 'the party will be suspended in mid-air, unable to change the situation.'[3]

The people who are out to undermine the formation of an anti-monopoly coalition are doing all they can to discredit the working class as a social political force. For instance, they allege that the workers are insufficiently educated, that at the present level of scientific and technological development, in view of the intricate national and international economic structures, the proletariat lacks the training for building a new society. But we know that it is precisely the scientific and technological revolution that creates the objective preconditions for the appearance of increasingly educated and increasingly skilled and intellectually mature workers. It moulds the proletarian cadres capable of playing the role of the motive force of social progress and taking over the management of production.

In a developed capitalist system, apart from the proletariat there neither is nor can be any other social group able to play a great transformative role. According to Lenin's analysis, 'only the proletariat — by virtue of the economic role it plays in large-scale production — is capable of being the leader of *all* the working and exploited people, whom the bourgeoisie exploit, oppress and crush, often not less but more than they do the proletarians, but who are incapable of waging an *independent* struggle for their emancipation' (Vol. 25, pp. 402-404).

Here the problem of the unity of the political organizations of the working class assumes paramount importance. In many countries, Canada among them, this problem is linked largely with the relations between the communists and the social democrats. As was stated in the final document of the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1976, 'the basic interests of the working class and of all working people require the overcoming of the obstacles which stand in the way of cooperation and which complicate the struggle of the mass of the working people against monopoly capital and against the reactionary and conservative forces.' In keeping with this, the conference participants declared their readiness 'to contribute toward cooperation, on the basis of equality, with all democratic

forces and in particular with the socialist and social-democratic parties in the struggle for peace, democracy and progress for society.'[4]

Of course, in view of the stance of many social-democratic leaders, it is not easy to organize such cooperation. Among the social-democrats there are still many for whom anti-communism and anti-Sovietism remain the alpha and omega of all their ideological and political guidelines. Some parties still regard association with the communists as almost a crime. However, the differentiation of the social-democratic camp was noted as early as 1969, at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Since then, as we all know, this process has been gaining momentum, while on many key issues, for instance, the struggle for peaceful coexistence, the struggle against imperialism, and the quest for a way out of the economic crisis, the attitudes of the communists and the socialists have drawn much closer together. In some countries it is now possible to speak of a growing left wing in the social-democratic parties. This is what creates the basis for coordinating the actions of the two principal contingents of the working class in the modern capitalist world.

We must make it absolutely clear that, eager though we may be for the development of contacts with the social democrats, there can be no question of concessions on our part in the ideological sphere. The revolutionary potential, so vital for society's fundamental transformation, cannot be awakened in the working class on the road of reformism. Lenin wrote that 'the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism' (Vol. 22, p. 302). Our experience bears this out completely. The consciousness of the working class can be promoted and its understanding of its historic role can be raised to the necessary level only by a revolutionary party waging a struggle side by side with the proletariat, championing its interests and the principles of democracy and never losing sight of the ultimate goal, the socialist perspective.

We have now come to the main problem, the problem of the aims of the anti-monopoly struggle at its present stage, i.e., in a situation witnessing a qualitative aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. We need hardly stress how important it is to find ways of surmounting the effects of the economic recession of the mid-1970s. As the Canadian experience shows, this is all the more important in view of the fact that the monopolies and the bourgeois governments serving their interests continue their efforts to place the burden of the most painful crisis phenomena on the shoulders of the working people. Their panacea for surmounting the decline is intensification of labor, which leads to more subtle exploitation; for curbing the inflation — a wage

freeze, which hits the people's living standard; for reducing unemployment — a reduction of the taxes on the monopolies and also the arms race, which still further disorganizes the financial structure and complicates the international situation; for reducing the trade deficit — tariff barriers, which ultimately hit the working people in the partner countries.

The communists firmly reject the 'tighten your belts' call that the ruling circles of the capitalist countries make to the working people, appealing to the exploited to 'share the burden' with the exploiters. The crisis, as we, Canadian communists see it, should be solved at the expense of the monopolies, who are to blame for it and are making profits out of it, and only at their expense. Our specific slogans are: safeguarding and raising of the living standard, struggle against inflation, guaranteed employment, better social security and the extension of civil rights. The Canadian communists take into account the fact that parallel with general manifestations of the crisis, each country has its own specific problems. In Canada, for instance, this means resistance to increasing penetration of U.S. capital into the Canadian economy, and also the building of equal relations between English and French Canada.

But whatever concrete anti-crisis measures are proposed by the communist parties, they do not forget the perspective. The communists strive to find a way out of the crisis that would make it possible to advance to the ultimate goal — to genuine democracy, to genuine social progress, to socialism. We, Canadian communists, regard it as our main task to use the current crisis of capitalism to erode this obsolete socio-economic formation and bring nearer its final collapse.

The increasing economic pressure on the working masses, the sharp aggravation of social contradictions and the dogged resistance of the ruling classes make it clearer than ever before that in capitalist society it is impossible to secure the fulfillment of many of the vital demands being put forward in the course of the anti-monopoly struggle. As a result the working people are beginning to understand the need for cardinal changes in the economic and social structure of the society they live in.

Thus the stage is set for a gradual transition from the struggle against the most reactionary manifestations of monopoly capitalism's policy, from the defense of basic democratic freedoms and social rights to quests for the solution of the deep-seated crisis brought to light by the general crisis of capitalism. There is a prospect that the movement for real democracy, arising and developing in the bourgeois-democratic state, will grow into a struggle for socialist transformations. And the Canadian communists believe that they will

be worthy of the name of a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party only if they do everything to turn this prospect into reality.

Giving practical shape to the Leninist principle of combining the struggle for democracy with the struggle for society's socialist transformation, the participants in the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties emphasized that they regarded action 'against imperialism and for general democratic demands as a component and a stage of the struggle for socialist revolution and the abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man.'[5] In one form or another, this proposition is today included in the programs of many communist parties. The struggle for its implementation exemplifies correct assessment of the situation created by the present turn in the development of the crisis of capitalism.

However, all our efforts would be doomed to failure if we did not constantly bear in mind that we are not living and fighting in the artificial climate of a laboratory, whose sterile cleanliness ensures the successful fulfillment of planned experiments. The communists and their allies are fighting a subtle, and still strong adversary, who refuses to leave the stage of history voluntarily. To defend their positions, the ruling classes of the capitalist states engage in social maneuvers and have frequent recourse to repressions, to a policy of force, and openly encroach upon civil rights, and human rights in general. Ultras of various hues have become active. Fascist and neo-fascist elements have reared their heads. In the capitals of the leading imperialist states, notably in Washington, plans are being made to bring outside pressure to bear on countries where there is a possibility of the left forces, chiefly the communists, coming to power. Vigorous steps are being taken to return the world to the cold-war period with all its cataclysmic dangers. Anti-communist campaigns are being launched with the working class and its allies among other social strata as the chief objective.

To a considerable extent the bourgeoisie link their calculations with the attempts to split the working people. The ruling classes of the capitalist states are, for example, increasingly banking on stirring up nationalist and racist sentiments, and gambling on religious strife. Only recently it seemed that this weapon, once so widely used against the working people, was totally obsolete and that the bourgeoisie had thrown it on the scrap heap. However, the growing crisis of capitalism has engendered some objective factors that are making it possible to renew the attempts to replace class, social contradictions with national, racial and religious contradictions. These factors include the uneven economic development of regions in the different capitalist countries and the massive employment of foreign-born workers. This has given new topicality to Lenin's warning that 'only

by casting off every savage and foolish national prejudice, only by uniting the workers of all nations into one association, can the working class become a force, offer resistance to capitalism' (Vol. 19, p. 308).

The bourgeoisie reckons mainly on splitting the political and trade union organizations of the working class, and above all the communist movement at national and international levels. This assault on proletarian solidarity is led by all sorts of individuals, both right and, if one may call them so, 'left.' Essentially speaking, the bourgeois ideologists are helped equally by the right-reformist rejection of quests for revolutionary ways of ending the crisis and by the ideological guidelines of the pseudo-revolutionaries, who regard every new turn of the crisis as a possibility for a 'revolutionary explosion,' and whose adventurism compromises the ideals and real achievements of socialism in the eyes of the masses.

The bourgeois ideologists and reformists in the working-class movement direct their attacks mainly against the international solidarity of the working class, of all working people, against the international unity of the communists. They seek to impose on the working class, the working people and primarily the communists the shabby idea that fidelity in theory and practice to the principles of international solidarity and its class basis — proletarian internationalism — is 'dangerous.'

But such arguments are calculated to appeal to the politically immature. They win no response among politically conscious working people. The historic significance of the working people's international solidarity is becoming increasingly obvious in a situation in which the cosmopolitization of capital is leading to the internationalization of the class struggle, the effects of capitalism's world crisis are acquiring a global scale and the foreign policy gambles of the governments of different imperialist states carry the threat of a worldwide catastrophe.

This understanding of the situation is exemplified by the 1976 Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe. In the unanimously adopted final document they unequivocally declared their intention to '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 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.'[6]

It may be stated with confidence that this is the approach of the communists fighting in other continents to the central problem of the international communist movement. The communists of Canada also

stand firm on these positions. We proceed from the fact that our party was born in the very heart of the working-class movement of our country and answers for its actions to the working people of Canada. Sovereignty and independence are our inalienable right and no one has ever tried to deprive us of it. No one has ever tried to encroach on the national character of the party. But as is stated in the resolution of the CPC's 23rd Convention, our party 'continues to base itself on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the laws of revolutionary change.'[7] This is where it draws its strength, its faith in future victory.

Moreover, our convention made it clear that for the Canadian communists proletarian internationalism 'is not only a question of international solidarity. It is above all agreement on the general laws of revolutionary change . . . Our party has always striven to combine patriotism and internationalism. We cannot agree with those who call for the weakening of proletarian internationalism and who choose to give precedence to the local approach while pushing into the background the common principles of the international working-class movement.'[8]

In this we are the heirs and true followers of the October Revolution in Russia, of the communists of the Land of Soviets, who have made internationalism their militant slogan. 'We,' Lenin wrote, 'are proud that we settle the great problems of the workers' struggle for their emancipation by submitting to the international discipline of the revolutionary proletariat, with due account of the experience of the workers in different countries, reckoning with their knowledge and their will, and thus giving effect in deed . . . to the unity of the workers' class struggle for communism throughout the world' (Vol. 31, p. 269).

The widely celebrated 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution has prompted us to think yet again about 'the experience of the workers in different countries' of which Lenin spoke. This experience shows that no matter how different the specific forms of transition to socialism determined by the level of development and national traditions of the country in question may be, the socialist revolution and socialist construction possess certain features that apply to all peoples embarking on the path of socialist transformation of society. Such fundamental problems include the question of the power of the working class acting in alliance with all the working people; the elimination of the socio-economic domination of the exploiting classes; the communists' rallying of the toiling masses to fight for the building of a socialist society; and defense of the revolution from all attempts to restore capitalism.

The very existence of real socialism is having a profound and

varied influence on the international working-class movement. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the bourgeois ideologists and propagandists to hide the indisputable fact that only socialism gives the working people freedom, genuinely democratic rights, prosperity, access to knowledge and firm confidence in their future. The achievements of existing socialism fortify the confidence of the communists and all the other champions of social progress that they are moving along the correct road. Those who hold forth about the 'difficulties' of socialism, which more often than not they have invented themselves, and in doing so try to slander socialism as such, must realize once and for all that the peoples of the socialist countries themselves know that the house they are building is not yet complete, that they still face complex problems. They do not conceal this fact and can do without the 'advice' of the fault-finders. They are solving their problems without this kind of 'help,' thus affirming yet again the vital strength of existing socialism.

In working out our strategy and formulating our tactical objectives we never forget that the threat of world war has not yet been removed. We know that ultra-reactionary circles in the imperialist camp have not abandoned the idea of deciding the historic argument between capitalism and socialism by force of arms. This is why the Canadian communists so resolutely oppose our country's inclusion in the military structures of the Pentagon. We are convinced that a country's participation in the West's military-political pacts is incompatible with the interests of the mass of the working people and sets up serious obstacles on the path of social progress.

This is why we value so highly the peace policy of the socialist countries, which launched the transition from military confrontation to détente. But we have never regarded peaceful coexistence as a sort of idyl. As the communists see it, peaceful coexistence is a specific form of the acute class struggle in the world. This struggle embraces all areas of material and social life. It is a struggle in which victory requires the collective effort of the international working class, of the working people of the socialist and capitalist countries and the peoples of the Third World. This unity is needed more than ever now, when our common adversary, the world bourgeoisie, increasingly resorts to coordinated international actions directed against socialism, against the communists and other progressive forces in the capitalist world, and against the national-liberation movements.

The destiny of coming generations is being shaped in hard-fought class battles. Life is convincing the masses that it is only by applying Marxist-Leninist theory that we can lay bare the roots of the processes eroding the capitalist world and, consequently, chart effective

ways and means of protecting the rights of the working people and ensure the purposeful unity of all the anti-monopoly forces. The revolutionary transformation of the world started by the October Revolution is proceeding inexorably, developing and growing stronger. Our entire planet hears Lenin's prophetic words: 'Communists should know that ... the future belongs to them' (Vol. 31, p. 101).

With this article by William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, the *WMR* begins a new series examining the problems of the crisis of contemporary capitalism. This subject has often figured on our pages. The object of the present series is to give a more systematic and comprehensive account of the basic aspects of the present stage in the general crisis of capitalism, to study the forms it takes in various regions and countries of the capitalist world, and to acquaint readers with the positions of the communist and workers' parties on this problem.

1. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969,* Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 13.
2. *Convention 76,* Toronto, 1976, p. 61.
3. William Kashtan, *Toward Socialism,* Progress Books, Toronto, 1976, p. 61.
4. *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe,* Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, Berlin, June 29-30, 1976, pp. 22-23.
5. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969,* Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 37.
6. *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe,* pp. 20-21.
7. *Convention 76,* p. 37.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

African Panorama

THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS IN THE SOCIALISM-ORIENTED COUNTRIES OF AFRICA

International exchange of views

This discussion was organized by the *WMR*'s Commission on Problems of the National-Liberation Movement in Afro-Asian Countries. The participants were: *Naim Ashhab,* Politbureau member, CC, Jordanian CP; *Georges Batal,* Politbureau member, CC, Lebanese CP; *Jaakoub Garro,* CC member, Syrian CP; *Idris Cox,* representative of the CP, Great Britain on the *WMR; Ali Malki,* Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria; *Amr al-Masri,* representative of progressive opinion of Egypt; *Daniel Naame,* Politbureau member, CC, Syrian CP; *Lasisi Osunde,* secretary of the journal *New Hori-*

zon (Nigeria); *John Nkosi,* South African CP; *Ahmed Salem,* representative of the Sudanese CP on the *WMR; Seydon Cissoko,* General Secretary, CC, African Independence Party of Senegal; *Tahar Ali,* Tunisian CP; *Emile Touma,* Politbureau member, CC. CP Israel; *Adel Haba,* CC member, Iraqi CP.

The discussion covered a wide range of questions concerning not only the specific processes of social development in the progressive countries of Africa, the methods of solving the basic economic, social and political problems, but also the general principles of socialist orientation, the general requirements and regularities of the transition from the pre-capitalist or early capitalist stages to the initial period of building socialism.

Socialist orientation: principles and substance

The substance of this transition has been fairly thoroughly investigated by Marxist science. Non-capitalist development, *Cissoko* stressed, is above all a consistent national-democratic revolution, which hits capitalism hard and, while not destroying it, weakens it sufficiently to open the road to socialism. It is a transitional stage characteristic of young countries where there is not yet a material base for the building of socialism, said *Ashhab*. It is a preparatory process, a preparatory period which may last decades because the creation of the base begins from very modest, insubstantial initial positions.

Non-capitalist development, *Malki* noted, makes it possible to create the most general, basic conditions for embarking on socialist construction when the necessary subjective, political factors are present. The content and aims of this stage are varied. They involve ridding the country of foreign exploitation and overcoming economic backwardness, widening the state sector and gradually strengthening socialist elements in the economy, creation of socio-political conditions ruling out any possibility of the commanding heights in the state sector being taken over by the national bourgeoisie; agrarian reforms in the interests of the peasant masses and development of the cooperative movement on democratic principles; democratization of the state apparatus, gradual extension of the participation of the mass of the working people in administration; expansion of all-round cooperation with the world socialist system; and gradual evolution of the left wing of revolutionary democracy in the direction of scientific socialism. As progressive economic and social changes strike deeper, of course, the class struggle tends to grow.

Naame spoke of the inevitability of intensification of the class struggle, as both an internal and international factor. He stressed that although the nationalization of big industry, the creation of a state

sector of the economy, radical agrarian reform and other socio-economic changes cannot in themselves bring socialism, the realization of these measures checks the consolidation of capitalist relations, while not completely excluding them. So quite naturally such forces as the feudal lords, bank and big industrial capital, and world imperialism try to block such progressive advances and guide events into the capitalist channel.

In this connection attention was drawn to the terminological weakness of the concept 'non-capitalist development.' *Cox,* for example, said that when Lenin pointed out the possibility of bypassing the capitalist stage, he did not have in mind the complete cessation of the growth of capitalism. But this, *Cox* went on, is exactly what the term 'non-capitalist development' implies. In fact all economically backward countries, including those which politically adhere to the most advanced and progressive positions, pass through some phase of capitalist development. Even the Soviet Union, when it introduced the New Economic Policy in 1921, was compelled to allow a definite, although brief, revival of capitalism. So the current term, *Cox* believes, cannot express the actual state of affairs. This view was supported by some other participants in the discussion.

The need to apply Marxist-Leninist method in assessing a national-democratic revolution was emphasized by *Cissoko,* who spoke against the tendency to regard as socialism-oriented countries only those whose leaders declare their allegiance to Marxism-Leninism. Such declarations should, of course, be taken into consideration, but they are not sufficient in themselves. What matters is not so much the preferences to Marxism-Leninism as the concrete program carried out by the state, the measures it takes to solve current problems.

Cissoko also pointed out the absurdity of attempts to 'identify' the non-capitalist and socialist stages of development made by leftist-minded petty-bourgeois elements. This was not only a theoretical but a practical mistake, stemming from underestimation of the heterogeneity of the national-liberation movement and overestimation of gains, which incidentally have been considerable. The movement's revolutionary potential is not in doubt. Nevertheless it cannot by itself resolve the basic contradiction of our epoch. Attempts to build a kind of symbiosis of the socialist and capitalist orientations were equally unsound. The newly-free countries had only two alternatives. Development could be in either a socialist or a capitalist direction and any 'in-between versions' suggested by the leaders of some African countries were bound to lead to capitalism. *Osunde* cited the example of Nigeria, where the official formula 'neither capitalism nor socialism' in fact merely masks capitalist development.

At the same time participants in the exchange of views noted that a certain similarity in the tasks of overcoming economic and cultural lags that confront all or the majority of the newly-free countries generates a corresponding similarity in the ways of dealing with them. The need for the all-out development of production, for instance, demands the use of both state and private enterprise, regardless of the orientation that is chosen. Of course, the relationship and ultimate prospects of the two forms of production and other economic activity differ fundamentally. In the socialism-oriented countries the positions of the state sector prevail fairly quickly, both economically and politically. But even in countries oriented on capitalism the weakness of the local bourgeoisie quite often gives the state the leading role in the development of key branches of the economy, although state enterprise is ultimately subordinated to the interest of private capital.

The developing countries of both orientations are equally interested in using foreign capital to speed up economic growth, but the conditions for its investment and use differ substantially according to orientation. The line between the capitalist and socialist orientations is less marked in the sphere of seeking foreign financial aid. The differences of approach to the question of its sources tend to be obliterated by the urgency of the problem of finance, which is particularly felt by countries that have no high-profit export resources.

In these conditions the ties between certain socialism-oriented countries and the world capitalist economy are not merely maintained through the channels of trade, technical, economic and financial aid. They are actually strengthened. A definite contradiction arises between 'non-capitalism' in internal development and anti-imperialist positions in foreign policy, on the one hand, and external economic ties mainly with the capitalist world, on the other. In practice this contradiction emerges as an element of the wider contradiction between all the developing countries and the developed capitalist powers in the sphere of economic relations. Its progressive solution, as the participants in the discussion noted, implies gradual modification of the character of world economic relations, the struggle for development of economic relations between all countries on a basis of equality and mutual advantage, without any discrimination or interference in internal affairs. Relying on the active support of the countries of the socialist community, the developing countries have in recent years more and more vigorously advocated the actual realization of these principles.

In the discussion of this problem it was pointed out that there is a certain similarity between the two groups of countries in some other aspects of socio-economic policy — introduction of elements of planning, accounting, and so on. In time this similarity tends to weaken,

but on the whole the socio-economic expression of the socialist orientation is bound to experience the 'muffling' effect of the fact that at a certain stage, as Lenin noted, the development of the lagging economy toward socialism and toward state capitalism proceeds along 'one and the same road' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 32, p. 335).

It is a different matter in politics, in the sphere of relations between different social classes. Here, speakers stressed, the socialist orientation logically presupposes the realization of a policy of strengthening the socio-political role of the working masses and, above all, the working class, particularly in countries with a relatively high level of socio-economic development, where the working class is comparatively large and, what is more, has its own revolutionary traditions, experience of the political struggle and organization, and is thus the most reliable force in support of socialism. Such a policy creates a situation radically different from the situation in the capitalism-oriented countries, where the evolution of the state-political superstructure leads to the transformation of the national bourgeoisie into the dominant class, even when the state sector holds the commanding heights in the national economy.

Socialism, Lenin wrote, 'is inconceivable without large-scale capitalist engineering based on the latest discoveries of modern science. It is inconceivable without planned state organization' and 'unless the proletariat is the ruler of the state' (Vol. 32, p. 334). So, as was pointed out in the exchange of views, the socialist orientation finds expression not only in the accelerated development of the productive forces in the framework of the state and cooperative sectors of the economy, but also in the democratization of social life, which tends to heighten the class consciousness, organization and political role of the working class, and stimulate activity on the part of the supporters of scientific socialism. While such economic criteria of non-capitalist development as precedence in the growth of the state economy, and strict state regulation of the activity of national and foreign capital are fully preserved, in the course of time increasing significance is attached to social criteria (changes that are directly in the interests of the working masses) and to political criteria, particularly changes in the character of government through the advance of the revolutionary democrats to positions of scientific socialism and through their being 'boosted' by representatives of the working class.

Participants in the discussion noted that the question of the correlation of economic and political aspects of social development, of the role of the economic basis and the state-political superstructure is of key importance in assessing the practical side of the socialist orientation. According to Marxist-Leninist theory, the economic basis, the decisive factor in social life, creates a corresponding state-political

superstructure, which, as Engels pointed out, 'by virtue of its inherent relative independence,' 'reacts in its turn' upon the basis. Moreover, the character, the direction of such reaction are determined by the economic needs of society. Politics, which Lenin called the concentrated expression of economics, is the direct 'modifier' of the economic basis, and in this sense 'politics must take precedence over economics' (Vol. 32, p. 83). Hence the great attention that was paid in the course of the discussion to these aspects of the socialist orientation.

Politico-ideological aspects of non-capitalist development

The possibility of the newly-free countries' bypassing the capitalist stage, which with the given pattern of economic relations in the world capitalist economy cannot eliminate the economic lag and dependence on imperialism, thus hinges on political factors. Chief among these is the removal of the national bourgeoisie or the bloc of feudal and bourgeois elements from state-political power and the transfer of power to the forces acting in the interests of and with the support of the working masses.

What would be a more exact social-political definition of these forces, which the communists define as revolutionary democratic? Coming mainly from the petty-bourgeois intermediate strata of the urban population, the revolutionary democrats are a focus not only of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal aspirations of these strata, but also of their anti-capitalist aspirations, which are not always, of course, sufficiently clear and consistent.

The propositions of Marxist science on this subject are well known.[1] But opinions differ concerning the ability of the revolutionary democrats to cope with the tasks of non-capitalist development, to create the necessary economic and particularly the political preconditions of socialism in the countries under their leadership. According to *Batal,* the possibility of bypassing the stage of capitalist development, as Lenin envisaged it, could become a reality only under the political leadership of the proletariat. The experience of the Central Asian republics of the USSR, which under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union reached socialism without entering the capitalist stage, and also the experience of a number of other socialist countries indicate that the foundations of a non-exploitative society can be laid only by forces that have adopted the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism. Non-Marxist political leadership, on the other hand, has quite different results, as evidenced in Egyptian evolution.

The exception that proves the rule, *Batal* continued, was Cuba, where shortly after the revolutionary-democratic element came to

power, thanks to the timely fusion of the cause of national liberation with the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the rallying of the masses around the fighters dedicated to the people's cause, a unified Marxist-Leninist party was founded, the Communist Party of Cuba, which guides the process of development in accordance with the basic laws of the building of a socialist society. Of course, there have been mistakes and omissions, but they have not changed the general line. Public ownership of the means of production was very quickly introduced in Cuba. The society that emerged there was not multi-structured. It was a society in which exploitation had been abolished and the foundations of socialism were being laid. Undivided political leadership was provided by the vanguard of the working class.

This means, *Batal* said, that to pursue the socialist orientation effectively power must be in the hands of only those social groups that maintain Marxist-Leninist ideological positions. Hence the vitally important significance of the existence of independent working-class parties. On the other hand, any admission of the possibility of socialist transformations in a power set-up that does not actually accept the ideology of the working class is refuted, in *Batal's* view, by the historic switches that have occurred in many developing countries, including those of Africa.

On this point *Ashhab* noted that in Africa the subjective, political factor is particularly important, because many of its countries rank among the most backward in socio-economic development. This naturally shows itself in a corresponding weakness of class differentiation. Another factor that must be taken into account is the relative instability of the political leadership. Coming mainly from the petty-bourgeois, intermediate strata, it has a tendency to vacillate. This is due to the process of internal differentiation that is characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie in general. Depending on specific conditions, this process can lead to two basic results: development is subordinated either to the interests of the working people or mainly to those of the well-to-do social groups. If the progressive wing acting in the interests of the working masses comes to power, it usually gravitates ideologically toward the working class. Today, when world socialism's influence is growing, the conditions for such evolution are naturally far more favorable than in the past. Cuba is a classical example. In *Ashhab's* view, similar but not identical processes are at work in Angola, Mozambique, the Congo and Algeria. It is too early yet, of course, to say that in these and some other African countries the question of 'who will win' has been finally decided in favor of socialism. There can be no doubt, however, that the factors tending toward such a solution are growing, particularly if we consider the general features of the international situation.

Ashhab said that in view of all these factors one cannot agree with the idea that non-capitalist development or socialism-oriented development are possible only under proletarian leadership. Lenin, he noted, did not consider such leadership necessary for the working class at the beginning of this road (here the reference was not, of course, to democratic revolution in developed capitalist countries, where in our epoch — the epoch of imperialism — the leading role is played by the proletariat) as distinct from the stage of actual socialist construction, when — and here he left no room at all for doubt — the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential.

Haba stressed that there is a sufficiently distinct boundary line in both theory and practice between a socialist orientation of development at the stage of the national democratic revolution and socialist construction proper, even though the tasks of the two stages interlock to a degree. Power in countries following a non-capitalist path does not belong to the working class, but neither is it wielded by the bourgeoisie. It is held by a coalition of social strata differing in orientation, and the fate of the main trend of development depends on the balance of political forces in the leadership, the degree of their maturity and their closeness to the ideas of scientific socialism. This coalition is not yet faced with building socialism as an immediate task, which is a matter for the future that really does require a Marxist-Leninist party playing the leading role and a solid worker-peasant alliance. A clear distinction must therefore be drawn between the two stages as to character and content.

Ali voiced the opinion that in young states the leading role of the working class allied with other social strata is not a sine qua non for the launching of the revolutionary movement but its result. As for the further development of the movement, it depends largely on the process of radicalization of part of the petty bourgeoisie and on the effectiveness of the political and ideological struggle carried on by the most advanced forces.

It would be wrong to regard every petty bourgeoisie in power as progressive, as the situation in Tunisia, for example, indicates, *Ali* went on to say. There the national-liberation movement was led by a nationalist petty bourgeoisie. The assumption of power by this class quickened the pace of social differentiation, which expressed itself in, among other things, the formation of a new capitalist class on the basis of both the ruling elements and members of the old bourgeoisie, which had been there even before independence. The differentiation also found reflection in a vacillating official policy of the Socialist Dastour Party. One extreme of this vacillation was support for fairly deep-going structural reforms of a generally anti-capitalist nature initiated under the leadership of Ahmed Ben Salah, and the other, the

virtual adoption (in 1969) of a capitalist orientation, which persists to this day. Unfortunately, the Ben Salah experiment was marked by serious mistakes, such as the fact that reforms were accompanied by a curtailment of democratic freedoms and even by repressive measures against the left. Tunisia's communists, who are now fighting for what they call a 'new progressive democratic alternative,' insist on the need for a broad national democratic alliance.

Ali went on to say that the progressive forces in power in some African countries have for some time been inclined to compromise with certain reactionary circles. The point at which they set out to effect radical structural reforms and to fight against reaction is the crucial moment of ideological choice. If amid the welter of social and political antagonisms the revolutionary-minded part of the petty bourgeoisie gains the upper hand the situation changes in quality and substantial opportunities are created for these progressive elements to adopt the ideology of scientific socialism and to cooperate more actively with the communist party, with the prospect of an organizational merger in the long term. While taking these opportunities into account, we must realize that this is a long process and that the existence of an independent party of the working class is a vital necessity at the moment.

Al-Masri considers that the absence of such a party was one of the factors which prevented Egypt's progressive development. Speaking of the political evolution there in the 60s, he pointed, in particular, to the contradiction between the words and deeds of the leading circles. The National Action Charter, a program document approved in 1962, assigned a big role to the working class, and during political crises some national leaders had nothing but praise for this role. In fact, however, the picture was totally different. A process took place of systematically subordinating the trade unions to the bourgeois bureaucratic managerial group in the public sector of the economy and the state apparatus. This hampered the growth of the political consciousness of the working class and its independent class actions designed to maintain and further the progressive trend of development.

There is no doubt, *Nkosi* said, that an independent political party of the working class is crucial for the successful development of the revolutionary process. However, this theoretically correct proposition does not as yet apply in many countries of Tropical Africa where the working class is still weak or in the process of formation. In these circumstances revolutionary democratic vanguard parties which have a world outlook fully or at least partly based on scientific socialism and hence are likely to become communist parties eventually, are the optimal instrument of political education, mobilization and leadership

of the masses. This is one of the principal aspects of the political content of a socialist orientation.

However, the formation of vanguard political organizations is no easy task. For one thing, it is hard to get the kind of social composition of a party that makes for close, everyday links with the working people. *Nkosi* illustrated this by referring to the formation of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party (SRSP). Most of its members are either civil servants or party officials. This makes the party's ability to influence the masses day after day and take their real sentiments into account highly problematic.[2] It is a reality that must be borne in mind when examining the problem of a vanguard party and of the working people's place and role in its activity.

It was also noted during the exchange of views that not in all socialism-oriented countries does the national leadership adopt sufficiently consistent measures to educate the working people politically, to organize and rally them for the fulfillment of progressive development tasks and increase their social and political role. These measures go deeper and are more consistent where the views of the revolutionary democratic leadership are closer to the ideology of scientific socialism. It is worthy of note that in countries with a socio-economic development level which is relatively high by African standards the leadership is often less close politically and ideologically to scientific socialism (initially, anyway) than in countries with more backward socio-economic structures. One reason for this situation is differences in the share of petty-bourgeois and related strata in the composition of society and, accordingly, in the extent to which petty-bourgeois political and ideological notions are current. The greater their share and the more widespread these notions, the greater is the whole set of contradictions that make regimes committed to non-capitalist development vulnerable to both external, particularly economic, pressure and internal degeneration processes, as in the case of Eygpt. To maintain and stabilize a really socialist orientation, it is essential to have political and ideological structures helping to offset the operation of the negative factors mentioned above. Socialism-oriented regimes can only grow stronger through conscious activity unfailingly directed toward progressive development.

In this connection speakers stressed the importance of the political alliances that communists can establish with revolutionary democrats. A prerequisite of this cooperation, *Cissoko* said, is to appreciate each other's position and prevent any sectarianism on either side blocking the attainment of revolutionary goals.

The African communists' paramount task, which they must carry out in alliance with progressive currents, *Malki* said, is to make the socialist orientation irreversible. Speaking of the contemporary rev-

olutionary process in Algeria, he pointed out that its prospects depended directly on unity of the people and the mass of workers behind the objectives of national development and social progress. This unity is feasible, as was indicated by the discussion of the draft National Charter in the summer of 1976 and by the voluntary participation of students, women, working people, and the National People's Army in the implementation of agrarian reforms. However, there is also a need for suitable political conditions assuring the extension and consolidation of the democratic and social foundations of power. Lack of these conditions creates serious difficulties in mobilizing the masses.

In Algeria, *Malki* went on, the progressive forces have yet to achieve an adequate degree of political and ideological unity despite the fact that their objectives are fundamentally the same. At the same time, the National Charter can initiate a fruitful unification process that will not be reduced to arbitrarily chosen, unacceptable forms. At this stage the revolution could be promoted by the organization of a genuine revolutionary democratic party. The National Liberation Front (NFL) could become such a party if thoroughly renewed. It is not a party today — this is admitted by the most progressive men in power — but rather a bureaucratic apparatus, which has been a hindrance to important changes, such as the agrarian revolution. And this means that along with the creation of a broad front of forces opposing imperialism and advocating social progress the real renewal of the NLF is one of the main political requisites of deepening the national democratic revolution, of its further sucess, such as could eventually pave the way for a socialist revolution, *Malki* concluded.

Garro likewise spoke of relations between communists and revolutionary democrats. In his view, it is very important for the revolutionary democrats that the communists should support them and also offer them comradely criticism and advice. Criticism — which should be flexible and constructive — was not used sufficiently in the past. For instance, the attitude to the policy of the Egyptian regime under Nasser was too uncritical. Yet it is indisputable that certain features of that regime, such as the lack of a genuine revolutionary democratic party, fear of the masses and of really progressive forces, above all Marxist-Leninists, were conducive to the development of the trends which in the 70s led to the reorientation of Egypt.

Prompt exposure and proper assessment of all these weak points by the communist parties of Arab countries, *Garro* maintains, could have yielded specific positive results. It is necessary to open the revolutionary democrats' eyes to the shortcomings of their policy, call their attention to open doors through which neo-colonialist forces can make their way, to the loopholes which a bureaucratic or commercial bourgeoisie can use to bolster its positions. We must bring it

home to them that real revolutionaries whose goal is socialism should not fear the working class and its real spokesmen, the communists, but should cooperate with them. Of course, this requires tact and the use of methods in keeping with conditions in the given country.

Participants in the exchange of views touched on the problem of building up the state. They noted that no matter what kind of government you have, since the system of institutions making up the state is an aggregate organ of class rule, the chief instrument for pursuing a definite policy, the principles of its organization, formation, functioning and improvement are of primary political importance. They are particularly important in socialism-oriented countries, for there the state operates as the instrument of revolutionary change of the 'natural' course of social development.

In this connection speakers pointed to the need to democratize government and public life in socialism-oriented countries and extend the participation of the working people, especially the working class, in government. This democratization has generally been effected by increasing the role of central and local elected bodies and through a certain promotion of democracy in the production sphere, in the state and cooperative sectors of the economy. However, speakers said, there is hardly any socialism-oriented country where the workers and peasants really play a decisive role in the state. Nor is this necessarily due to the inadequacy of the working people's class and political consciousness, for there is also the fear that they may become 'too' independent politically, a fear which certain revolutionary democrats have still not discarded. Hence the lack of political organizations in a number of socialism-oriented countries through which the working people could express their opinions or uphold their class interests. In other words, in these countries there still linger palpable elements of a situation known as 'revolution from above.'

In this atmosphere, when the actual scale and solidity of the social basis of revolutionary democratic regimes are much smaller than they could be in theory, the working people tend to be passive and indifferent to the policy of the leadership, an obstacle which the latter occasionally tries to 'remove' through economic and political coercion. All this complicates the revolutionary process. On the other hand, in countries whose leaders adhere to Marxist-Leninist ideological principles, the approach to the problem of democratizing political institutions and public life warrants a more optimistic estimation of their future.

Social and economic foundations of non-capitalist development

Whereas the very possibility of non-capitalist development in young states is conditioned by political factors and a socialist orientation

manifests itself primarily in the political sphere, this does not detract in the least from the vast importance of progressive social and economic changes which are the primary aim of the political superstructure of the state. Indeed, speakers noted, the main objectives of a socialist orientation are to end social and economic backwardness as early and as effectively as possible, harmoniously develop the productive forces, establish a new economic basis and improve the standard of living. This is why political factors, while determining the adoption and steadfast pursuit of a non-capitalist policy, play at the same time something of an auxiliary role in the overall content of socialism-oriented development.

It is indisputable that a more advanced social system provides more favorable conditions for economic growth. This Marxist-Leninist thesis also applies in full measure to the system of social relations at the non-capitalist stage of development in spite of their transitional, relatively fast-changing character. The opportunities for social and economic progress afforded to young states by a socialist orientation are much greater than in the case of a capitalist orientation. They express themselves in greater concentration and more meaningful utilization of manpower, material and financial resources, in the fact that the sphere of production and distribution is made to serve the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population and not those of a small social group, in the curtailment and ultimate abolition of the exploiting activity of foreign capital, and so on.

To be sure, these opportunities do not translate into reality automatically but as a result of an appropriate economic policy on the part of a revolutionary democratic leadership and its government agencies. It should also be clear that the diversity of specific conditions presupposes a corresponding diversity of methods, rates, priorities, proportions and forms of effecting social and economic changes.

Industrial development, *Salem* said, is particularly important to young states. One of its requisites is maximum mobilization of the real and potential surplus product, of surplus value, which arises in every country and every production activity. This mobilization necessitates class measures by the revolutionary democratic state, including steps to curb the national bourgeoisie's profits and consumer spending.

Discussion on this subject also touched on industrial priorities in national economic development, the ratio between state efforts to advance the two basic spheres of material production: farming and industry. Speakers stressed that in principle the need to build up a reasonably strong industrial basis for the rapid growth of the productive forces is not in question.[3] However, this problem will certainly

take a long time to solve in countries whose social and economic structures are particularly backward (Tropical Africa). In these conditions a revolutionary democratic leadership logically concentrates its economic policy first of all on agricultural production, its elementary modernization and steps to improve the condition of the peasants, or the overwhelming majority of the population, which makes possible, among other things, a certain reduction of migration to the cities and the dangerous growth of unemployment. But as time goes on agriculture ceases to be an 'absolute' priority, for the objective needs of development gradually extend the place of industry in economic policy.

A reverse evolution of priorities is likewise possible, as was the case in Algeria. There the existence of some industrial production created in colonial days, as well as more favorable material, financial and technical conditions and opportunities than in countries of Tropical Africa, made it possible from the outset to gear the economic development strategy to industrialization. But the requirements and prospects of intensive industrial construction (along with social and political factors) predetermined subsequently the need for a radical agrarian reform including measures to update 'traditional' agricultural production, although industrial development is still the main line of the leadership's economic policy.

It follows, participants in the discussion concluded, that there can be no total uniformity in deciding on economic policy priorities. Every priority is prompted by the given economic, social and political situation, and sooner or later there comes a certain easing of the 'absolute' character of the original choice. Rigidity would militate against harmonious economic development.

Cissoko did not deny the great economic and social importance of industrial development in the socialism-oriented countries, but urged the need for a thorough analysis of developments in the countryside, where there was a steady change of structures toward capitalism in its elementary forms, with a development of commodity, market-oriented production, resulting in social stratification and concentration of property in the hands of some sections of the national bourgeoisie. In a sense, this was a natural development because the eradication of the positions of imperialism and the feudal strata opens up extensive opportunities for the emergence of capitalist structures in the countryside. But these trends cut across the state's orientation upon the establishment of conditions for developing socialist-type relations, which will win out only when they extend to the whole of society, including the rural population.

Elaborating on the subject, *Malki* described the situation in the Algerian countryside, where there was an opposite trend toward a

limitation of capitalist development. The former colonist sector of agriculture (European land-owning settlers), comprising the best lands was transformed soon after independence into a self-governing sector, which created some conditions for eliminating the old capitalist relations of production. A radical agrarian reform, officially known as the 'agrarian revolution,[4] has been under way in the so-called traditional private sector since 1972.

Al-Masri characterized some of the socio-economic factors which determined the change of social orientation in Egypt. He recalled that one of the main results achieved under Nasser's leadership by the 60s was the establishment of a state sector in the economy. There had been a policy of intensifying its progressive, anti-capitalist content. It is true that this process bore mainly on industry and foreign trade, but some premises for the emergence of transitional social relations were created. At the same time, there were various contradictions which in the overall context of social relations led to difficulties and delays along the path of progressive development and these, together with other factors, were eventually decisive in the abandonment of this path. To illustrate this, he gave two examples, one of which relates to agriculture and the other to industry.

From 1952 to 1970, the state provided 97 per cent of all investments in Egypt's agriculture. However, according to official data, the share of the state sector in agricultural production did not exceed 2.7 per cent. For all practical purposes, the policy in agriculture was aimed at strengthening the rural bourgeoisie. Thus, the limitation on land area owned by individual landholders (or their families) did not extend to agricultural firms, that is, capitalist enterprises in agriculture. Moreover, these enterprises did not pay any taxes at all. Another characteristic point was that the well-to-do farmers beginning to practise various forms of capitalist exploitation had secured control of the cooperatives with the support of the state agencies. This shows that the progressive measures did not go deep enough to prevent the continued reproduction of capitalist relations in the countryside, where the rural bourgeoisie was becoming the dominant class.

Meanwhile, the development of the state sector in industry was increasingly subordinated to the interests of the private sector. Thus, the bulk of the state investments in building went into the private sector, which was awarded contracts for building projects. One-time Egyptian Prime Minister Ali Sabri said in his book about the first five-year plan that the role of the private sector in building was the main cause of the non-fulfillment of the overall plan targets. All these conditions, including the support of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, gave the private contractors' sector semi-monopoly positions. Acting in concert, the private firms managed to raise prices in building by

more than 40 per cent. This alone was enough to prevent the fulfillment of the first five-year plan.

Assessing the overall importance of the state sector, *al-Masri* noted that in each of its three periods in Egypt (under the royal power during the British colonial rule, in Nasser's period, and at present) it had a different socio-economic content which was determined by the character of the political power. The state sector does not automatically generate socialism, although, of course, it is impossible to make any progressive advance without it.

According to *Batal,* it is not the state sector or the agrarian reform as such, but the social character of the political power that is of fundamental importance. He cited the experience of Turkey, where a powerful state sector had once been established. How did that sector develop, and what is its present state? What is now taking place in Egypt? What is happening in a number of other countries where the so-called new bourgeoisie is enriching itself? *Batal* asked these questions to emphasize the capitalist orientation of these countries.

In response, *Haba* pointed to the fundamentally distinct role of the state sector in the socialism- and the capitalism-oriented countries. In the former, the development of the capitalist element is being curbed, and the state has an influential and active role to play in trade, in the infrastructure, and in the basic sectors of the economy. There is nothing like it in the capitalism-oriented countries, where there is, as a rule, a strong private sector exerting a powerful influence on economic life alongside the state sector.

No country working for economic independence can do without an extensive state sector, *Naame* emphasized. Of course, where parasitic classes and groups are in power, they tend to subordinate the state sector to their own interests. Everyone has heard of the attempts to develop the state sector in the capitalist way, using it to service private capital in industry and agriculture and cater for the parasitic bourgeoisie, which is incapable of building industrial enterprises or setting up banks. Still, the communists resolutely advocate the preservation and strengthening of the state sector, because, with the right changes in the political situation, it can, must and will serve the mass of the people, the socialist orientation, and eventually, socialism construction as well.

Malki said that in the socialism-oriented developing countries there is a trend which, although incapable of jeopardizing the actual existence of the state sector in view of the prevailing balance of forces, seeks to subordinate it to interests which are not always those of the nation. But the importance of this sector of the economy is undoubtedly great now and will continue to be so in the future, that is, at the stage of socialist construction. There is no doubt that when the

working class becomes the ruling class it will be easier for it to advance toward socialism if it has a built-up state sector at its disposal, instead of having to put through nationalization and carry on a struggle which could have been completed at the earlier stage of the national-democratic revolution.

Participants in the discussion pointed to the positive role of the state's broad involvement in economic construction and remarked on the fact that in many countries state enterprises and organizations were still less than profitable or even produced a loss. But it was also emphasized that here one should bear in mind the strategic, structure-transformative function of the state sector. It would be wrong to assume that its low or negative profitability was some kind of 'innate' or constant feature. Much depended on subjective factors, on the improvement of the organizational and administrative system, and on the business and political qualities of executives.

In this context, *Malki* drew attention to the ideological consequences of training national personnel in the capitalist countries and to the danger of giving key posts to men who favored cooperation with the imperialist powers. The social origins and political views of government economic personnel were also important. In Algeria, a large part of them were revolutionaries and ardent patriots deserving the utmost trust. Conversely, there was a need for political vigilance with respect to those who sympathized with bourgeois liberalism. Lenin warned that nationalization could be used by the state ' ... in the interest of the landowners and capitalists, in which case we have not a revolutionary-democratic, but a reactionary-bureaucratic state ...' (Vol. 25, p. 358). In exactly the same way, in present-day African conditions, nationalization and cooperation could be placed at the service of the bureaucratic sections, whereupon the national-democratic state would be transformed into a bureaucratic and reactionary state. So one of the conditions for steady advance is democratization of the state apparatus and administration of the economy.

On the whole, the discussion of the socio-economic aspects of development shows that despite some similarity of the basic problems facing all or most of the developing countries in this area, as noted above, some lines of economic policy inhere only in the socialist orientation or characterize it to a much greater extent than they do the orientation on capitalism. These lines are:

limitation — all the way to total elimination — of the positions of foreign capital established in the colonial period, and struggle for equitable economic and technical ties with the developed capitalist countries;

steady extension and deepening of economic cooperation with socialist countries;

stringent regulation of local private enterprise with a view, on the one hand, to using its potentialities for developing the productive forces and, on the other, to preventing its domination of the socialized sphere of the economy;

establishment on the basis of nationalized foreign property and constant expansion, through new construction, of the state sector of the economy as the main channel for the development of the productive forces;

transformation of the socio-economic structure of agriculture for the purpose of eliminating the obstacles to its modernization and intensification;

gradual intensification of the planning of socio-economic development;

steady extension of employment and raising of living standards among the low-income categories of the population and reduction of social distinctions;

democratization of management of enterprises and organizations in the state sector of the economy.

The participants in the discussion noted that the measures taken along all these lines to develop the productive forces are paralleled by a corresponding evolution of the relations of production. The substance of non-capitalist development lies in the fact that eradication of the relics of feudal and semifeudal relations and containment of the growth of capitalism through revolutionary transformations help to introduce anti-capitalist elements into social life, and to create transitional relations which, given the right political conditions, could fairly soon become socialist-type relations.

International factors

The revolutionary process in Africa, of which the development of some countries along the non-capitalist road is the most concentrated expression, has gone forward in close connection with the overall international situation, which is characterized above all by the changing balance of forces in favor of socialism. The participants in the discussion emphasized the steadily growing role of the factor of the world socialist system's support of the progressive African countries. Without this support, *Ashhab* said the non-capitalist way could not now have been regarded as an alternative of development.

Cissoko stressed that the future of the present-day national-liberation movement is closely bound up with the growth of the world socialist system and its influence on the world situation. The social content of non-capitalist development and the successes scored along this path largely and often crucially depend on the ties which the socialism-oriented countries maintain with world socialism. Exper-

ience shows that any relaxation, let alone rupture, of such ties inevitably leads to retreats from earlier political and social gains and reorientation upon capitalism.

Haba brought out two aspects of the influence exerted by the world socialist system on social development in the newly-liberated countries. First, much importance attaches to the force of example and experience in solving the key socio-economic and political problems in the socialist-community countries. Second, these countries, and the Soviet Union in the first place, have extended concrete economic and other assistance to African countries, including assistance in setting up key industries.

The progressive forces in Africa put a high value on this assistance. At the same time, the participants in the discussion noted, now and again one hears statements to the effect that the material support from the socialist countries is inadequate. It is quite obvious, however, that it is imperialism that bears all the historical responsibility for the backwardness of the African countries.

When providing disinterested assistance to these countries for their economic development, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have to set aside resources which they have not accumulated through colonial exploitation but solely through the labor effort of their peoples. Equality and mutual advantage are the key principles of cooperation between socialist and African countries, which is more than can be said of the policy being pursued by the developed capitalist countries. This effectively disposes of the argument of those who take the hanger-on attitude to the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community.

The world socialist system is a mainstay of the African peoples, *Malki* emphasized. At the same time, the revolutionary forces should not lose sight of the continued danger of imperialist intervention in various forms, including armed intervention. Whenever this or that country actually advances along the non-capitalist road, imperialism uses various external levers to block the process. Here, the geographical factor has some part to play, although one should not, of course, allow oneself to indulge in a kind of geographical fatalism and assume that it is impossible for any socialism-oriented country to advance simply because it is in a hostile environment.

The existence of the socialist camp and its support, *Cissoko* said, do not of themselves eliminate the threat of neo-colonialism. After all, the non-capitalist development is carried on by states taking the socialist orientation but economically still tied mainly with the imperialist system. This is bound to start trends which under some circumstances can cause departures from the socialist orientation.

Touma drew attention to the fact that now that the potentialities for

direct armed intervention by imperialism have been sharply reduced as compared with the past neo-colonialism is the main instrument for resisting the non-capitalist development of African countries. Imperialism has been using Israel and certain reactionary regimes in developing countries for its neo-colonialist strategy. In this sense, Israel was especially active in Africa in the 60s.

An important new element of neo-colonialism is the growing financial might of Arab oil-producing countries like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrein and the United Arab Emirates. Their petrodollars are being used as an instrument of pressure on the progressive forces of Africa. Saudi Arabia, for instance, has played a substantial role in the reorientation of the Egyptian leadership. Nor has it withheld funds for frustrating the revolutionary processes in some other African countries. This, *Nkosi* pointed out, is another source of danger for progressive African countries with severely limited internal potentialities for the accumulation of capital.

Relying on local conservative circles and reactionary regimes, imperialism still has considerable reserves for intrigues and attempts to defeat the liberation movement in Africa, *Nkosi* and *Ashhab* noted. That is the light in which one should consider the growing role which Saudi Arabia has to play, alongside that of the Republic of South Africa. It is trying to knock together under its leadership a reactionary Egypt-Sudan-Saudi Arabia axis and thus acts as a vehicle for the imperialist tactic of pitting Africans against Africans. All this is a grave threat to the successful development of the revolutionary process in Africa, and it is the duty of all the progressive countries of the continent, the speakers emphasized, to frustrate the efforts of imperialist agents and to confront them with unity and resolve to strengthen and extend the revolutionary gains.

World imperialism has been trying hard, other speakers said, to prevent the strengthening of the political independence of the African countries and their attainment of economic independence. It does this through its agents and the elements of parasitic capitalism which it has been implanting for quite a time and which have the backing of the international monopolies. It also resorts to direct and indirect intervention in their affairs. Whereas in Angola imperialism, and particularly U.S. imperialism, was incapable of turning the tide in its favor, in Zaire it managed to do so with the use of reactionary forces in Africa.

The chief task facing the countries of the African continent, participants in the discussion emphasized in conclusion, is to block imperialist attempts to encroach on their national independence, and to work for economic independence, with reliance on their own internal resources, the creative energies of their people, and the assistance of socialist countries. The bourgeoisie, which was formed

in the days of colonial domination, seeks to put the African countries on the path of capitalist development and to subordinate them to the imperialist monopolies. But the facts show ever more clearly that it is the non-capitalist way that offers the African peoples the greatest opportunities for achieving their aims by creating the objective and subjective premises for transition to socialism. In political terms, this path has already provided a real demonstration of its advantages over the corresponding aspects of the situation in the capitalism-oriented countries. Nor is there any doubt of its socio-economic advantages, even if these have yet to be adequately realized. But all other conditions being equal, the economic potentialities of the socialist orientation, together with its political achievements, open up a much more attractive vista of all-round progress for the broad masses than does development along the capitalist road. That is what, in fact, determines the prospects for the whole revolutionary process on the continent of Africa.

This survey opens our African Panorama series. The development of the national-liberation movement in Africa, its successess and difficulties attract the attention of the whole world. The peoples of the continent face complex problems of further struggle against imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism, which are still entrenched in the south of Africa. At the same time there is a growing number of countries that reject the capitalist road and are oriented on socialism, on the social system under which no human being can be exploited by another.

The socialism-oriented states are the vanguard of the contemporary national-liberation movement. So our African Panorama series has naturally opened with an exchange of views on the revolutionary process in the countries that have chosen the non-capitalist road. Future articles will deal with both general theoretical and political problems and with various aspect of life in particular countries.

1. See, for example, the studies published by an international research group in *WMR*, November 1975.

2. This was apparently not the least important reason why the SRSP leadership headed the nationalist campaign launched in Somalia in support of aggression against revolutionary Ethiopia.

3. Options in industrial construction depend, of course, on the existence of mineral and power resources, the dimensions of the country, its population, geographical situation and other factors. Accurate long-range guidelines for industrial specialization within the framework of the international division of labor are also needed.

4. For details see A. Benabdelkrim, 'The agrarian revolution in Algeria,' *WMR*, October 1976.



Space research, peace, cooperation

'My spaceflight was not my achievement. It was communism's. I am proud to be a communist. I ask the *World Marxist Review* to convey my warm greetings to all my like-minded comrades, to all communists, throughout the world.

Gagarin
April 29, 1961.'

This entry in the *WMR* Guest Book by Yuri Gagarin, the world's first astronaut, shows that at the very dawn of the space age progressive scientists, communists saw the connection between astronautics and the revolutionary ideals of our time, the forces of peace and social progress. Now that space exploration is recognized as one of the global problems on whose solution man's potentialities and further progress will depend, the social role and progressive mission of astronautics is growing.

The past two decades of the space age, opened by the Soviet Union's launching of the first man-made earth satellite, have witnessed many advances; a new knowledge of the mysteries and fundamental evolutionary laws of the universe and of the laws of life on our own planet; new technological solutions, which are moving from 'space technology' into various production spheres and are at times used in fields of human activity far removed from space; and lastly, a new conception of the interconnection and interdependence of the earth's inhabitants, which we can only see by looking at the planet from outer space, a spirit of community amid the interstellar vastness, which gives a powerful impetus to greater understanding among nations.

The progress which astronautics is expected to make in the third decade of the space age will be of still greater significance to mankind. What are the achievements of the first two decades? What is the outlook for further exploration? How does astronautics influence the life and destiny of humankind? Answers to these questions have been given by scientists of three countries who attended the 28th International Astronautical Congress in Prague last autumn.

FOR ALL MANKIND

Marcel Barrere
President, International Federation of Astronautics (France)

Space exploration is developing and will continue to develop along two principal lines. One of them is space exploration proper, the study of the planets and the solar system, the designing of more perfect spaceships and satellites, and exploration of the resources of space and the possibilities of using them. This line has been important from the outset and will remain so. However, astronautics has made considerable headway in two decades. It has moved on from reconnaissance flights to programs for improving man's life on earth. This has given rise to another line — exploration of the earth from outer space, which is needed to solve challenging problems of global significance, such as the energy problem, to ascertain and register resources, to observe and study climate, and to expand transport and communications.

Another noteworthy result of progress in astronautics is the widening of the circle of space powers, which now includes many countries besides the Soviet Union and the United States. Originally space exploration was confined to only a few countries by the prohibitive cost, but the scientific data and technical achievements obtained by these space powers has gradually become the patrimony of all mankind, including countries which lack the economic and scientific potential to carry out independent space programs. The UN and the International Federation of Astronautics encourage this form of international scientific cooperation.

Another important form of international scientific cooperation is the realization of joint or multinational space programs. While outlays per kilogram of payload weight sent into outer space tend to diminish and we can now send out more research equipment than before, space programs will not get much cheaper in the current decade. The fact that various countries can allocate only limited sums for space exploration continues to restrict research, so international projects involving more and more countries are gaining in importance. Soviet-American cooperation plays a particularly important role. However, it is essential to bring more countries into space exploration, for the problem does not concern this or that country or people but the entire planet and hence mankind as a whole.

While this does not come into my studies, I would like to say a word about the impact of weapons design and manufacture on space research. Some contend that the development of military technology benefits space exploration. This is partly true, for most of today's missile weapons are still much more sophisticated than rockets used

for peaceful purposes, and some of the discoveries and solutions resulting from military research find application in so-called civil exploration of space. However, they constitute only a fraction. Yet substantial allocations are still made for military technology under the pressure of world political realities. If the situation were to change, this would greatly advance space exploration.

OUTER SPACE AND 'MAN'S EARTH'

Vitaly Sevastyanov
Twice Hero of the Soviet Union, Pilot-Cosmonaut of the USSR

Notions of the world in which we live have changed radically since the beginning of the space age, especially since man walked in space. For the first time in history, mankind is in a position to take a global view of the earth and events on it in both the direct and indirect sense of the phrase.

Such a view means very much to people's lives, to their knowledge of the world and of themselves. Antoine de Saint-Exupery, the airman and humanist writer, spoke of the world he saw from his plane as 'man's earth,' implying the dependence of the planet's inhabitants on one another. This dependence of human beings on the planet and on their fellow-humans is felt even more keenly by the cosmonaut, who looks at the earth from the lifeless expanses of outer space. The immense altitude of orbital flights offers an even more impressive view of the planet, giving us a new grasp of its significance to mankind.

A global view of the planet enables man to feel and realize more keenly his dependence on it as the totality of unique living conditions which he must protect and preserve, and the need for mutual understanding and cooperation among people on earth. Even when he had gained some idea of the dimensions of space, man continued to regard himself as living in a huge place called Earth. Yet he had no graphic conception of the actual size of this world or of the ratio between the earth and the universe. Not until we were able after Yuri Gagarin, the pioneer cosmonaut, to look at the planet from outer space did it become evident how very small the earth is in comparison with the black, lifeless abyss of space — no bigger than a grain of sand. You can orbit it in a mere hour and a half and take in at once Europe, Asia and South America. One of the strongest emotions the flight aroused in me as a cosmonaut was this realization of the rather narrow limits of our world.

And the earth itself is like a spacecraft. It sails through the universe with its crew of four thousand millions. The life and safety of this crew depend on itself, on how reasonable and far-sighted its members

are. The human habitat cannot be preserved unless the danger of nuclear war is banished for ever, unless détente is made irreversible, unless humanity is freed of the cost of the arms race. In promoting the influence and prestige of these ideas, the cosmonaut performs an important social mission. The successes of space exploration have always been linked with ideas of peace and social progress. Like Yuri Gagarin, all of us Soviet cosmonauts see a close connection between space research and the processes of revolutionary change and building communist society, processes which determine the future of mankind. Astronautics today champions the cause of peace and socialism, the promotion of mutual understanding and peace among nations, both in space and on earth.

The global view of the planet has become essential to its exploration; satellites and manned spaceships are a most valuable instrument for getting to know the earth. This is all the more important with industrial civilization assuming a global character and giving rise to a number of problems on whose solution the further development and the very existence of mankind will depend. Operating from outer space, you can study the evolution of various processes, including such negative ones as pollution of the atmosphere, the ocean and rivers. This makes it possible to find ways of combating them. Satellites enable us to study and forecast weather, carry out cartographic surveys, prospect natural resources and explore the world ocean, all of which is something that mankind must do to satisfy its most essential needs.

A view of the planet from outer space also gives us a new appreciation of the connection between the earth and the universe. Not until he had gone beyond the bounds of the earth did man begin to realize the influence of space processes on life on the planet, in particular the impact of solar activity and solar rhythms on processes taking place on earth and influencing mankind. As a result, the incidence of drought, the multiplication of field and forest pests, and even outbreaks of certain diseases are now linked to phenomena occurring on the sun. This shows how closely man's life is linked with them, and how important it is to know the nature and mechanisms of this connection so that we can forecast adverse events and prepare for them by taking measures likely to reduce their harmful effect. All countries and peoples, the whole of mankind, have a stake in this.

A global view of the planet is essential to the use of the resources of space in solving terrestrial problems. After all, the resources of our planet, seen until recently as inexhaustible, now appear in their real and, alas, very modest proportions. The threat of an energy crisis looms large already. Astronautics can help mankind to solve this key problem. To be more specific, this congress has been discussing the

possibility of building gigantic solar power plants in space. These plants could be placed in stationary orbits over definite areas on the equator, at an altitude of about 36,000 kilometers. Powerful solar radiation would be converted by means of semi-conductor panels into electric power, which would then be transmitted in the form of laser beams to receiving stations on earth. Solar energy, which reaches the planet's surface only in part, could meet all of man's energy requirements even though they are bound to grow.

Outer space is also likely to be very useful as an environment for production processes that cannot be carried out on the planet. Technological experiments conducted in space have shown that man can build real orbital factories that would produce the specially pure substances needed for the further development of electronics and the manufacture of highly valuable medical preparations. These factories would advance numerous spheres of human activity.

However, global projects of this kind can be carried out only if various countries pool their efforts in the interest of the entire population of the planet. International cooperation in space should therefore assume an increasing scale in the third decade of the space age.

When, in the summer of 1975, Soviet and American spacemen met in orbit the world press described their docked ships as a prototype of the international orbital stations to come. I think such stations will become a reality in the third decade of the space age. Czechoslovak, Polish and GDR cosmonauts have begun to train in the Soviet Union. They will soon be joined by cosmonauts from other socialist countries. They will take part in flights on board Soviet orbital Salyut stations, which will thus become international. Right now the possibility of a new Soviet-American program of joint experimental flights involving Salyut-type stations and the U.S. Shuttle spacecraft is under discussion.

During preparations for the joint Soyuz-Apollo mission Soviet and U.S. experts worked out a docking unit whose significance is by no means purely technical. Spaceships and orbital stations equipped with such units can now cooperate in space, exchange crews for joint work and come to each other's aid in case of danger. I trust and believe that outer space will be an area of cooperation and not confrontation and the spirit of cooperation and mutual confidence generated in orbit will be transferred to earth.

INTERCOSMOS: RESULTS AND PROSPECTS

Professor *Hans Fischer*
Director, Institute of Electronics of the GDR Academy of Sciences

In the 20 years since the Soviet satellite launching astronautics has

moved on to the practical use of space for the good of man. This trend will grow in the third decade that has just begun. Space today is seen not only as an object of research but as a unique technological environment, a bridgehead for the exploration of our planet and its resources and for the designing of more and more efficient technological systems.

Outer space is necessary to all countries and peoples but not all of them are strong enough economically to explore space — far from it. Not one of the small CMEA countries could conduct space exploration on its own. This gives a special importance to the Intercosmos space program, which unites the efforts of socialist countries within the CMEA framework. Developing scientific and economic integration has brought a large group of socialist countries into the space power category. Thanks to the fact that the Soviet Union has made its cosmodromes, rockets, terrestrial stations for the tracking of flights and the early processing of information coming from orbit, meteorological and communication satellites and other manned or unmanned spacecraft available for joint operations under the Intercosmos program, the socialist countries are in a position to use all the fundamentally new opportunities which space navigation creates for science and economy.

Intercosmos, a standing long-range program, is and will go on developing rapidly because it benefits all. International division of labor and use of each partner's strongest assets will enable us to improve space programs and make wise use of resources and scientific potentialities.

Cooperation in space brings the countries concerned direct economic gains. For instance, the crew of Soyuz 22 photographed the earth's surface with a multizonal MKF 6 camera made in the GDR, at the Carl Zeiss Jena people's enterprise, in collaboration with Soviet specialists. Tests showed that the proposed new technical solutions were correct. The photographs that were taken can be used for economic purposes. Such photographic systems make it possible, for instance, to organize regular supervision of the state of forests, detect in good time areas where pests begin to multiply fast, trace the development of farm crops, estimate future harvests and the stock of feed in pasturelands, ascertain areas of the world ocean rich in plankton and hence in fish, and check the degree of air pollution.

It is not only the immediate benefits of astronautics that are highly important. There are also the indirect gains, such as the application of achievements of space research in traditional economic fields on earth. The GDR Academy of Sciences Institute of Electronics has been designing instruments for use in spacecraft beginning with the very first satellite of the Intercosmos series. Much of the vast exper-

ience we have gained is of economic use and we make sure the various industries know about those of our achievements which they can use. This is going on in three directions. One is the application in industry of high-standard, compact and dependable probes of humidity, temperature and pressure. Another is the use of telemetric systems devised for use in satellites; these make it possible to follow various technological processes in terrestrial conditions and to get rapid information from numerous points in convenient form. The third line is the use of spacecraft memory elements.

Intercosmos differs from all other international space programs in that it is not restricted to the conduct of this or that experiment but advances as the socialist community develops its forms of cooperation. It should yield many positive results in the third decade of the space age.

Changes in Sri Lanka

Interview with *Kattorge P. Silva,* Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC, Communist Party of Sri Lanka.

Q. How do you assess the outcome of the general election to the National State Assembly of Sri Lanka held last July?

A. It was a victory of the extreme right-wing, pro-imperialist United National Party (UNP) and, consequently, a serious setback for the democratic left.

The UNP won an absolute majority of seats in the National Assembly, 139 out of 168. For the first time the left has no representation in the Assembly and the strength of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) of Sirimavo Bandaranaike has been reduced to eight seats. The Tamil United Liberation Front, which is seeking a mandate to form a separate state, has emerged as the biggest opposition force.

The post-election political situation is fraught with danger to Sri Lanka's independent development and the unity of its peoples.

Q. What do you think caused such a swing of votes toward the right-wing party in Sri Lanka?

A. We think the events in Sri Lanka should not be seen as something isolated or as the outcome of only the specific conditions prevailing in our country. They have certain general aspects, which can be observed in recent developments in several countries of our region, where right-wing forces have defeated, temporarily at least, the ruling national bourgeois or social-democratic parties enjoying the support of the left forces.

Those parties were called upon to rule in their countries at a time when world capitalism was already experiencing the most deep-seated and many-sided crisis. As these countries were linked economically to the world capitalist system, their governments were unable to prevent the devastating impact of the crisis on their economies. This expressed itself, among other things, in the fact that earnings from exports dwindled very noticeably, the prices of basic imports, including oil, sky-rocketed, and inflation and unemployment reached unprecedented heights.

The impact of the crisis on these countries could have been substantially mitigated by determined efforts to break out of the stranglehold of the world capitalist market and establish closer relations with the crisis-free socialist world, as well as by steps for a fundamental economic and social restructuring in a socialist-oriented direction. But the political leadership of these countries, being mainly in the hands of the national bourgeoisie or social democrats, hesitated or refused to take this course, with the result that the masses tended to be disenchanted with the ruling parties.

Sri Lanka with its weak, underdeveloped economy was exposed to the full impact of the world capitalist crisis with devastating effects. The cost of living had increased by over 300 per cent since 1970. Unemployment had risen from 0.8 to 1.3 million, or 26 per cent of the work force. The people experienced great hardships owing to the scarcity and high prices of food, clothing and other essential commodities.

Even the progressive economic measures taken by the United Front government to curb the monopolies could not substantially ease the people's condition due to inefficient management, bureaucratic practices and corruption. The main responsibility in this respect lies with the right-wing leadership of the SLFP. They not only resisted the adoption of policies that could have mitigated the disastrous impact of the world capitalist crisis on Sri Lanka but also followed policies that put new burdens on the masses and alienated social foces which had helped the United Front to defeat the UNP government in 1970.

In the early years of the United Front government, when the mass enthusiasm and activity generated by the electoral victory of 1970 were at their height, the SLFP right-wingers were compelled to go along with many progressive changes proposed by the left parties and the radical forces within the SLFP. But things began to change in 1971, after the armed rising of the left extremists united in the People's Liberation Front, an action which played into the hands of reaction and the SLFP right wing. The rightists took this opportunity to malign the socialist countries and the entire left movement in Sri Lanka, alleging that they were responsible for the rising and the

economic dislocation because they had 'misled' the youth by spreading revolutionary ideas. It was at this period that a new 'united front' between the SLFP right-wing leaders, some sections of the bureaucracy, and leading personnel of the security services began to consolidate themselves around Prime Minister Bandaranaike in an 'invisible government.'

The economic situation in Sri Lanka, worsened by the world capitalist crisis and by successive crop failures, was used by the SLFP right-wingers to advance their so-called 'package deal.' Compelled to yield to certain demands of the left-wing and radical forces in regard to land reform and the imposition of ceilings on the accumulation of wealth and the ownership of houses, they tried to get the support of these forces for a policy of lowering the already low living standard of the masses.

Subsequently, when attempts were made to extend this policy to the wealthy, which found reflection in the 1975 budget, the dominant right-wing section of the SLFP began to take steps to break the United Front by mounting provocations against the left. It succeeded in bringing about the withdrawal of the Socialist Party from the government despite the resistance of the Communist Party and radical sections of the SLFP. Thereupon Felix Dias Bandaranaike, a leading SLFP right-winger who took over the finance ministry, reduced the taxation on the propertied classes. 'Free trade zones' and a 'foreign investors' guarantee law' were proposed in order to encourage domestic and foreign capital.

The joint action of the communists and the progressives within the SLFP at times succeeded in halting the dangerous drift to the right and also in bringing about certain new measures of nationalization, but their efforts to re-establish the United Front were opposed by the SLFP right-wingers. Matters came to a head with attacks on the railway strikers and the police shooting of university students toward the end of 1976. In these conditions the Communist Party decided in February 1977 to quit the government. Thus the right-wing leaders, by breaking the United Front, paved the way for the electoral victory of the UNP.

The misuse of emergency powers to harass political opponents, reluctance to take action against police brutalities, and even justification of such actions by the Prime Minister herself, the arbitrary closing down of parliament for nearly half a year, attempts to substitute personality cult for democratic norms, misuse of the mass media to boost a narrow family group and their assumption of extra-constitutional authority — all these alienated considerable sections of the public, including numerous members of the SLFP itself.

Despite certain welcome steps, the failure of the government to

evolve a comprehensive solution to the problems of the Tamil minority and to put an end to the administrative discrimination and humiliations which they experienced drove a large number of Tamils to support the divisive demand for a separate state.

These are the more important aspects of the situation during the July elections which resulted in a swing to the right.

Q. How do you account for the setback of the Left Front in the elections?

A. Although the left parties parted company with the SLFP before the general election and set up a United Left Front, some shortcomings in their past functioning within the government had their impact on the voters. Some sections of the left did think it necessary to get the masses, if only temporarily, to agree to a lower level of consumption. This stemmed from the erroneous conception that the presence of two left parties in the government was tantamount to a change in the nature of the slate. However, this demand on the masses, made at a time when capitalist relations were dominant in society and when the left was not strong enough to impose similar sacrifices on the rich, resulted inevitably in the left parties losing the confidence (and votes) of a great many people.

The left forces could not always mobilize the masses in support of their progressive proposals, made within the United Front government. Although this was often due to their resolve not to play into the hands of the UNP or damage relations within the United Front, it weakened in practice the fight for the adoption of progressive measures. Besides, the masses had no idea of the independent positions of the left on many important matters. As a result, the left failed largely to maintain its identity and was associated in the minds of the people with many unpopular policies of the SLFP leaders. It should also be noted that the left parties within the United Front were unable to ensure proper interaction and coordination between them, which encouraged right-wing SLFP leaders to try to play them off against one another.

The United Left Front, which came into existence only a few weeks before the elections, had too little time to make its program known to the people or to show itself as a real alternative to both the SLFP and UNP. The fact that it could not lay claim to forming a government of its own was a further drawback. The massive propaganda barrage of the monopoly newspapers and the bourgeois media deluded the people into believing that the choice was only between the UNP and SLFP.

Q. In the light of the outcome of the general election, do you think participation of the left parties in a government in which the national bourgeoisie enjoyed a dominant position was correct?

A. Our decision to form the United Front with the Socialist Party and the SLFP in 1968 and to join the government in 1970 was entirely correct. It made it possible, firstly, to defeat the reactionary UNP government in the 1970 elections, and secondly, to carry out some anti-imperialist, progressive measures, thereby achieving greater political independence, making considerable headway toward economic independence, and weakening the positions of foreign and domestic capitalists. Moreover, as pointed out in the program documents of the Ninth Congress of our Party (1975), there was a possibility of transforming the United Front into a national democratic front, with the prospect of embarking on non-capitalist development. Such a transformation required a corresponding shift in the balance of class forces within the United Front, unity and assumption of leadership in the Front by workers and other progressives. This could only be brought about by the workers and other working people unfolding broad mass struggles for socio-economic change, against imperialism and the reactionary forces supporting it. The fact that the left-wing forces failed to use this possibility does not mean it did not exist at the time, when the United Front was not split and both the Socialist Party and the Communist Party were partners in it.

Q. Now that the UNP has received a massive mandate, will it be able to provide a stable government?

A. No doubt the UNP leaders have skillfully utilized the split in the United Front and all the wrong policies of SLFP right-wingers to get an unprecedented majority in parliament. Yet there are several factors which will work against the stability of UNP rule.

Its massive majority robs the UNP of any excuse of alibi for any delay or failure to implement its election promises, and such promises were made extravagantly to various sections of the population and will be very hard if not impossible to keep. It must also be borne in mind that the continuing world capitalist crisis considerably restricts the prospects of substantial 'aid' from imperialist sources, which the UNP banks on above all.

It will not be possible for the UNP to maintain for long the 'new image' of a reformed party. Its real character is already revealing itself as preparations go on for a foreign policy shift from non-alignment to membership of ASEAN and for the creation of 'free trade zones' in which enterprises set up by foreign investors would be safeguarded against nationalization. It is also seen in plans to hand import and wholesale trade back to private business and curtail the public sector in industry and agriculture. the UNP's claim that it would provide a just and democratic government got a severe jolt by an unprecedented orgy of terroristic violence against its political opponents following the elections and, shortly afterwards, by racial

disturbances. The 'freedom of the press' of which the UNP talked so loudly during the election campaign has turned out to be a mere farce, with the same sycophancy from the state-controlled mass media but now directed at a different target. The amendments it has made to the constitution are dangerous steps toward a more authoritarian form of rule. Step by step, the real intentions of the UNP are coming into the open. This is bound to produce corresponding changes in the mood of substantial sections of the population which supported the UNP in the elections.

Lastly, the UNP has yet to propose a realistic solution of the problem of national minorities, which poses a serious threat to the unity of our peoples.

Q. How do you visualize the path of advance for the left forces in the new situation?

A. We are entering a period which will be marked by increasing struggle of all anti-imperialist and democratic forces against neo-colonialism and UNP-led domestic reaction. The growing polarization of social forces provides ample opportunities for the working class and the left as a whole to emerge as the leader of this struggle. Having no representation in parliament, whose powers, moreover, tend to be curtailed, they must lay emphasis on extra-parliamentary mass action. Their success in this will largely depend on a correct assessment of the level of political consciousness of the masses. They must, furthermore, be vigilant about all attempts to substitute ultra-left adventurism or infantile anti-parliamentarianism for actions mobilizing the masses for struggle. The main danger from ultra-left adventures at the present time is that they can provide the reactionary UNP government with an opportunity and excuse to pass over to more outspokenly fascist forms of rule. The progressives must win over the honest people now under ultra-leftist influence. This could be done by frank self-criticism of past mistakes and by courageously giving correct leadership to mass actions.

A task of paramount importance in the present situation is to reinforce and consolidate the United Left Front. This means, in particular, creating a permanent leading center of the Front, establishing district and area committees, training cadres and strengthening the Front's positions in mass organizations. The United Left Front must also strengthen itself by bringing in all other democratic forces and socialist-oriented groups that are prepared to join it on the basis of its program. This program, which should be widely publicized, offers realistic and progressive solutions to Sri Lanka's political, economic and social problems.

The progressive forces realize the need to help the masses learn from their own experience, to unite with them in all struggles, de-

manding implementation of the UNP's election pledges, and to advance their own proposals for the solution of development problems in the people's interest. This will help to unite the forces disillusioned with UNP policies in the fight for a left-wing government of all democratic, radical and socialist forces.

As for the role that the SLFP can play in the coming period, it depends entirely on the extent to which it is prepared to end the dominance of right-wing leaders over it. Among the SLFP supporters there are those who want Sri Lanka to go forward on a progressive and socialist-oriented path. They are urging that the unity between the SLFP and the left be restored. But it would be idle to expect that this could be done on the old basis, with right-wing policies and a right-wing leadership in command.

Q. What are the main issues before the Tenth Congress of your party to be held early this year?

A. A thorough evaluation of the experiences of the party during the period of its governmental alliance and the lessons to be drawn from the electoral defeat would be among the main issues before the Tenth Congress. It has also to evolve specific new tactics and working methods corresponding to the changed political situation and update the party program, taking into account the realignment of class forces in the anti-imperialist front.

A SCIENCE IN ITS YOUTH

A. Anikin. Cloth $5.25. 388 pages

The history of economic theory: the ancients, medieval thinkers, Hume, Quesnay, Smith, Ricardo, Sismondi, Fourier, Owen among others. Each theory is situated in its historical-political background, giving the link between the old and modern trends and the background to the development of Marxist economic thinking.

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF MATURE SOCIALISM

L.I. Brezhnev, *Voprosy razvitia politicheskoi sistemy sovetskogo obshchestva* (Questions of the Development of the Political System of Soviet Society). Moscow, Politizdat, 1977, 488 pp.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union attaches immense importance to the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, which on the basis of the experience gained in building the new society in the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries provides a proper historical perspective, helps to decide on the main line of social, economic and political development for years ahead and gives a clear picture of internal and international events. *Questions of the Development of the Political System of Soviet Society,* a recent book by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, President of the Presidium, Supreme Soviet of the USSR, illustrates the creative theoretical work of the CPSU, its loyalty and adherence to the scientific principles of creative Marxism-Leninism, and its courageous and innovating approach to problems. A collection of speeches, statements, articles and messages of greetings covering the 1964-77 period, the book is an outstanding contribution to the creative elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory, a major event in the country's ideological and political life.

With the building of developed socialism in the Soviet Union — and the experience of the past 10 to 15 years is of fundamental significance in this respect — social relations in Soviet society have risen to a new stage of structural and functional maturity. This gives full scope to the operation of the laws of socialism, demonstrating the inherent integrity, political stability and dynamism of its social system and its other advantages.

The political system of socialism is a powerful factor in implementing socialism's advantages and inexhaustible potentialities. It is an integral, harmonious set of components through which the Soviet

people, led by the working class, manage the affairs of society. It is based on economic and social achievements. In the construction of developed socialism, a powerful economic system has been set up; the people have attained a high degree of social, political and ideological unity, and all classes and social groups have drawn visibly closer together, the working class retaining its leading role; any essential distinctions between mental and manual labor are being obliterated, and the fraternal alliance of all of the country's nations and ethnic groups has become stronger than ever. 'It is necessary,' Brezhnev noted, 'that the political life of society should advance in step with these processes' (p. 116). Proper functioning of the political system of socialism, above all the diversified activity of the CPSU based on the findings of science and vast practical experience, is the key to successful management of the economy and other spheres of the life of society (see p. 161).

Showing the development paths and prospects of Soviet society's political system, Brezhnev stresses that the main line of this development is to deepen and extend socialist democracy (see pp. 61, 117 and 408). 'We communists are supporters of genuine democracy and cannot conceive progress without it. We see democracy as involvement of the mass of working people in political and other social activity, and the provision of conditions for them actually to participate in the management of society and in government' (p. 116). This is the keynote of the book.

The author points out that in the process of building a developed socialist society the state of proletarian dictatorship was gradually transformed into a socialist state of the whole people expressing the interests of all classes and social strata and all of the country's nations and ethnic groups. However, the Soviet state retains its class nature and is a powerful instrument enabling the working class to fulfill its historical mission, which is to build a classless, communist society. Brezhnev lists the great and historically significant tasks which the socialist state accomplishes in ensuring and protecting the Soviet people's labor and championing world peace. He lays special emphasis on the comprehensive development of the mature socialist society, noting that it cannot properly perform its economic function in isolation from its social, political, cultural and ideological education tasks. 'Without a well-regulated state apparatus whose every part runs smoothly, it is impossible to manage a complex and sophisticated economic system or other aspects of the life of society, to say nothing of the country's defenses' (p. 117). Hence it would be unnatural in present-day conditions to suggest 'stripping' the state of certain functions, let alone call for its replacement by social self-government bodies. The road from the state to communist social

self-government is a different one. It does not consist in restricting the functions of the state but in reinforcing it, in improving the functioning of every part of the state apparatus, making higher demands on officials and establishing closer links between the state and the people. This, the author says, is the literal meaning of 'democracy,' namely, people's rule, participation by the people in decision-making on government and other social matters, or the real people's self-government of which Lenin spoke (see p. 408) and which has always been a key issue for us.

Elaborating this thesis, Brezhnev indicates ways of improving the work of government bodies and strengthening their links with the population, noting the increased role of the trade unions, the Komsomol and other organizations, as well as of work collectives, in government and the administration of society. He writes that the power of the Soviet state is determined primarily by the social awareness and organization of its citizens and their social activity, adding that 'in our, Soviet conditions, administration is not confined to acts by administrative bodies. We have a variety of forms in which the working people exert direct influence on affairs at the enterprise. The workers are in a position to participate through the trade unions, production conferences and people's control bodies in drafting decisions on all important problems in the work collective's life.' (p. 134).

The book defines the role of the Communist Party, the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, in great detail and from every angle. Brezhnev emphasizes that the purpose of party leadership is to ensure the solid ideological and political unity of Soviet society and the meaningful and harmonious development of its every part (see p. 84), and that the party's highest goal is steadily to improve the people's life (see p. 159).

Operating within the framework of the Constitution, the CPSU, as the ruling party, has always decided, and will continue to decide, on the policy line to be followed in solving all key problems of state activity.

Realization of the ideas of freedom and equality, and concern for every member of society are typical of socialist democracy. 'The citizen's condition in socialist society,' L.I. Brezhnev says in the very first document included in the book — his report on the 47th anniversary of the Great October Revolution — advancing a thesis which has since been incorporated in the new Soviet Constitution, 'is determined not by his wealth or origin but by his achievements in labor, by his abilities, intellect and initiative, by his contribution to the common endeavor' (p. 5). This principle of socialist humanism runs right through the book.

Socialism guarantees citizens genuine equality, a real right to work,

rest and recreation, education, maintenance in old age, and so on. But the citizens' rights are not limited to guarantees of economic well-being. 'Indeed, the goal of socialism is also to meet people's social, spiritual and moral requirements' (p. 313). In this context, the author points to the need to treat every person fairly and with due respect, and to the need for the state and the given work collective to take care of him, to help and support him. He reaffirms this idea again and again, calling for continuous efforts to pefect the 'great art' (p. 408) of treating people tactfully and attentively.

The task, Brezhnev says in his speeches and articles, is to provide everywhere the most favorable conditions for the all-round development of the individual, guarantee the right of every citizen to combat departures from the standards and principles of socialist society, and to criticize shortcomings in work (see p. 139) and see to it that discipline is based not on fear, but on a high level of social consciousness and a keen sense of responsibility (see p. 192). He stresses that the CPSU consistently advocates strict adherence to socialist legality in every echelon of the state and raising the authority of the law.

An important condition for the effective functioning and further progress of the political system of mature socialism is the population's growing social consciousness and political knowledge, which means that every citizen should not only know his rights and freedoms but also his duty and responsibility to society and the state. This inseparable unity is the mainstay of socialist democracy, which has nothing to do with either 'command' activity or anarchic highhandedness in respect of Soviet legal and moral standards.

When charting the path of the society to come, the founders of Marxism-Leninism could not, of course, formulate in specific terms the tasks facing socialist society at the various stages of its maturing. Communist and workers' parties have to fulfill these tasks in definite historical situations. Brezhnev's works are an outstanding example of the presentation and solution of major political problems in the period of building developed socialism and communism in the Soviet Union. A most important feature of the book is that many of its general political ideas and specific recommendations have been translated into reality by the organizational work of the party and the state. These achievements have been given concentrated legal expression in the new Soviet Constitution, to the drafting of which Brezhnev made a major contribution.

This book unquestionably has a significance beyond the problems of Soviet society. The history of the socialist-community countries shows that the stage of developed socialism is an indispensable part of the social transformations carried through in any society building communism. To be sure, each party bears in mind the conditions in

which the economic, social and cultural development of its country has proceeded. At the same time any experience gained in building socialism and effecting the gradual transition to communism adds to the potential of every people and every communist or workers' party and helps them to cope with their tasks. This is what makes Brezhnev's book so important: it sums up the experience of the CPSU and is an important contribution to the theory and practice of socialist and communist construction.

V. Kudryavtsev,
Corresponding member,
Academy of Sciences,
Director, Institute of
State and Law,
USSR Academy of Sciences

THE HUMAN RIGHTS HYPOCRITES

Look Homeward, Jimmy Carter: The State of Human Rights, USA. Prepared by: Communist Party USA. New York, June 1977. 67 pp.

The U.S. Administration's 'human rights campaign is simply another anti-socialist gimmick, a new ploy in the 60-year-old U.S. capitalist-imperialist policy of seeking to discredit socialism — and, primarily, the Soviet Union' (p. i). That is how a special paper prepared by the Communist Party of the USA describes the anti-Soviet campaign which is today a central element of Washington's policy. This time it has begun a 'concerted propaganda onslaught against the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, on the ground of alleged violation of the Helsinki accords' (p. 1).

The authors note that the sponsors of this provocative campaign have failed to say or have deliberately concealed the fact that the Helsinki Final Act consists of three main sections. In the United States 'it has not been published in full in *any* newspaper or periodical of mass circulation' (p. 1), although the Administration had undertaken to 'disseminate and make it known as widely as possible.' Excerpts carried by *The New York Times* were brief and limited to some aspects of the 'third basket,' where some forms of cooperation in the humanitarian and other fields are being presented by bourgeois propagandists as its main content and are being used by them to carry on a loud 'human rights' campaign.

Even a brief review of the provisions, the authors say, 'will make clear why Carter, Brzezinski and their kind have shied away from honestly discussing the Helsinki accords as a whole' (p. 2).

The U.S. government and its propaganda media have tried hard to

conceal the first section of the Act setting forth the principles by which the Conference participants agreed to be guided in their relations with each other, undertaking to respect 'each other's right freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems as well as its right to determine its laws and regulations.'

But it is the U.S. Administration that has meddled most grossly in the political, economic and cultural life of other countries and violated the peoples' right to decide their own future. Thus, 'it has intervened openly to influence the character of the regime and the identity of the elected officials in Portugal.' During the 1976 electoral campaign in Italy U.S. official representatives demanded that the Italian people and their political parties should not 'admit communists to a share in the Italian government' (p. 3).

Through CIA agents, says the Communist Party's document, the U.S. 'openly tries to stir up disruptions within the socialist community of nations.' Through Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, which do not shrink from using the services of avowed fascists, efforts are being made to incite 'subversive activities, including terrorist adventures and other illegal acts against the socialist states' (p. 5).

The document says that the provisions of the Final Act's first section, which the U.S. propagandists have ignored, reflect the two International Covenants on Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1966 and ratified by scores of countries except the U.S. itself. The U.S. Administration has not signed any of these Covenants, although President Carter has conceded, the document says, that they are 'valid criteria for the measurement of human rights' (p. 6).

The United States is also in breach of the second section of the Final Act, having pursued a patently discriminatory policy with respect to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, insisting on changes in their internal laws and procedures in return for the extension of the most-favored-nation treatment in trade, which is standard for civilized countries, despite the fact that under the accord the United States has the duty to 'endeavor' to reduce or progressively eliminate all kinds of obstacles to the development of trade.'

The document specifically emphasizes the fact that while the U.S. government has made much ado over 'human rights' in other, especially socialist, countries, the most elementary human rights written into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are being trampled at home.

Today, over 10 million workers are deprived of the possibility of realizing their right to work, which is designed to ensure the life and happiness of human beings, and the figure goes up to 15 million if the officially uncounted unemployed youth are added (see p. 10).

The country which official propagandists seek to present as a citadel of freedom is, in fact, a hothouse of racism that is steadily growing into a form of apartheid for 25 million Black Americans and discrimination against other national minorities: Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Asian Americans and Native American Indians (see p. iii).

There is nothing in the United States like equality for women, who receive only 57 per cent of the wages paid to males (see p. 10). The document also presents various other examples of the crying violations of the basic human rights and freedoms in the United States.

A special section exposes the flagrant violations of fundamental human rights by Federal agencies (p. 13). This applies to the rights guaranteed to the people by the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution, including freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, and freedom from unreasonable searches of their persons, houses, papers or effects. The document quotes the Final Report issued in April 1976 by a Senate Committee under the chairmanship of Senator Frank Church to investigate the intelligence agencies. It says that the FBI headquarters alone maintained over 500,000 intelligence files. In the period 1953-73, 250,000 first-class letters were illegally opened and photographed by the CIA. Millions of private telegrams were obtained by the National Security Agency in 1947-75. These agencies, the Senate Committee admits, 'have violated or ignored the law over a long period of time and advocated and defended their right to break the law' (p. 15).

The demagogic nature of the U.S. government's calls for broader contacts and exchange of information under the Helsinki accords is exposed, for instance, by the fact that 'the U.S. has the most restrictive visa and entry requirements of any state signing the Final Act' (p. 61). The authors of the document say that there is any amount of evidence to show that on the exchange of information the United States lags behind the socialist countries, including the translation of books, the staging of plays, the purchase and playing of films and TV programs, language studies and other fields (see pp. 62-63).

The facts show 'the hypocrisy of U.S. government pretensions on "human rights" ' (p. 7). The false U.S. campaign, the authors rightly note in the document, 'is already beginning to boomerang.'

Peter Petersen

MATERIALIST TRADITION IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *What Is Living and What Is Dead in Indian Philosophy*. People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1976, pp. 655.

Not much is known abroad about the materialist schools of Indian philosophy. Paradoxically enough, during the 19th century, both spokesmen of British imperialism and admirers of Indian civilization and culture in the West equated Indian philosophy with mysticism and spiritualism; the former, to 'prove' that the other-worldliness of Indians prevented them from pursuing material aims and developing a capacity for self-government, and the latter, in the belief that Indian philosophy was the true antidote for the sordid material avariciousness of 'Western civilization.'

By a coincidence, Tilak, Gandhi and many other leaders of our liberation movement also asserted 'the superiority of Indian spiritualism over Western materialism.' They saw in this an instrument for rousing the self-respect and political morale of the Indian people, for convincing our masses that our civilization was at least equal to that of the British for all that they had conquered our country and were ruling over it. The result was confidence that India was bound to achieve freedom.

All in all, due to the most diverse circumstances, Indian philosophy and idealism (generally referred to in India as spiritualism) came to be inseparable in the minds of many people, and this deep-rooted notion persists both in India and abroad. This view has been proved incorrect by Professor Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, a recognized Marxist scholar of international repute.

His writings, including the one under review, point out that many outstanding Indian philosophers were committed materialists despite the fact that their viewpoint could not become the dominant social philosophy. It is undoubtedly true that Vedanta,* a highly speculative, introspective, idealist school of philosophy, increasingly sophisticated with the passage of time, has been the dominant philosophy of India for about 2,500 years. But the reason for this phenomenon is that the ruling ideas of society are admittedly those of the ruling class. The Brahmans, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas, together embodying spiritual, political and economic power in Indian society, always championed Vedanta with all their might. It gave them the philosophical justification for oppression and exploitation, institutionalized in the caste system, of which the Shudras, the toiling masses of Indian society, constituted the base. Vedanta was also upheld by all the famous law-givers of India, and this found reflection in our civil and criminal codes.

It has also to be emphasized that Vedanta is the theology of Hindu religion. It prescribed the path of salvation for every Hindu. Con-

*Vedanta (lit., conclusion of the Vedas), a religious philosophical doctrine. The Vedas are the four principal sacred books of the ancient Indians — Rigveda, Atharvaveda, Samaveda and Yajurveda — written between the 12th and 7th centuries B.C.

tradicting the Vedas was unpardonable apostasy involving excommunication from the rigidly closed caste society. One can very well imagine, therefore, the grip of Vedanta on the Indian mind.

But this does not mean, Professor Chattopadhyaya notes, that materialist philosophers and schools in India did not courageously and constantly challenge Vedanta.

We do not propose to elaborate the distinctive viewpoints of all the materialist schools of Indian philosophy. Here, we can only stress what was common to them as against the idealists, which is what Professor Chattopadhyaya deals with in his book.

Vedanta, like all idealist or agnostic philosophies, insisted that the nature of ultimate reality could not be grasped through reason, sense perception and practical experience. True, some Vedantists granted a limited, partial reality to matter, the empirical validity of sense perception. But, almost like Kant, they argued that such experience was no proof that ultimate reality had been grasped. Others put forward Berkeleian arguments to the effect that all sense perceptions are mental images which are abstract, not material.

It stands to the credit of the various materialist schools in India, above all the Lokayats, who were the most uncompromising and militant of all materialists, that despite other differences among them, they insisted that practical sense experience and inferences derived from such experience constituted a reliable test of valid knowledge.

The materialists differed on the 'original' form of matter. The Lokayats held that the earth, water, air and fire were the primordial form of matter. The Sankhyas, another school of philosophy, held that primeval matter was an undifferentiated mass. The Nyaya-Vaisheshikas, yet another school, presumed that original matter consisted of atoms, though their conception of atoms was of a rough-and-ready, pragmatic nature. However, common to all three, as well as to other materialist schools, was the basic proposition that consciousness, the soul, etc., were a product of matter and hence secondary, not vice versa. As Engels pointed out, this is the dividing line between materialists and idealists in the history of philosophy.

Revealingly, astronomy, mathematics and medical science, specifically anatomy, psychology and surgery, above all the first two of these sciences, developed to a very high degree in ancient India as in other ancient civilizations. And it is very significant that, by and large, our scientists were votaries of the materialist Sankhya system and not of Vedanta. Indeed, Sankhya offered full freedom and encouragement to empirical, practical studies which Vedanta virtually condemned.

Actually Buddha and his early followers gave expression to the protest of the popular masses against Brahmanism, which sanctified caste distinctions, in the period of disintegration of primitive com-

munal relations and rise of class states. Buddha's search for the causes of human misery and suffering led him to reject the Vedas, Brahma and the Atman, and, in the final analysis, to some elements of a materialist world outlook. But afterwards the Buddhist religion assumed a different character. At the same time, due to the inadequate development of the natural sciences and the Hindu social structure, the materialist schools in India, barring the Lokayats, made innumerable compromises with idealism. Therefore, while appreciating and highlighting the Indian materialists' contribution to the development of a modern, scientific world outlook, Professor Chattopadhyaya explicitly recognizes their shortcomings and limitations. He describes the Achilles heel of the Indian materialists as follows: they proved unable to show who gave the 'first' push to matter or to refute the Vedantist proposition that the push was given by an invisible transcendental force, and in the end made serious compromises with their opponents. However, the issue on which the materialists, except the Lokayats, surrendered most was not philosophical but theological — they admitted the attainment of salvation after death (called Moksha in Sanskrit).

The book under review brings out all the positive and negative aspects of Indian materialism in great detail. The author quotes amply from the original writings of both idealist and materialist philosophers. He relates the controversies between the idealist and materialist traditions in Indian philosophy to the ideological requirements of present-day Indian society. All-round progress in modern times, he stresses, demands a rational, scientific, materialist, socialistically oriented outlook on life and its problems. Professor Chattopadhyaya very ably reveals that it is the materialist traditions of our philosophy which, for all their limitations and compromises, are conducive to the development of such an outlook. Conversely, he shows that India's idealist traditions, for all the widespread veneration they enjoy among the people — which is another name for superstitution — essentially inhibit and shackle our social advance and buttress our backwardness.

It is well known that the reactionary forces fight progressive movements and aspirations not only in the sphere of politics and economics, but also in ideology, culture and social psychology. Superstition is the crude and vulgar form of idealism, and it is an ally of reaction. This is why all democratically-minded, progressive Indians will remain deeply indebted to Professor Chattopadhyaya for placing in their hands a weapon for fighting contemporary Indian reaction in an important class battlefield, ideology. This is what makes his book so valuable.

Srinivas Ganesh Sardesai

The party press

CARRYING ON THE FIGHT

The contributions below are about two communist publications in Latin America — *Patria,* the weekly of the Honduran communists, and *Voz Operaria,* the central organ of the Brazilian Communist Party, which are fighting in difficult conditions on behalf of the working people.

In its first issue, which appeared in September 1976, *Patria* said: 'The people of Honduras need newspapers which will take their side, will defend them and will tell them the truth.' *Patria* has proved its worth as a paper persistently championing the interests of the working class and all other working people.

A faithful continuer of the cause of *Vanguardia Revolucionaria,* the paper published by the Communist Party until 1976 when it was forced out of existence by reaction's political intrigues, *Patria* has for over a year now been engaged in intense ideological struggle against the enemies of the working class and peasantry, in defense of all that is noble and finest in our people. Responding to current events in the country, *Patria* exposed the offensive mounted by the rightist forces, the landowners and monopolies and showed how the desarrollist bourgeoisie (i.e., the bourgeoisie with imperialist connections) actually frustrated the agrarian reform and why they were able to do it. Defending the people's interests, the paper oriented the trade unions to fight all attempts at violating their rights. It voiced the indignation of the working class at the Nicaraguan dictator Somoza's interference in the internal affairs of Honduras.

Covering the events at factories, villages and city neighborhoods, *Patria* has invariably brought to light acts of injustice committed against the people — a fact that has earned it respect among the workers and attracted to it many young members of the revolutionary movement, who become contributors to this militant communist paper.

Our paper popularizes the achievements of the socialist community of countries. It gave particularly wide coverage to the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution by highlighting the successes scored by the Soviet Union in building communist society and in the struggle for peace, independence and social progress.

Milton Paredes

'The communists will not relax their struggle,' *Voz Operaria* has declared editorially in response to brutal repressions. The paper resumed publication in spring 1976, after nearly a year's silence, caused by the authorities' intensified campaign of terror against the Brazilian Communist Party, its press, against all Brazilian patriots.

The facts bear out our paper's statement. During the 55 years of their existence the party and its press have operated only two years in legal, and six years in semi-legal conditions. Operating underground to this day, they are waging unrelenting struggle against fascist terror and imperialism.

Now as before, the paper popularizes the party's slogans: 'Read, reprint and circulate *Voz Operaria!*,' 'Demand the release of all political prisoners!,' 'Fight dictatorship, support democratic unity!' Now as before, the paper presents a clear and laconic account of the party's stand, its assessment of the situation in the country and the directives for the struggle against the fascist regime. *Voz Operaria* also carries economic and socio-political material, articles on living conditions of workers and peasants, the position of women, action against the rising cost of living, on the trade union movement and the struggle carried on by working people, students and intellectuals.

The paper publishes resolutions and other documents issued by the party's Central Committee, and materials signed by the BCP General Secretary. It has printed the minimum program and a call for concerted struggle against fascism, for a patriotic and anti-fascist front. It attaches much significance to the struggle waged by members of the Catholic Church and the Brazilian Democratic Movement, the only legal opposition party, against reprisals, torture and murder of political prisoners, and also against discriminatory conditions and laws, and for broad popular participation in elections. Though rather small, *Voz Operaria* publishes material on developments abroad, on life in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

This communist newspaper is winning growing prestige and significance under conditions of the social and political crisis and the mounting struggle of the masses, as evidenced by the heavy losses suffered by the regime in the 1974 elections to the Congress, in the 1976 municipal elections, and many other facts. Some time ago, for instance, *Voz Operaria* was in the focus of attention in Brazil, when a Congress deputy was charged with having quoted in Congress the BCP's appeal to the nation, which the paper had printed. Even more important, Communist Party slogans published in the paper are often chanted by students when with the support of workers and intellectuals, they come out into the streets to demand democratic freedoms and a general amnesty.

Jose Soares



The Fatherland Front of Vietnam

At the beginning of 1977 the National Unity Front of Vietnam held its congress in Unity Palace in Ho Chi Minh City, founding the Fatherland Front of Vietnam which included the political parties and progressive public organizations from the North and South of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Held shortly after the Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, this congress, as its delegates pointed out, demonstrated anew the solidarity and unity of the 50 million population and a determination to follow the road of socialism.

The Front's excellent traditions are firmly imbedded in the Vietnamese people's heroic struggle for national independence and unity.

The Indochinese National Front of Struggle Against Imperialism — the country's first national front — was founded not long after the establishment, early in 1930, of the Communist Party of Vietnam (later renamed the Communist Party of Indochina) at the time of the mounting national-liberation struggle against the French colonialists.

The League of Struggle for the Independence of Vietnam (Vietminh) — a united national front of Vietnam — was created on the initiative and under the guidance of the Communist Party of Indochina in 1941 at the height of World War II. Besides the Communist Party it included trade union, youth and peasant organizations, representatives of the patriotic bourgeoisie and religious cults. The League played a major role in the formation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam which emerged as a result of the victory of the August 1945 revolution, and the defeat of the Frerch aggression in 1954.

The Fatherland Front of Vietnam was inaugurated in 1955 when the foundations of a socialist society were being laid in the North while in the South a puppet government was installed fully dependent on U.S. imperialism. A few years later, during the broad armed struggle against the corrupt Saigon regime, the Vietnamese patriots created the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, which fought heroically not only for the national liberation of the South but also for the unification of the entire country.

In 1976 after the Vietnamese people's historic victory over the imperialist aggressors, the National Unity Front of Vietnam was created based on the amalgamation of the Fatherland Front of Vietnam (1955-76), the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (1960-76) and the Alliance of National, Democratic and Peace Forces of Vietnam (1968-76). This process was completed in February 1977 with the formation of the Fatherland Front of Vietnam (FFV).

Addressing the FFV Constituent Congress, Le Duan, General Secretary of the CC CP Vietnam, spoke highly of the role played by these national organizations in the Vietnamese people's struggle. 'The National Unity Front,' he said, 'made an important contribution to the victory in the struggle against U.S. aggression and for national salvation. Guided by the working class, the Front is growing and becoming stronger, rallying the people around the party. The National Unity Front became one of the main factors of our victory ... The new Front is a front of all the people, uniting all segments of the population and inspiring the transformation of their revolutionary heroism into labor heroism.'

On February 4, 1977, in Ho Chi Minh City the Constituent Congress approved the Fatherland Front's eight point political program whose main aim is to 'unite all the people in the name of building a peaceful, independent, united and socialist Vietnam.'

Working people's power must be strengthened, the program notes, in the process of building a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and carrying out revolutionary transformations in production relations, in science and technology, ideology and culture. Conditions must be created, the document says, for all citizens to participate in managing the government, in economic and public affairs and for the FFV's active role in building up and controlling the people's organs of power. One of the FFV's main tasks is to mobilize the whole people for restoring and developing the economy, for socialist industrialization, abolishing poverty and backwardness, and transforming production from small-scale into large-scale socialist production.

In both parts of the country the FFV will popularize Marxism-Leninism and the course and policy of the Communist Party, national traditions and outstanding works of world culture.

The FFV political program sees one of its aims in concern for the people's material conditions and spiritual life, for implementation of the principles of equality of nationalities, equality of men and women and respect for the freedom of religion.

The Front will promote international friendship and cooperation, stronger militant solidarity and cooperation between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the fraternal socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, with the fra-

ternal peoples of Indochina — Laos and Kampuchea (Cambodia) — with the peoples of developing and other countries, will actively support the peoples' struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, monopoly capital, racial discrimination, for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

In conclusion the program stresses a resolve to consolidate, within the FFV, all revolutionary organizations, all patriots irrespective of social background, nationality, religion, sex or profession, all who love their country and support socialism.

It was stressed at the FFV Constituent Congress that the Front's leading and guiding force is the Communist Party of Vietnam — the tested vanguard of the Vietnamese working class, the most consistent champion of the vital interests of the Vietnamese nation and organizer of all the victories of the Vietnamese revolution.

Besides the CP Vietnam the FFV includes other political parties and progressive public organizations (the Democratic Party of Vietnam, the Socialist Party of Vietnam, the General Federation of Vietnamese Trade Unions, the Union of Vietnamese Women, the Vietnamese Youth Federation and others). All classes and social strata in the country and also Vietnamese citizens residing abroad are united in the FFV.

The Front's leading organ is the 191-member Central Committee which elects its Presidium and Secretariat. The Constituent Congress elected Hoang Quoc Viet Chairman of the FFV CC Presidium and Nguyen Van Tien, General Secretary. Ton Duc Thang, President of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, is Honorary Chairman.

The Front is working actively to implement its political program. An enlarged meeting of the Secretariat of its Central Committee in April discussed the Front's work in 1977, stressing the importance of preparations and control of elections to the people's councils at all levels. Conferences of local FFV committees, including communes, are likewise planned to discuss the draft of a new Constitution and mobilize the broad masses in expanding and strengthening the new way of life and socialist culture.

Broad unity of the patriotic and progressive forces led by the Communist Party, wrote the party paper *Nhan Dan,* helped Vietnam to defeat Japanese, French and American aggression, win independence and unite the country, which had been forcibly split. On a common Vietnamese platform such unity today, *Nhan Dan* emphasized, will be decisive in helping establish a prosperous socialist society in a united Vietnam.

Israel: the cost of militarism

Throughout the brief history of the State of Israel, the invariable policy of its Zionist rulers has been to turn the country into an armed camp from which to make incursions into neighboring Arab states and strike the progressive, national-liberation movement in the Middle East. *Three times* over the past 20 years Israel has provoked armed conflicts in this area.

Israel today holds the world record for the share of military expenditures in the GNP. This index is much higher than in France, Britain, the FRG or Italy. Even plainly doctored official data (taking account of only so-called direct military expenditures) indicate that the war effort in 1976 prevented productive utilization of more than one-third of the GNP and over half the budget appropriations (see Table 1).

Table 1
Share of military expenditures in the GNP and state budget of Israel

	Share in GNP (per cent)	Share in budget (per cent)
Before 1967	10	25 (1966)
1967-70	20-25	
1975	32	50.5
1976	35.2	56.7

The militarists, who set the tone in national politics with the backing of Western, primarily U.S., imperialists, constantly demand new appropriations to purchase up-to-date offensive weapons abroad. The result is a serious disruption of the system of foreign payments and recurrent breakdowns of the monetary and financial machinery. As against other countries, the balance of payments deficit in 1976 soared to a record $4,000m. In the same year the foreign debt stood at $9,000m., which exceeded the state budget and almost equalled the GNP. It meant a debt of nearly $3,000 per inhabitant. Official records indicate that by the end of the current fiscal year Israel's debt will range between $11,000m. and $12,000m.

Prior to the 1967 aggression and the 1973 war Israel paid its external debt, relatively small at the time, mainly out of funds raised or 'donations' made by Jewish communities in Western Europe and the U.S. The situation has radically changed since then. A major source of foreign financing now is loans, and the national debt is growing faster than it can be paid off.

Mounting debts exact greater budget allocations to pay the debts plus interest. Whereas the sums budgeted for this purpose in 1977 made up 25 per cent, in 1978 they will range from 30 to 40 per cent (see Table 2).

Table 2
Budget appropriations for payment of debts

	Total amount of budget (000m. pounds)	Total of payments (000m. pounds)	(per cent of budget)
1969	5.59	0.88	15.8
1976	87.6	18.0	20.4
1977	122.5	30.3	24.7

Militarization, which has assumed unprecedented proportions, is the pivot of national life. It has lowered production capacities in such branches as the manufacture of industrial goods for the population, agriculture or construction. Industry has become an appendage of the war machine and fills mostly military orders. Over half the industrial workers, who number about 250,000, are engaged in industries subordinated to the Defense Ministry or filling its orders. Upwards of 800 industrial plants (the most important of them have been built with U.S. money) produce supplies for the armed forces.

Universal militarization has engendered serious economic imbalances and become the principal cause of a chronic and intensifying crisis. It imparts increasingly parasitical features to the economy. The GNP has virtually stopped growing in late years. It went up two per cent in 1975 and only one per cent in 1976. Even this insignificant growth was a result of expansion of the war industry or industries supplying it. Unemployment is on the rise (there were 50,000 jobless in 1976) and it is no longer nullified by the call-up of men and women as in the past. Emigration has assumed a large scale. At present more people leave the country than emigrate to Israel under the influence of Zionist propaganda.

Successive governments have tried to cope with the country's difficulties — a product of adventurist policy — by putting the main part of their burden on the people's shoulders. They imposed new

direct or indirect taxes, repeatedly reduced budget allocations to keep the prices of necessities stable, as well as allocations for social purposes. In February 1976 the Department of Revenues released a document stating that Israel ranked first in the world for taxation and that in the past ten years revenues from taxes had increased 16-fold (in current prices). Due to the extended range of taxes and the higher rate of taxation, the share of the national income which the government removes from citizens' pockets to fill the Treasury has gone up in the past decade from 35 to 70 per cent. In 1974 nearly half the working people's wages and salaries was spent on taxes.

Growing prices have become a heavy burden for the people. They increase three times over every three or four years. From 1948 to 1977, retail prices grew almost 30-fold (see Table 3).

Table 3
Retail price index (per cent, 1948=100)

1948	1959	1964	1969	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
100.0	309.3	416.3	515.0	828.6	1,157.7	1,162.5	2,117.7	2,889.5

Growing prices and inflation tell above all on wages. In 1976 alone, real wages fell off 13.8 per cent. Afterwards the decline went on even faster.

The overall result is a continuous impoverishment of the people. Over 20 per cent of Jewish families are living below the poverty line, according to official statistics. The Israeli press admits that 40 per cent of children are undernourished. Thousands of Arab families living in Israel or the areas occupied by it are in a still worse, often a disastrous, plight.

The government of the ultra-rightist Likud bloc which took over in 1977 has been carrying on its predecessors' adventurist policy and, indeed, is stepping it up. The new budget drafted by this bloc and approved by the Knesset in the summer of 1977 provides for greater military expenditures than ever. Officially announced appropriations for military purposes exceed 76,375m. pounds, that is, make up 62 per cent of the total. The share of appropriations for military purposes under the current budget is the greatest since the rise of the State of Israel. It was 50.4 per cent of the budget in 1975 and 56.7 in 1976.

The pattern of the budget suggests that there will be a further attack on the working people's standard of living and that inducements and easements will be offered to big domestic and foreign investors, primarily for military ends. The budget, said Meir Vilner, General Secretary of the CC CPI, speaking in the debate on the budget, 'is a reflection of the Likud bloc's policy line: preparations for a new war,

and striking new blows at the wage and salary earners and the working people at large.' Israel's communists and working people firmly oppose the government's home and foreign policy, which is leading to new aggressive ventures, pushing the country to the brink of economic catastrophe and causing untold hardships to the people.

Emile Habibi

ERNESTO CHE GUEVARA

I. Lavretsky

Diaries, letters, interviews with family and friends and access to Cuban documents provide one of the fullest, most fascinating pictures of Che.

Clears up mysteries surrounding Che's death and explains the role of Tanya, Debray and Arguedas.

Outlines the political development and actions of a man whose actions inspired people throughout the world.

Cloth $4.35 300 pages, photographs

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6

In memory of Knud Jespersen

Comrade Knud Jespersen, Chairman of the Communist Party of Denmark, was a prominent figure in the Danish and international communist movement and a dedicated fighter for the cause of the working class, for the Danish working people's vital rights, and for peace, democracy and socialism.

Knud Jespersen was born on April 12, 1926. His father, a communist worker, was executed by the nazis. At the age of 16, in the hard years of the Second World War, he joined the Communist Party and was active in the Resistance, courageously carrying out the party's assignments. His spirit was not daunted when he was arrested by the Gestapo and thrown into a concentration camp. Like thousands of other Danish anti-fascists, he was saved by the peoples' victory over fascism.

In the ranks of the working class and the trade unions, Knud Jespersen devoted all his energy and organizational talent to the struggle in the postwar period. He became leader of the masses, winning their respect. In 1951 he was elected chairman of the North Jutland district organization of the CPD, and in 1952 he became a member of the CPD Central Committee. Six years later, the Danish communists elected him Chairman of the party.

Since then, the party has successfully united its ranks, considerably extended its ties with the masses and enhanced its influence in the country's political life. After Danish communists were elected to Parliament in 1973, Knud Jespersen headed the communist parliamentary group. His popularity was further enhanced by his fiery speeches in Parliament and at mass rallies in defense of the working people's rights and the Danish people's national interests.

Knud Jespersen was a dedicated internationalist. He was active in a number of international communist forums, heading the CPD delegations to the 1960 and 1969 International Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties.

Knud Jespersen contributed regularly to *World Marxist Review*, analyzing general theoretical problems and problems of the class struggle in Denmark.

The memory of Knud Jespersen, a communist and an internationalist, will always remain with the communists of the world.

JUST ARRIVED IN CANADA:

Political Economy: Capitalism

EDITOR: G. KOZLOV **FIRST PRINTING 1977**

New comprehensive easy to use book on Marxist-Leninist political economy.

Ideal for textbook use or personal reference and study.

(Not to be confused with *Political Economy of Capitalism*, Edit. Afanasayev.)

CLOTH 554 PAGES **PRICE: $4.95**

AVAILABLE FROM:

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St., 3rd Floor, Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

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
71 Bathurst St., 3rd floor,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6 Canada

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism,
5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi 55, India.

New Horizon Publications
14 Tamaklos Street,
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria.

FRENCH EDITIONS:

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et d'Information,
9 Boulevard des Italiens,
75 Paris 2e, France.

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières
185 rue Ontario est
Montréal, Québec, H2X 1H5, 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 25-6º 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.

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, 30 Lisboa-1, Portugal.

PUNJABI EDITION: Punjab Book Centre, 1038 Sector 22-B, opp. General Bus Stand, Chandigarh, India.

RUMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim, Calea Grivitei 64-66, P0B 2001, Bucaresti, Rumania.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, Smolenskaya-Sennaya 32/34, Moscow 121200, USSR.

SINHALESE EDITION:
91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka.

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Aereo 1253, Bogotà, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A. Filosofia y Letras 34, Copilco Universidad, Mexico 20, D.F. Mexico.

Ideologia y Politica, Fr Rufino Torrico N° 671-Of. 401, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracás, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

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.

TAMIL EDITION: Marxia Oli, 32 Broadway, Madras-1, India.

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.