WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

November 1978, Vol. 21, No. 11 $1.00

Hungary /16

NATO, hands off Africa! /60

Economic crisis and developing countries /104

Imperialism and border conflicts /94

Guiding socialist culture /115

Rumania /48

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

November 1978, Vol. 21, No. 11

Features

3 The 20th anniversary of *WMR*

4 A strategy tested by the October Revolution
M.G. Knutsen

16 The socialist political system in Hungary
D. Nemes

Party experience

26 Banner of struggle and victory
G. Pharakos

37 Lessons of the November Revolution
A. Norden

48 Worker participation in running society
C. Dascalescu

Viewpoints

60 African panorama

69 The people's will is invincible
N. Ashhab

74 The chauvinistic content of the 'three worlds theory'
W. Namiotkiewicz

85 'National exclusiveness' and the road to socialism
C. Barreto

94 Imperialism and border conflicts
J. Laborde

Exchange of views

104 The economic crisis and the developing countries
G. Skorov

Science, culture, ideology

115 Guiding socialist culture: some pressing problems
L. Zhivkova

(Continued next page)

Continued

The press

124 A course of peace and socialism
Y. Potyomkin

128 Labourites, monopolies and the working class
P. Boychuck

131 Truth vs. slander
J.M. Varas

Facts and figures

136 Steadfast service in the cause of peace and socialism

Represented on the Editorial Board and Editorial Council of PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM are the representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties in the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, 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, Paraquay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Senegal, South African Republiç, Spain, Soviet Union, Sudan, Syria, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, 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, Flemish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamilnad, 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

The 20th anniversary of *WMR*

A meeting of the Editorial Board and the Editorial Council of *World Marxist Review (Problems of Peace and Socialism)* to mark its 20th anniversary, was held in Prague on September 14.

Among the honorary guests were *Aziz Muhammed,* General Secretary, Iraqi Communist Party; *Iradj Eskandari,* General Secretary, People's Party of Iran; *Nicolas Chaoui,* General Secretary, Lebanese Communist Party; *I. Bilen,* General Secretary, Communist Party of Turkey; *Dezsö Nemes,* Political Bureau member, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; *Namsrayn Luvsanravdan,* Political Bureau member, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party; *Enrique Rodrigues,* Executive Committee member and CC Secretary, Communist Party of Uruguay; *Dimitr Stanishev,* CC Secretary, Bulgarian Communist Party; *Jan Fojtik,* CC Secretary, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia; *Ray Raye De Smet,* CC member, CP Belgium; *Vadim Zagladin,* alternate member, CC CPSU and First Deputy Head of its International Department; Academician *Alexei Rumyantsev,* the first Editor-in-Chief of *WMR;* veterans of the Journal *Helena Berg* (SUPG), and *Idris Cox* (CP Great Britain), leading party workers, executives of the press and publishing houses of many countries.

On the anniversary, the journal has received many messages of greetings from the Central Committees of fraternal parties, party leaders and statesmen, publications of Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties, international democratic organizations, and revolutionary-democratic parties and readers (a survey of the messages will be found at the end of this issue).

The journal's work over this period was reviewed in the address of its Editor-in-Chief, *Konstantin Zarodov*.

Speakers at the meeting emphasized that over its two decades, *WMR* has become a prominent international rostrum for communists, and that its multinational collective has done much to spread the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, facilitating the exchange of experience between the communist and workers' parties, and strengthening the international solidarity of communists who, in their own countries and internationally, are engaged in a heroic struggle against the forces

of imperialism and reaction, and for the ideals of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

The Secretary-General of the International Organization of Journalists, *Josef Kubka,* presented the Julius Fucik medal, awarded to the journal's staff for its work in promoting democratic journalism.

The meeting unanimously adopted a letter to the fraternal parties, which follows:

Dear Comrades,

The Editorial Board and the Editorial Council of *World Marxist Review,* meeting on the journal's 20th anniversary, express their deep gratitude to the communist and workers' parties for their messages of good wishes on the occasion of the journal's jubilee.

The conference of fraternal parties held in April 1977 set the main directions of our work and we are guided by them in all our planning. We shall continue to promote the exchange of practical and theoretical experience between the parties and help their struggle for peace and socialism.

Fully conscious of the complex tasks ahead, we convey to the fraternal communist and workers' parties our thanks for their assistance and support now and in the future.

A strategy tested by the October Revolution

Martin Gunnar Knutsen
Chairman, CP Norway

CLASS ALLIANCES OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE ANTI-MONOPOLY STRUGGLE

With the passage of time since that night in Petrograd in the autumn 1917 — a night swept by the winds of the future — one comes to see the real dimensions of the Great October Revolution, the first socialist revolution in the history of mankind. The workings of its powerful potential are making themselves known today, in the last quarter of the 20th century, in the insuperable growth of working-class militancy and the emergence of qualitatively new conditions favoring an expansion and deepening of the revolutionary movement. Our daily experience shows the truth of the conclusion drawn by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, that the massive battles fought by the proletariat in the late 60s 'foreshadow new class battles which could lead to fundamental social change, to

socialist revolution, and the establishment of the power of the working class in alliance with other segments of the working people.'[1]

In recent decades, the world economic and socio-political situation has taken shape in the context of the general crisis of capitalism induced by the socialist revolution in Russia and deepening under the impact of the successes of world socialism and the national-liberation movement, on the one hand, and the growing potentials of the revolutionary, democratic, anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces, on the other. It is these two parallel and interrelated processes, the favorable impact of the détente and the consequent weakening of the positions of the cold-war forces banking on anti-communism that have produced the objective factors whose origination and shaping make it possible to take a fresh look at the strategy and tactics of alliances of the working class in its struggle against monopoly domination, and for peace, democracy and socialism.

In analyzing this problem, which is of key importance for the future of socialist revolution, we are naturally aware that it is highly complicated and multi-faceted because it springs from the complicated and multi-faceted processes of social development now going on in the capitalist world. That is why I should like to start by saying that this analysis is based above all on the experience of the CP Norway, whose standpoint is presented here as recorded in its documents that reflect the specifics of the concrete situation in which we have to live and work. But in working and implementing our own line, we naturally rely on the rich experience of the fraternal parties of the capitalist countries, and the experience of the land of the victorious October Revolution and of all the other states advancing along the socialist road.

The crucial importance of support for the working class by other sections of society is one of the key theoretical propositions elaborated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. It has been tested by the experience of the October Revolution and the practice of the present-day revolutionary struggle.

Analyzing the events of his day, Marx reached the conclusion that the workers 'could not take a single step forward, could not touch a hair of the bourgeois order, until the course of the revolution had aroused the mass of the nation, peasants and petty bourgeois, standing between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, against the order, against the rule of capital, and had forced it to attach itself to the proletarians, as their protagonists.'[2]

Marx thus formulated the idea of the proletariat's class and political alliances. In the new historical conditions at the turn of the century, it was developed by Lenin, who saw it as a major task of the working class 'to unite and lead the scattered and backward sections of the

working and exploited population' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 28, p. 466). The working class, he stressed, raises 'the banner of the revolution *for* the whole people, *on behalf of* the whole people, and *with the aim* of awakening and drawing into the struggle *all* the classes who need freedom and are capable of striving for it' (Vol. 18, p. 112).

It is no exaggeration to say that under present-day conditions the welding of a broad bloc of forces around the proletarian nucleus has in a number of countries become a crucial imperative of success in the anti-monopoly struggle. Is this not one of the main lessons of the tragedy of the Chilean revolution? Such is the conclusion reached by our Chilean comrades when analyzing the causes of the fall of the Popular Unity government in 1973. 'We were defeated because the working class was isolated from its allies,' stated Rene Castillo, a member of the Chilean Communist Party leadership. 'In the conditions prevailing in our country,' he wrote, 'it was also necessary to rally the broad middle sections around the working class, in one form or another winning over various non-monopoly bourgeois groups, notably the middle and petty bourgeoisie.'[3] 'We needed to win over, to a greater extent, the support of the middle sector, and to work better with this in mind,' CPC General Secretary Luis Corvalan stated at the beginning of 1977.[4]

One cannot fail to see that classes themselves and the relations between them are not static but dynamic categories, and an analysis of the revolutionary process in the present century shows us how important it is for the success of the liberation movement to estimate exactly the dynamics of the correlation of class forces at every stage.

The Bolsheviks' preparation for and carrying out of the Great October Socialist Revolution, whose 61st anniversary is being marked this year, exemplify this approach. As Marxists look back on the events of that period, they necessarily draw the conclusion that the October victory would have been inconceivable without the tactics of the proletariat's alliances in the approaching revolution which Lenin worked out in the early 20th century for Russia's specific conditions.

The essence of Lenin's tactics was that at the first, *democratic* stage of this revolution, when the resistance of the autocracy had to be crushed and the vacillations of the bourgeoisie paralyzed, the proletariat should win over the mass of the peasantry. At the second stage, however, that is, in the course of the *socialist* revolution, when it was the resistance of the bourgeoisie that had to be broken and the vacillations of the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie overcome, the proletariat should, as Lenin conceived it, rally to its side the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population (See Vol. 9, p. 100). The victorious revolution achieved by the Russian proletariat provided the best proof of the correctness of Lenin's tactics.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have taken an equally dialectical approach to the problem of proletarian alliance-building since the October Revolution. Leaving aside the differences in the policies pursued by this or that communist party depending on the specific historical situation in individual countries, we could discern the main trend. Up to the mid-20s, the basic objective was to build a united *working-class front*. Later, in the late 20s and early 30s the threat of fascism that had arisen in many capitalist countries created the need to build an anti-fascist *popular front*. And after the Second World War the situation offered objective opportunities for setting up an anti-monopoly *democratic front* — a broad coalition of all the social and political forces opposing the power of the monopolies.

Favorable conditions for welding such unity arose in the mid-60s. As was stated in the main document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, 'The convergence of interests of the working class, farmers, urban middle strata and intellectuals as well as their growing cooperation reduce the social foundations of monopoly power, sharpen its internal contradictions and promote the mobilization of broad masses of people for the struggle against monopolies and imperialism.'[5] Seven years later, in the summer of 1976, the problem of setting up an all-embracing front of political and social forces to campaign for peace, democracy and social progress formed the hub of the comradely discussion at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe.

The CP Norway also took an active part in the Berlin Conference, where we acquainted ourselves with the experience of the fraternal parties and shared our own experience. On that occasion we stressed 'the correctness of working for unity of action by the people against monopoly capital, and the importance not of isolation but of efforts to attract allies in the struggle for democratic rights and against the power of the monopolies.'

Each party quite naturally proceeds from the concrete social, political and economic conditions in which it has to carry on its struggle. In some countries, where reformist attitudes predominate in the leading organizations of the working class, the communists work for the victory of the left-wing policy and support leaders taking a left orientation. In others, the main task is to involve in political life sections of the working people which, for various reasons, still stand aloof from the class struggle. In some countries, there has arisen a real possibility for communists to participate in government, and this determines their tactical line in the struggle for political alliances.

We Norwegian communists, while taking into account the fraternal parties' experience in the struggle to consolidate the unity of the working class and all the other working people, act in the light of the

specific socio-economic situation in Norway. Thus, our party's 1973 Principle Program says that the broad-alliance policy starts from the premise that this alliance 'should be based on the classes and sections of society which suffer from the reactionary policy of local and foreign monopoly capital. It should include workers, fishermen, peasants and intellectuals, housewives, small businessmen and other working sections of the people.'[6]

No matter what the concrete tactics of this or that party may be in tackling this most important problem of the revolutionary movement, all the activities of the communists of the non-socialist world are inspired by one common goal formulated in the Berlin Conference's appeal to act in such a way that 'their policies and the ideals of justice and progress, whose champions they are, become ever more a force promoting the broadest unity of the working people and of the mass of the people.'[7]

The strategy of each communist party, including the CP Norway, for building and consolidating the proletariat's alliances has objective premises that obtain to a great extent in all capitalist countries. Their tactical line is guided by the concrete situation in each of these countries.

One should include among the strategic factors: the socio-economic and political consequences of the general crisis of capitalism, the effect of the scientific and technological revolution on the social structure of bourgeois society, the change in the balance of forces between imperialism and socialism on the world scene, and the growth of the ideological and political influence of existing socialism. The tactical factors include, among others, the degree of intensity of the crisis cycle, the social structure of the given country, the correlation of the political forces there, the place and role of the communist party, and the extent to which the working people are organized.

In the context of state-monopoly capitalism, the scientific and technological revolution tends to reproduce on an increasing scale ever sharper social antagonisms generating new contradictions characteristic of capitalist society. The result, as the Document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties noted, is 'not only the growth of the contradiction between capital and labor, but also the deepening of the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation and those of the financial oligarchy.'[4]

The scientific and technological revolution brings perceptible and sometimes even qualitative shifts in the social structure of bourgeois society. This is seen, above all, in the steady growth of the army of wage labor and its increasing share of the gainfully employed population, an army that with the activization of the process of proletariani-

zation gradually absorbs the majority of the population. Moreover, the key aspect of the regrouping of social forces in bourgeois society, a factor that is of crucial importance in the further development of the whole socio-political process in the capitalist countries, is the increase in the numbers and net weight of the industrial proletariat. (In the most developed capitalist countries it came to about 30 million at the beginning of the century. By 1950 it had risen to 132 million, and by 1975 to 209 million. Between 1950 and 1975 its share of the gainfully employed population increased from 56.9 per cent to 69 per cent.)

Similar trends can be detected in Norway, although the share of the working class in our country is somewhat lower than the average figures given above. Thus, industry accounts for a third of the population, but in the whole of the production field, workers make up at least 40 per cent of all wage and salary earners.[9]

As the chief creator of surplus-value, the working class remains the prime object of capitalist exploitation. As the main productive force — society could not exist for a single day without its labor — it has a decisive effect on social processes. So life itself makes the proletariat the strike force in the economic and political drive against monopoly capital.

The massive regrouping of the class and social forces in contemporary bourgeois society substantially increases both numerically and proportionally the sections of the population who, as victims of exploitation, have to bear the brunt of the deepening crisis of capitalism. Thus, in Norway, wage and salary earners number 1.45 million, or 84 per cent of the active population. Another 15 per cent of Norwegians are small businessmen like small-holders, fishermen, taxi and truck owners, etc.[10]

As a result, the great majority of people in bourgeois society, including those generally described as the middle strata, gradually come to understand that their main enemy is monopoly capital. This fundamentally widens the social basis of the anti-imperialist struggle. Increasingly broad masses of the non-proletarian population — small farmers, petty and sometimes medium bourgeoisie in the cities, clerical workers and intellectuals — begin to feel an objective need to rally around the working class, with the result that the latter acquires allies in the struggle against the tyranny of the monopolies, for social and economic progress.

The communists, however, have to take into account the extreme heterogeneity of the strata lying between the working class and the monopoly bourgeoisie, the diversity of their social and political interests, and the instability of their ideological principles. Nevertheless, our main premise, as the 1969 meeting stated, is that on the

whole 'despite their lack of unity and special susceptibility to bourgeois ideology, large masses of the middle strata are coming forward in defense of their interests, joining the struggle for general democratic demands, and becoming increasingly conscious of the vital importance of united action with the working class.'[11]

It is sometimes suggested that the role of the peasantry as an ally of the working class is gradually disappearing, if only because of their steadily shrinking numbers. One can scarcely accept this view, however. Of course, nobody would deny that the proportion of people engaged in agriculture compared with the mass of the population in the developed countries was already quite small in the mid-70s (1.6 per cent in Britain, 3.6 in the U.S., 6.8 in the FRG, 7.4 in Norway, 12.4 in Japan, 17.2 in Italy).[12] Moreover, in the Common Market countries, for instance, the authorities plan to eliminate another 5 million out of the 10 million agricultural workers by the early 1980s,[13] bringing the proportion down to 7 per cent.[14]

But as experience has shown, the process of concentration of agricultural production in the hands of the big monopolies only sharpens the contradictions in the countryside by accelerating the ruin of the small and middle farmers. Witness the widespread strikes by rural workers that have figured in the political life of many capitalist countries in recent years. One need only recall the massive demonstration by 100,000 farmers of the Common Market countries in Brussels a few years ago. Or the big national actions by rural workers in Austria, Denmark, the FRG and other countries. It is significant that calls for unity of action with the working class are more and more frequently heard on such occasions.

In the early 70s, when resisting Norway's entry into the European Economic Community, we realized the importance of involving the peasants on our side as allies. They and their organizations had an important role to play in the mass movement and did much for the victory of the anti-monopoly forces. Norway issued a resounding 'No!' to the Common Market.

One must always remember, of course, that under capitalist conditions the peasantry could not and has not become a homogeneous class. A substantial part of it tends to be at odds over political principles and to wobble between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This is why it is mainly the agricultural workers and small farmers who become allies of the proletariat in the anti-monopoly struggle.

But the middle peasant farmer is also subject to ruthless exploitation, and this, as experience has shown, also makes him a potential ally of the working class. Taking this into account, the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of the Capitalist Countries of Europe on Problems of Agriculture, held in Paris in the spring of 1975,

called for improvement in the position not only of the worst hit sections of the population (agricultural laborers, small farmers and tenant farmers), but also the middle farmers.

When considering the possibilities and ways of winning over the broad petty-bourgeois masses, the traditional urban middle strata, to the side of the working class, the Norwegian communists remember Lenin's advice to take into account 'the disunity between the bourgeoisie and its petty-bourgeois allies, or the instability of their alliance' (Vol. 30, p. 274). This important tactical proposition of Lenin's is particularly relevant today, when hundreds of thousands of small and middle capitalists are being completely subjugated to the big monopolies under the impact of the differentiation and polarization of social forces intensified by the scientific and technological revolution.

Such a radical change in the socio-economic position of the petty and middle bourgeoisie of the towns inevitably affects its social psychology and political position. The intensified pressure of monopoly capital prompts considerable sections of it to join the anti-monopoly front. But whether the small or middle bourgeois will side with, or challenge the monopolies depends, as the communists emphasize, on the specific historical situation. This is why in trying to pull the middle strata out of the reactionary influence of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the Norwegian communists offer factual proof of the common interests of this social group and the working class, and argue that only a close alliance and joint struggle can bring satisfaction of their just demands.

Today one sees many new aspects to the question of the intelligentsia's position in the socio-economic structure of capitalist society, the question of its ideological and political orientation. In the very early days of monopoly capitalism, Lenin said that the intelligentsia would inevitably be proletarianized (See Vol. 4, p. 209). And it is a fact that state-monopoly capitalism has deprived the intelligentsia of its independent position by turning a substantial part of it into wage labor.

This process has been intensified by the scientific and technological revolution, which by virtue of its intrinsic, objective laws has brought the social position of the scientists and technologists close to that of the working class. What is more, the sharp rise in demand for specialists has changed their social composition. Today's engineers and technologists in the capitalist countries are recruited not only from the bourgeoisie. Many of them come from the middle strata, and also from among the working class and the peasantry.

From the communists' standpoint, all this creates objective conditions for the broad sections of the intelligentsia, particularly in the scientific and technological sphere, to support the working class in its anti-monopoly struggle. And although considerable sections of the

intelligentsia and white-collar workers are vehicles of monopoly influence, the crisis of bourgeois ideology, on the one hand, and socialism's power of attraction, on the other, tend to bring them into the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist struggle. 'The alliance of workers by hand and brain is becoming an increasingly important force in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, for the democratic control of production, of cultural institutions and information media, and for the development of public education in the interests of the people.'[15] Who can doubt the historical importance of such an alliance, considering the steadily growing role of the intelligentsia in a situation in which science is increasingly becoming a social force with a tremendous impact on all social processes?

The mounting pressure of the monopolies due to the growing socio-economic crisis, and also the most aggressive imperialist circles' drive for military superiority over the socialist world with its accompanying threat of a nuclear cataclysm, their repeated interference in the affairs of other countries — all these things make the general democratic slogans proposed by the communists in the interests of the working class, slogans that can be understood by many other strata of the population. It would seem, therefore, that Marx and Engels' prediction concerning the transformation of the proletariat into 'the leading class of the nation'[16] is coming true. This is what made it quite realistic for the Berlin Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe to call for a dialogue with the broad Catholic forces, and with religious people of other denominations. That is what creates conditions in which communists can take joint action with youth, women's and other organizations for the common cause of peace and social progress.[17]

In seeking relations of alliance in the common struggle with the non-proletarian strata of the working people, the Norwegian communists believe that such unity at the present stage is mainly to be forged in joint anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist actions. Moreover, the communists should never forget the long-term prospect. This is why we set ourselves the goal to broaden the alliances formed for obtaining certain partial demands, into wider democratic alliances. We think this will help to secure wider cooperation between all progressive forces for deep-going social change.

At our 16th Congress last April, we Norwegian communists. worked out a program which can and must provide the basis for such militant cooperation. The measures it envisages for overcoming the consequences of the economic crisis are acceptable to all the working people, to all the victims of capitalist exploitation. Among them are expansion of Norway's trade with the crisis-free socialist countries and its release from ties with West European finance capital; struggle

against monopoly tax-evasion and more government spending on public health, social security and cultural developments; a greater say for parliament and the trade unions in directing economic life, and nationalization of the banks, large shipyards, and foreign property in key industries. One of our demands is a cut in arms spending, active efforts to consolidate and deepen the détente, and further to spread the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations.

So, step by step, relying on common fundamental interests, we seek to reach a solution of the crucial problem — unity of action by all the democratic trends in terms of broad democratic political alliances. The aim of the latter is not only to put an end to the power of big capital, but also to bring about radical political and economic changes that could form a basis for continuing the struggle for socialism.

In our strategy and tactics of building a democratic alliance we always work on the assumption that its main force is the working class. Consequently the success of this strategy and tactics depends primarily on whether we can achieve working-class unity. This task is all the more important today, when alongside the industrial proletariat, steadily growing numbers of non-manual staff in industry, in the system of distribution and government establishments become a component part of the working class. Our experience shows that their unification is hampered by group tendencies. Only if these are overcome is it possible to attain a higher level of political and class consciousness in the whole of the working class.

When tackling this key task, we constantly turn to the experience of the fraternal parties, because centrifugal trends in one form or another are characteristic of the working people in virtually all the capitalist countries. In some, for instance, a specific contingent of the working class is made up of so-called foreign workers, whose numbers run to several million. In some capitalist countries, the ruling classes seek to split the working people by using racist and nationalistic slogans and fanning chauvinism. In others, they play up the contradictions between national regions. We know that the right-wing and ultra-right bourgeois parties try to brainwash the workers ideologically and recruit them to their ranks. Some workers are deceived by the pseudo-revolutionary slogans of the ultra-left groupings.

All the same, the cardinal fact at the present stage is that in a number of capitalist countries there is not one, but two or sometimes several parties whose social basis is made up of the proletariat. Consequently the main task in the struggle for pooling the proletariat's efforts is to establish and expand contacts between the communists and these parties, particularly the social-democratic and socialist parties, to overcome the barriers to cooperation between them and draw them into the anti-monopoly alliance.

One must note, however, that the occasional attempts to secure joint action by groupings and parties with different ideological and political positions through their organizational unification have not up to now been successful. In Norway, this has also ended in failure. The Norwegian working-class movement has had to pay a high price for such an experiment, because after its failure there was a decline in the sense of comradeship and in the level of joint action by members of the Socialist Electoral Alliance.[18]

This, we believe, suggests the following incontrovertible conclusion: a key condition of communist-socialist cooperation is for the communists to retain their ideological identity and organizational independence. It is on this basis, relying on the Communist Party's strengthened positions, that it has been possible in the mid-70s in some countries and on the international plane to achieve success in establishing contacts between the communists, on the one hand, and social-democrats and socialists, on the other.

The prospects depend on the road the social-democratic leaders take. Will they go on seeking integration with the bourgeois society, or will they revamp their policy? The communists are naturally interested in how they tackle this historical dilemma, because only if the proletarian trend wins out within social-democracy will the possibilities be created for broad cooperation between the two political trends in the working class of the developed capitalist countries, cooperation whose goal is to establish an advanced democratic system today, and build a socialist society in the future. We feel that the future of the working-class movement in the developed socialist countries will largely depend on how this process runs. At our 16th Congress, we reaffirmed our readiness and will to cooperate on concrete issues with the social democrats, but naturally without forgetting our ideological differences. Left unity has to be re-established in order to counter the growing pressure on the working people of Norway from the right.

But unity of action does not imply our party's subordination to the Social-Democratic Labor Party. Nor does it imply a renunciation of the struggle against the bourgeoisie's ideological influence on the working class, the struggle against the latest wave of anti-communism. On the contrary: in this situation of growing ideological contest, it was emphasized in connection with the mid-September campaign to collect funds for our newspaper, *Friheten,* ever greater importance attaches to the party press, which is the party's effective weapon.

Our strength, the strength of the communists, stems from the fact that the course of social development objectively leads the masses to the ideology of scientific socialism. There is evidence of this in the

major successes that the communist parties of a number of capitalist countries have already won in the crucible of stubborn class battles. In the whole non-socialist world, there are now about 4.5 million communists, and not less than 40 million electors vote for the candidates of the communist parties. (And this means that for every communist there are eight persons who trust us, support us and follow us!) The communist and workers' parties are represented in the highest legislative bodies of 25 states. Thousands of communists are elected to municipal bodies at all levels. The communists play an important role in the trade unions, in youth, women's and other organizations.

The experience of existing socialism multiplies the communist parties' potential for influencing the broad mass of the people. Free of economic crises, satisfying the constantly growing material and spiritual expectations of its citizens, based on equality and justice, socialist society signposts the way out of the economic and social, ideological and moral impasses to which capitalism has brought hundreds of millions of people.

We live at a time, speakers at the 16th Congress of the CP Norway emphasized, in which our ideas, communist ideas, score victories all over the world, while the movement to which we belong is the chief force in the reconstruction of the world, of the advance from capitalism to socialism. We live in a world, delegates said, in which socialism is already a reality in a number of countries, providing hard evidence that it is possible to build a society free from the sores of capitalism.

In the middle of the last century, looking ahead across many decades, Marx warned the rulers of the capitalist world: 'History is the judge — its executioner, the proletarian.'[19] Today, in the second half of the 20th century, we are fully aware of this judgment. Its execution was started by the proletariat of Russia 61 years ago. It is up to us to continue the endeavor begun by the October Revolution.

In the crucial battle against the self-seeking policy of the monopolies, for peace, democracy and socialism, the working class is joined by all those who want to establish the greatest historical justice: to eliminate the system of exploitation and oppression. The doom of capitalism and the earnest of our victory lie in this unity of aspiration and action, which has been made possible in our day.

1. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969.* Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 24.
2. Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* (in three volumes). Vol. 1, p. 214.
3. R. Castillo. *One Thousand Days of Revolution. The First Critical Analysis.* Peace and Socialism International Publishers, Prague, 1978, pp. 22, 16.
4. *Marxism Today*, April 1977, p. 107.

5. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*. pp. 25-26.
6. *Prinsipp-program for Norges Kommunistiske Parti*, Oslo, 1973, pp. 68-69.
7. *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe*, Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, Berlin, June 29-30, 1976, p. 22.
8. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*. p. 19.
9. See *Statistical Yearbook*, Olso, 1977, p. 18.
10. Ibid., p. 46.
11. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*. p. 25.
12. *The Statesman's Year-Book, 1977-1978*. 1977, pp. 119, 594, 973, 1103, 1090. *Statistical Yearbook*. Oslo, 1977, p. 17.
13. *Economie et politique*. June 1969, p. 39.
14. H. Thomas. *Europe. The Radical Challenge*, London, 1973, p. 165.
15. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*. p. 25.
16. See Marx and Engels. *Selected Works* (in three volumes). Vol. 1, p. 124.
17. See *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe*. p. 24.
18. See *WMR*, November 1977.
19. Marx and Engels. *Selected Works* (in three volumes). Vol. 1, p. 501.

The socialist political system in Hungary

Dezsö Nemes
PB member, CC HWSP

Taking the socialist road, in whatever form, means setting up a qualitatively new political system, the origins of which go back to the Great October Socialist Revolution, which opened a new era in history.

The political system is part of the socialist socio-economic formation and develops together with it, but its development must keep ahead of society as a whole. Once the new system of government bodies and agencies has been set up, it begins to play the principal role in uniting the people, setting their creative energies in motion, raising their political consciousness and cultural standard and moulding their way of thinking on socialist lines. Its function is to ensure active participation of more and more working people in mass organizations and in control over administrative and economic bodies, enterprises, cultural and educational institutions.

The socialist political system can cope with its tasks only if it is stable but not rigid, if the system of government bodies and agencies is steadily improved and they take into account the requirements and potentialities of society at each particular stage of its development.

Where it lags behind the development of socialist society its functioning may encouter difficulties. The rise and then the deepening of trends toward dogmatism, revisionism and nationalism or toward all of them at once may have dire consequences. Even if there is no actual degeneration of the foundation of socialist society — social ownership of the principal means of production and production relations based on it — the political system may be deformed to the point of becoming an obstacle to, rather than a factor for, socialist progress.

Mistakes in party and government policy made in Hungary in the late 40s and first half of the 50s had a disastrous effect on our society. With external and internal class enemies on the offensive, the political system found itself paralyzed. Hostile forces led, encouraged and directly supported by Western secret services contrived to disrupt political life in Hungary to such an extent that in the autumn of 1956 they were able to stage a counter-revolutionary rebellion under the spurious slogan of 'improving socialism.' While putting down the rebellion, our party, led by Janos Kadar, reorganized its ranks and reactivated the political system. We were helped in solving these challenging problems by unstinted support from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and by the fraternal parties' firm and unanimous internationalist solidarity. These factors played an important role in the speedy consolidation of the country's socialist forces. Having foiled the attempt at a counter-revolutionary coup, we set out to rectify the mistakes and our socialist political system was soon consolidated. However, we did not allow the real achievements of the previous period of socialist construction to be nullified. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party held that they must be preserved and used for further progress.

The experience of socialist countries shows that when the foundations of the new society have been laid (according to Leninist principles and with due regard to the given situation), class antagonisms disappear fast and it becomes possible and necessary to carry forward the political system. However, this development may slow down or even break off where there is a delay in ascertaining the possibilities and new social requirements that arise and where, moreover, the situation is aggravated by imperialist attempts to interfere.

The fraternal countries are building socialism and communism amid a worldwide class struggle. This means that in perfecting the political system of socialism we should never ignore imperialist designs against us or make light of imperialist intrigues and hostile acts. The cold war period is a thing of the past and the Vietnam war, in which the United States suffered its worst defeat ever, whereas the Vietnam people achieved a historic victory, is over. Nevertheless, imperialism not only persists in attempts to interfere in the internal

affairs of socialist countries but has lately intensified these attempts on the false plea of 'championing human rights.' Powerful reactionary forces, primarily the U.S. military-industrial complex, are trying to resume the cold war and are planning new military ventures. And while there is a rather sharp controversy between reactionary circles in the West and the more realistic and far-sighted bourgeois politicians who are aware that the policy of confronting the world with the threat of a new war is disastrous, ideological attacks on our countries and attempts to undermine socialist society have by no means ceased.

As for Hungary, the exploiting classes no longer exist as a social force. Members of these one-time classes and their descendants have reconciled themselves to the new social order, and many more have come to realize its historic necessity whatever Western propaganda may allege. There are fewer and fewer persons among them who want to engage in counter-revolutionary activity. However, imperialism is now carrying on subversion among other population groups as well in the hope of corrupting them morally and politically and of finding 'useful' people among them. Still, this does not cancel the task of further improving the socialist system as the development level of our society requires. But it must be fulfilled in a way that dooms all attempts at hostile interference and even more hamstrings the opponents of socialism.

For over two decades now, Hungary has had a political system free of all deformations. Today the HSWP is giving the system proper leadership and direction. It is the party that is entirely responsible to the people for the proper functioning of the political system, for correct government policy, for the progress of society. The party's policy and main tasks are defined by its congresses. Mass support for the party's policies goes hand in hand with ideological education and organizing work on a vast scale. The party assures the implementation of its policy by the National Assembly, the government and administrative bodies, as well as by mass organizations, through the communists active in them. It also enlists the participation of non-party working people in the realization of its policies at every level and in every public field.

The alliance between the working class and other classes and social groups, a component of HSWP policy, is of paramount importance for the functioning of the socialist political system. As early as the period of struggle for people's rule, our party was able to form a democratic alliance between the working class and working peasantry and this was further developed under socialism. Today the alliance between the working class and cooperative peasantry forms the basis of the developing socialist national unity of the whole people. The policy of alliances extends to all other working people, first of all the

intellectuals, whose role in the economic and cultural progress of the country, in the promotion of every aspect of public life, is steadily growing.

Historical traditions and the specific conditions of the rise and development of socialist statehood have, of course, an impact on the political evolution of socialist society, as well as on the nature and forms of class alliances. A topic being widely discussed in many countries is whether these alliances should be embodied in the activity of one party or of several parties. In post-liberation Hungary the political alliance of democratic forces took the form of a multi-party system. In 1949 the parties declaring for socialist construction formed a Popular Front.* It was not long, however, before the range of activity of the allied parties narrowed due to the above-mentioned political mistakes made by our party and then virtually tapered off altogether. This naturally hampered the development of the Popular Front. In the mid-50s, revisionist and nationalist elements came up with the catchwords of 'democratic socialism' and 'anti-dogmatism,' demanding that the Front be 'renewed.' Their aim was to make it an instrument of resistance to the Communist Party and socialist state. This was part of the political softening up for the counter-revolutionary rebellion.

In 1957, the PPF was reorganized on the initiative of the HSWP, with the trade unions, Youth League and other mass organizations participating. The party's aim was to unite one-time members of the allied parties who were dedicated to the working people's interests, as well as those non-party people who were willing to put their scientific, cultural and other public activities in the service of socialism and to cooperate with the HSWP. In the two decades that have passed since then, the activity of the Front has assumed a large scale thanks to our party's correct policy and the cooperation of all allied forces.

The PPF today is a solid alliance between the communists and non-party people. This implies something more than communist participation in the work of organizations uniting the non-party masses. It also means that party bodies and organizations strive to bring their allies into the work of formulating party policies. This has become a common practice except in the case of strictly inner-party matters. When, for instance, the CC HSWP puts plans for the country's economic or cultural development on the agenda of its plenary meetings, leading officials, including non-party people, of the organizations which were asked to join in drafting decisions and are to carry them out are invited. The Central Committee invites leading officials of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and representatives of trade

*It was based on the Hungarian National Independence Front established in 1944. In 1954 it was renamed the Patriotic People's Front (PPF).

union, youth, women's and other organizations to its meetings and to the various conferences and forums it holds. Their opinions and suggestions help the party determine its stand on questions relating to the activity of these organizations. This is also a current practice in other party bodies and widens the social basis of the party and the entire political system of our society. It enhances the autonomy of the mass organizations and gives them a keener sense of responsibility and thus stimulates every sphere of public life.

The PPF unites people who may hold either materialist or religious views, but who stand for the further progress of socialist society. The socialist state respects people's religious sentiments and guarantees the free functioning of the church. We have been striving for proper relations between state and church, and have already registered important gains.

Prior to liberation, the Church helped and defended capitalist and landowner power and took part in anti-communist propaganda. (Some progressive churchmen consider this incompatible with the mission of the church but their attitude did little to change the overall situation.) After the country had been liberated the working class as the leading force of the people's rule was confronted by churchmen whose political activity was aimed at restoring capitalist and landowner power and who tried to strengthen the political positions of various counter-revolutionaries disguising their opposition to people's rule with religious sentiments. However, the tremendous effort of the working class for the rehabilitation of the country had its effect on churchmen as well and brought about a polarization of views among them on the position of the church in the new situation.

The spring of 1945 saw a revolutionary land reform under which the estates of big landowners and the church were expropriated in favor of those who tilled them. And while Cardinal Mindszenty, the then head of the Hungarian Catholic church, anathematized the reform, those who received land found the reform a 'righteous deed.' The reform also won the approval of many clergymen, who regarded Mindszenty's reactionary attitude as contrary to common sense. Nor did church reaction succeed in rousing the masses against people's rule when the banks, factories and other capitalist enterprises were nationalized.

Differences in attitude to the socialist system, then in the making, gave rise to growing contradictions within the church. The trend toward loyal relations with the socialist state gradually gained the upper hand. This development went on more smoothly in the Protestant church compared with the Catholic church, in which it lasted longer and involved sharp controversies.

The reason for the change was that the establishment of people's

rule freed the church from serving the interests of the exploiting classes. Most churchmen, including high dignitaries, satisfied themselves by experience and acknowledged that the socialist system guarantees the people a free life and assures progress of the nation. Clergymen followed the example of the overwhelming majority of believers by supporting socialist construction. Another important factor for the change was the pursuit by Hungary and other socialist countries of a firm peace policy, which won support and sympathy among many churchmen.

And so, loyal political cooperation has become the dominant aspect of relations between the socialist state and the church. It finds expression, among other things, in the fact that churchmen are elected to various PPF bodies, including its All-Hungary Council, and participate systematically in actions organized by these bodies. The clergy is also represented in parliament. The normalization of relations between state and church benefits socialist construction and contributes at the same time to the stability of the social standing of the church.

The socialist state has not, of course, abandoned its task of spreading the scientific world-view among the masses. In turn, the church continues to preach its own conception of the world, the creation of man, and so on. Materialism and religion are poles apart and their adherents are engaged in an ideological dispute. However, this is not a dispute between political opponents but between people cooperating in building the new society and the effort for peace.

The legal foundations of Hungary's political system have been established by the Constitution, which says that ours is a socialist state and that all power in it belongs to the working people. The highest organ of state power is the National Assembly and its members elect the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic. The National Assembly decides on the government's main activities and adopts national economic plans, which are carried out by the government and other organs of state power.

The socialist parliament is the legislative assembly of the working people united in building the new society. It is not a battlefield for representatives of warring classes or rival political alignments, which is typical of parliament in capitalist countries. Parliamentary scuffles between bourgeois parties are expressive of an overt or covert bid for power, of a clash of interests between diverse business groups. In a socialist parliament, however, decisions are made by representatives of the working people, who are engaged in a common effort as builders of socialist society, and this conditions the forms and methods of its activity.

Most parliamentary business is conducted at its periodical sessions, but parliamentary commissions play a big role, too, especially in

drafting and discussing bills and in supervising the work of ministries and other government agencies. They have the power to hear government members and ministerial officials of any rank. Assistance to regional and local councils is a common activity of deputies.

The National Assembly, the HPR Presidium and Council of Ministers are the highest organs of power in our political system, whose basis is formed by the local councils. These are at once government bodies exercising state power in the areas concerned and self-government bodies of the working people.

The council system was brought into being after the establishment of people's rule in 1950. In setting it up, we drew on the vast experience of the Soviet Union's Soviets of People's Deputies. Specifically, we strove to draw the largest possible section of the population into the work of the councils, that is, into the activity of their various commissions, which is part of the mechanism of people's rule in the Soviet Union. However, the commissions did not 'take root' at first, did not become a form of participation of the population in decision-making at local level, nor were their links with the working people strong. One reason for this was that the organization of the council system coincided with the period of dogmatic distortions in Hungarian politics. Favorable changes did not come until after territorial committees of the PPF had joined in the work of the councils and their commissions.

A distinctive feature of our council system is that it combines direct with indirect elections. Deputies to the National Assembly and members of village, town and district councils (the latter applies to the capital) are elected by direct, universal, equal and secret ballot. Members of the Budapest Council are elected by district councils; members of regional councils are elected by members of town and village councils, likewise by secret ballot. This procedure guarantees the interdependence of higher and lower councils. Needless to say, higher councils exercise control in line with their jurisdiction over the lower ones. The Budapest Council and regional councils have the right to co-opt members who are prominent in public life and can help improve the functioning of the councils. However, the number of co-opted members may not exceed one-fourth of the total membership of any one of these councils.

The councils carry out tasks flowing from state plans and work for the advancement of their areas and for the satisfaction of local requirements. The councils are now more active as self-government bodies, primarily in the municipal, general service and cultural fields. On suggestions from the population, we carry out many projects not envisaged by the state plan: cultural centers, youth clubhouses, kindergartens, playgrounds, sports facilities in the towns, and small

water-supply systems, hard-surface roads, etc., in the countryside.

The funds needed for the council's activity in the above fields and for capital construction according to the development and reconstruction plans of Budapest and the regions are budgeted by the state. Enterprises and cooperatives situated in the areas administered by the councils concerned cover part of the expenditures. Work on a voluntary basis makes a tangible contribution. It has become a tradition for the working people to participate periodically in the construction of projects under the jurisdiction of councils. The councils organize this in collaboration with PPF bodies and often on the latter's initiative, as well as on the initiative of local party organizations. Voluntary social labor has become an important aspect of the socialist way of life and helps to speed the formation of socialist social consciousness.

Our electoral system is highly democratic. Every citizen over 18 has the right to vote. A person may be deprived of this right only by a court and only for a definite time. Every voter has the right to be elected. Candidates are nominated by meetings of the electorate called by PPF committees. These meetings discuss important governmental matters and the work of the councils. Candidates are proposed by the PPF committees and also by individuals at these meetings. In this way the electorate takes an active part not only in the voting on election day, but also in the selection of candidates. In every electoral district, two or more candidates may be nominated for election to any representative body.

Meetings which nominate candidates for election to parliament are often held in big enterprises situated in the given electoral district, in which case delegations from other enterprises and institutions functioning in the same district take part. As more than 97 or 98 per cent of the electorate go to the polls in both general and local elections, the elections are in the nature of impressive political demonstrations of the people's allegiance to the socialist system.

Now a word about the specific activities of the PPF, that highly important institution of our political system. Education campaigns hold pride of place in the Front's work. Great importance attaches also to such everyday functions of its numerous committees as organizing political and cultural actions, conferences of economic and cultural experts, meetings of rural inhabitants, and so on.

The PPF is a mass movement. It functions with the support of its member organizations and is therefore not a separate mass organization. It works through its committees operating in villages, towns, regions, the capital and its districts. The Front's highest body, elected by its congress, is the All-Hungary Council. In urban neighborhoods the PPF committees closely cooperate with the councils of the corresponding level, trade union committees and other mass organizations

which implement, within their jurisdiction, Front policies aimed at uniting communists and non-party people. The PPF movement involves federations of cooperatives, unions of national minorities, unions of small handicraftsmen and traders (about three per cent of the able-bodied population), the Society for the Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge and other organizations.

The experience of socialist countries shows that the trade unions become a notable component of the socialist political system as soon as the construction of the new society begins, especially if they have played an active part in the winning of power by the working class. This was the case primarily in those countries taking the socialist road where the trade unions became a serious political force even under capitalism. And although Hitler fascism broke off their activity, they reformed their ranks shortly after liberation, gained strength and moved into a position in the new society's political life never held by them before. As regards countries where the unions were not an influential political force until working-class power was established, their role in the early stages of socialist construction is not so great. However, it plainly tends to grow in such countries as well.

Hungary's trade unions cooperated with the communists and social democrats in the struggle for power and, having shown themselves to be an important political factor, joined immediately in socialist construction. But in the late 40s and first half of the 50s their position, too, was affected by the mistakes mentioned earlier. At that time a section of the party leadership held that since the party had become a mass party, it could assume the main functions of the trade unions while the latter's activity would be of secondary importance. These views aggravated the adverse effects of what was a dogmatic policy and told on the functioning of our political system. Consequently, the unions' immense contribution to the establishment of workers' rule and the initiation of socialist construction does not in itself assure the further growth of their public role. Gross distortions in party and government policy prevented the normal evolution of the unions, the largest organization of the working class and other working people.

Measures adopted by the party and government after suppressing the counter-revolution re-established the role and leverage of the trade unions. The unions contributed in large measure to the consolidation of the political system shaken by the 1956 events. This made it necessary to do away with dogmatic doctrines and revisionist confusion in the unions themselves. The party helped decisively in this.

Our trade unions today are carrying on manifold activities.* The important thing is the assistance which the unions offer in drafting and

*For the position and role of the trade unions in Hungary, see Sandor Gaspar, 'Builders of developed socialism,' in *WMR*, January 1978.

implementing national development plans and solving production and other problems. They exercise increasing control over government bodies, economic agencies and enterprise managements. Underlying their effort is readiness to cooperate and to help achieve common goals. However, the unions' traditional function of representing and defending the interests of the working class and other working people is as important as ever.

The Hungarian political system includes numerous other institutions, organizations and public self-government bodies. For instance, it is typical of our judiciary that people's assessors elected by councils from diverse categories of working people participate in court proceedings along with professional judges. People's control committees, whose heads are likewise elected by councils, also play an active role. Public order is maintained not only by the militia but by workers' squads operating on a voluntary basis in their off hours.

A noteworthy feature of our political system is that it provides ample opportunities for various public activities. Our sports societies have over a million members. The Hungarian Red Cross carries on health education, sets up blood banks with the aid of voluntary donors and teaches its members to give first aid. It also accomplished tasks prompted by international solidarity. Its 11,000 organizations operating in enterprises, residential neighborhoods and schools have over a million members. There is a Union of Scientific and Technological Societies (34 societies, 140,000 members). We also have various hobby associations. The state encourages the activities of all these non-political institutions.

In assessing a political system, one should proceed first of all from the conditions provided by the social order on which this system is based and whose progress it must serve. Under our political system, power is wielded by the people, exploitation has been abolished, everyone has a guaranteed right to work and social insecurity has been eliminated for all time. Socialism offers opportunities for development that our people have never had before. Our political system leaves no room for the cynical commercial exploitation of man's lower instincts; instead, the individual has every opportunity to develop and to enjoy cultural values. There is no room for fomenting hatred between nations or for war-mongering. The people's efforts are directed entirely toward safeguarding peace.

The political system of our society is the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is gradually developing with the support of all working people into a state of the whole people and has already covered a considerable part of this road. It ensures steadily rising material and cultural standards, the construction of a developed socialist society and the gradual transition to communism.

Party experience

Banner of struggle and victory

Grigóris Pharakos
PB member, CC CP Greece

PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE

The results and political implications of the CPG 10th Congress[1] have already been discussed on the pages of *World Marxist Review*. This article deals with the amendments it made to the party program.

Why the Program was amended

Formulation of its Program and its continuous improvement are of prime importance for every party. Lenin wrote in his time: 'Without a program a party cannot be an integral political organism capable of pursuing its line whatever turn events may take' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 17, p. 280).

Throughout the 60 years of its history, our party has consistently worked to develop and perfect its Program. Basically, this has been an ascendent process (except for certain deviations and errors which were overcome in a relatively short time). The Ninth Party Congress held in 1974, a few months prior to the collapse of the military-fascist regime, adopted a Program which, in its main strategic and tactical propositions and general political line, has stood the test of the class struggle and was reaffirmed by the 10th Congress in May 1978. But in the four years between the two congresses there have been serious changes both in Greece and the world.

One of these came in June 1974 with the fall of the U.S.-protected junta and with the ruling class changing over from military-fascist dictatorship to bourgeois parliamentary democracy. There have been other major changes also in domestic policy, connected, above all, with the mounting social struggle of the working class and the working people generally. The massive popular anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly movement taking shape in Greece lays a definite imprint on every aspect of political life and is bound to exert much stronger influence in future.

The day-to-day experience of the class struggle is reflected in the

revolutionary strategy and tactics worked out by our party, and is an indispensable factor in developing the party's overall ideological and theoretical concept. The combat ability of a revolutionary party as the vanguard of the working class is determined, Lenin emphasized, 'by the correctness of the political leadership exercised by this vanguard, by the correctness of its political strategy and tactics, provided the broad masses have seen, *from their own experience,* that they are correct' (Vol. 31, p. 25). Our party has accumulated a fund of experience and we have drawn on it to improve various aspects of our strategy and tactics and elaborate the ways and forms of struggle for revolutionary change. Now that we are operating legally and with more information available, we are in a position to promote collective theoretical effort and thus more precisely appraise the changes in the social and economic structure.

To this can be added the information following from changes on the international scene: the continuously altering alignment of forces in favor of peace, progress and socialism — attended by aggressive imperialist attempts to reverse the détente process — and the continuous efforts to strengthen the unity of the international communist movement.

This made it both possible and necessary to amend the Program approved by the Ninth Party Congress. This was done by the 10th Congress.

The party Program analyzes Greece's position in the imperialist system, in the world of today generally, and contains a scientifically balanced appraisal of capitalist development and socio-economic conditions in Greece. Basing itself on a comprehensive analysis, it declares that Greece today has all the objective material preconditions for transition to socialism, which, however, cannot be said of the subjective conditions. The Program also emphasizes that the dominant contradiction is that between the local monopoly oligarchy and imperialism, U.S. imperialism in particular, on the one hand, and all the other social classes and strata, on the other.

By amending the party Program approved by the previous congress, the 10th Congress enriched it and gave it more profound meaning. The present Program, along with all other policy documents, helps to raise the effectiveness of our critical approach to the anti-scientific bourgeois concepts of the country's future, to the erroneous views coming from the 'left,' both from well-intentioned elements and 'renewers' of the communist movement, or leftists who would completely revise Marxism.

This article will deal only with some of the many fundamental questions.

Defining the country's economic level is, beyond all doubt, a necessary premise for drawing up the party's strategy.

The unamended Program said that Greece was *becoming* an industrial-agrarian country. But the past 20 years have substantially altered the situation, necessitating a new appraisal. The changes, particularly in the size and structure of the national income and the class composition of the population, have in the past four years gained in momentum, scope and depth.

Today agriculture accounts for less than half of the gross national product. Industry's share in exports has risen from 56.7 per cent in 1973 to 64.2 in 1977, while the share of agriculture has dropped from 37.4 to 29.6 per cent. Blue-collar and white-collar workers now make up 46 per cent of the economically active population, with the larger share going to the industrial proletariat, whose growth has been especially rapid.

The 10th Congress established that the pace of economic growth allows for the conclusion that Greece is *already* an industrial-agrarian capitalist country. At the same time it was noted that the main structural defects in the economy have not been removed, that expansion in manufacturing has not solved the chronic problem of Greek industry, nor overcome its lag compared with industrially developed capitalist countries, nor the substantial lag in heavy industry, particularly in engineering and machine-tools, which are still at a rudimentary level. And the Congress emphasized that because of all this Greece should be regarded as a land with 'a medium level of development of the productive forces.'

It will be recalled that Lenin, who discovered the law of uneven economic and political development under imperialism, singled out countries with, at that time, a medium level of capitalist development. Development levels in capitalist countries were at one time the subject of much theoretical discussion and the program adopted by the Comintern Sixth Congress (1928) spoke of three types of capitalist countries, classifying in the second type 'countries with a medium level of capitalist development (Spain, Portugal, Poland, Hungary, the Balkan countries, etc. . . .).'

The drastic changes in the half-century since then have left no country at its former level, though we can still speak of a group of medium-developed countries.

In this respect Greece offers a classical example: labor productivity is 42-44 per cent of that of European developed capitalist countries, but appreciably higher than in developing countries; industry's contribution to national income is nearly 33 per cent compared with 47 per cent in developed countries and 15 per cent in developing; per-

capita national income (1974) averaged $4,500 in developed countries, $320 in developing countries and approximately $2,500 in Greece. Very much the same applies to other indicators used to measure socio-economic development. Greece holds a middle position between developed and developing capitalist countries.

From all this our party draws scientifically grounded, consistent and comprehensive conclusions relating to revolutionary strategy and tactics. And they differ fundamentally from views and positions which, in one or another way, regard Greece as a medium-developed capitalist country. For instance, the revisionists, who maintain that 'Greece has become a medium-developed industrial-agrarian country,' underestimate a number of other criteria, for example, dependence on foreign, chiefly U.S. monopoly capital and imperialism, strongly emphasized in our program. More, to believe the revisionist leaders, Greece has all the characteristics of a developed country, which, they argue, makes it imperative for it to join the European Economic Community, with all its alleged benefits. But these arguments studiously avoid or underestimate the people's insistent demand for withdrawal from NATO.[2]

But 'medium development' does not mean that, under capitalism, Greece will soon catch up with the developed capitalist countries, just as it did not catch up in the past 50 years despite development in the capitalist world as a whole. The Greek revisionist leaders are trapped in a contradiction: they hold up Eurocommunism as a model that best serves all the specific requirements of developed European capitalist countries, at the same time advocating it as a model for Greece, a medium-developed country. Recognition of Greek capitalism's middle position is at odds with the revisionists' argument in favor of joining the EEC and their rejection of the demand for withdrawal from NATO.

Even if Greece were a developed capitalist country, our party would still oppose membership of NATO and of the EEC, the imperialist league which is NATO's economic base, for our policy is struggle to free Greece from imperialist dependence, the main source of all its ills and the main obstacle to democratic and social progress.

Two stages of a uniform revolutionary process

Analysis of the country's socio-economic structure and its position in the imperialist system has led us to include this crucial strategic conclusion in the Program: 'Greece will arrive at socialism through a uniform revolutionary process consisting of two stages: the first, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and democratic, and the second, socialist stage.'

Unlike the unamended program, the first stage is not subdivided

into phases, the first being the 'new democracy' covering a large part of the transformations envisaged in the initial stage. The 10th Congress unanimously decided that there are no grounds for this subdivision into phases.

This was justified when Greece was ruled by the junta and it was necessary to mobilize maximum forces to overthrow it. The Communist Party accordingly offered the anti-dictatorial forces a minimum program in the fight to overthrow the junta. But what kind of regime would replace the junta? That question was answered not by the minimum program, but by the party's 'new democracy' program which corresponded to the people's democratic aspirations. The policy statement on the 'new democracy' took into account the fact that some forces, though amenable to the proposed regime or prepared to accept the communists' immediate goal, were not prepared to accept its program of revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly transformations. Some elements wholly disagreed with that program. Hence, presenting a wider-range program than the 'new democracy' would hamper unity of all the forces even in direct struggle against the dictatorship.

It is now perfectly clear that the conditions necessitating the 'new democracy' phase no longer apply. And not only because the junta is a thing of the past, but also because the nature and practices of the present authoritarian bourgeois parliamentary regime help the masses realize the need for anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic change. Equally important is the existence of a broad powerful popular movement exerting a growing influence on all the democratic forces and assisting their transition to active anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly positions.

Of course, we cannot rule out the need for tactical phases requiring the concentration of party policy ('anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic changes materialize through definite phases,' the Program declares). But to retain the clause on a special 'new democracy' phase would only confuse proper understanding of our strategic aim of carrying out the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic revolution and establishing a state of people's democracy. All party activity centers on this.

And so, the first strategic thesis of the Program is now formulated more clearly and precisely and there is a concrete analysis of people's democracy and of its corresponding power structure. In short, we have importantly amended and developed the party Program.

Much the same applies to analysis of the forces involved, to one or another degree, in the fight for revolutionary change. There are no particular innovations in the amended program, but the classification of these forces is more precise and their potential role more carefully

weighed. Thus, besides the working class, the prime motive force and leader of their alliance, there are also the peasantry, especially the laboring peasantry, handicraftsmen, engineers, technicians and scientists engaged in the production sphere, and other middle strata. Our party holds that other forces, too — small and even medium businessmen, for instance, oppressed by the insatiable monopolies — can to a certain degree be brought into the struggle for the revolutionary refashioning of society, or in any case, can be induced to take a neutral stand. Lastly, alongside this class differentiation, the Program examines the social and political opportunities for such categories of the population as the democratic intelligentsia, democratic-minded officers and NCOs, clergymen associated with the people, etc. Special emphasis is laid on the social and political activity of the youth.

On the question of peaceful or non-peaceful revolutionary reconstruction of society, the Program points out that the party should be prepared, and prepare the people, for the use of both forms depending on the behavior of the reactionary forces, and must be able to shift from one form to another. Our position on this question was analyzed and explained by Comrade Florakis, General Secretary of the Central Committee, in his report to the 10th Congress. It interpretatively generalizes the serious problems before us, disarms our enemies and critics and sets out the immediate tasks of the communists in generating a powerful mass movement.

The problems of the second stage of the uniform revolutionary process are examined in the main chapter of the Program, 'The Transition to Socialism,' in a wider framework than before. For socialism has become a popular talking point and many superficial views about it are being spread. It is therefore necessary to give the masses attracted by the socialist ideas and ideals a clear-cut and comprehensive understanding of the experience of existing socialism and of regularities of socialist construction.

This leads us to an important question closely linked with the second stage, namely, our party's attitude to proletarian dictatorship as a crucial regularity of the revolutionary process. This was the focal point both of the pre-Congress and Congress discussions, notably in debating amendments to the Program.

The CPG's attitude to proletarian dictatorship

Our party's position can best be understood by a brief review of our struggle against ideological deviations.

About 20 years ago there was a nascent revisionist trend among some of our cadres of petty-bourgeois origin. It was fed largely by the difficulties we were experiencing in our illegal work and the big mistake of the then leadership: dissolution of the illegal party branches led to their members joining the broad left EDA party.

Fifteen years ago there emerged a right revisionist group operating as a faction within the party Central Committee. Five years later, with the party driven underground by the fascist junta, this group tried to win a majority on the Central Committee and redirect the party onto an opportunist course. In this they failed and set about organizing a new 'party,' which continued to call itself the Communist Party of Greece, but with the addition of the word 'internal.' The world 'external' was clapped onto the name of our party, a slanderous attempt to indicate that it took its orders from outside. In short, the group was employing the same kind of lie which for so many years had been used by the class enemy.

Since then the leaders of this revisionist group have steadily been abandoning the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, along with the tactics of the new-type party, and have centered their efforts on fighting our party.

Life has dealt harshly with these renegades. In the underground years, veteran communists and activists rallied around the CPG and young fighters, tempered in the crucible of the anti-dictatorial struggle, turned away from the revisionists and joined the Young Communist League. The Ninth Party Congress (1974) trenchently criticized the erroneous right-opportunist revisionist policy directed against the CPG.

In the past four years the revisionists have lost all credibility in the eyes of the masses. The thousands of young Greeks who are taking a more radical stand and assimilating the ideals of socialism and communism, are joining the YCL.[3] In the trade union movement the revisionists play a distinctly minor role, with the overwhelming majorigy of union activists adhering to the CPG's consistent class policy. In other mass organizations, too, and in the municipal councils revisionist influence is incomparably smaller than our party's. In last year's parliamentary elections, despite the 'most-favored-attitude' of the class enemy, they managed only one-tenth of the vote polled by the CPG and won only one seat in parliament compared with our party's 11.

Notwithstanding their obvious failure, serious differences and discord, the revisionist leaders cling to the name 'Communist Party of Greece' and are intensifying their 'activity' against our party. They are instigating and organizing anti-Soviet and anti-internationalist campaigns. They are at the head of the anti-socialist 'human rights' campaign. In fact, they use any pretext — even the World Football Championship in Argentina — for their unscrupulous campaigns against the CPG, the CPSU and the CP of Argentina and all other communist parties that support the Argentine communists. And such campaigns are, of course, taken up and boosted by the right and

extreme-right media. To all intents and purposes the revisionists have degenerated into a group specializing in provocations and anti-communism, with the full approval of the ruling class.

The revisionist leaders claim that they are 'Eurocommunists,' even that they 'originated' that trend. For us Greek communists that is one more reason to repudiate and reject 'Eurocommunism.'

The Tenth Party Congress categorically declared: 'The CPG rejects the theory of ''Eurocommunism''.' The Congress made it clear that this does not mean that the party 'identifies ''Eurocommunism'' with the right of every fraternal party to seek its own road to the revolutionary transformation of its country. The CPG believes that it is the legitimate right and duty of every fraternal party to devise the ways and forms of socialist change and socialist construction, with due account to national specifics.' The Communist Party of Greece is convinced of the validity of Lenin's theses on the need to rely on the common regularities of the revolution and the fundamental principles of communism. He wrote of the 'application of the *fundamental* principles of communism ... which will *correctly modify* these principles in certain particulars, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions' (Vol. 31, p. 92). That is precisely why our Program states that 'the transition to socialism will be effected on the basis of the common regularities which, as the experience of building socialism has shown, retain their universal validity, with each country contributing certain features to this process.'

The Greek revisionists reject the concept of proletarian dictatorship. They have scant regard for common regularities and counterpose to our party's revolutionary strategy and tactics their 'strategy of continuous reform' maintaining it will sooner or later lead to socialism.

Now as in the past, our Program abides by the scientifically-grounded proposition that 'the socialist state, whatever concrete form it assumes, will in its class essence be revolutionary power of the working class in alliance with other strata of the working people, a power capable of building and defending socialism. In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat.'

The pre-Congress discussion and the Congress debates made it perfectly clear that our party unanimously accepts the need for proletarian dictatorship and its class essence as a power capable of building socialism and defending it against the inevitable attempts to restore capitalism.

Early in the pre-Congress discussion some comrades suggested that the Program retain the idea of proletarian power without, however, using the term 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' This was rejected by a great majority and it was emphasized that this term, used by the

Marxist-Leninist classics to define the substance of proletarian power, had to be retained in the party Program. No one expressed any doubts on that score at the Congress.

More than once our people went through the ordeal of fascist dictatorship of the most reactionary forces of capital, the last time under the military-fascist junta of 1967-1974. This naturally has generated a feeling against the very word 'dictatorship.' But our people suffered, perhaps even more, under the parliamentary form of ruling-class power in 1945-63. Thousands of valiant fighters were done to death. Communist supporters were shot down in the streets, fascism instituted a reign of unparalleled violence and terror, with thousands of communists and other patriots condemned to long years in prison and exile or to the Macronisi death camp. The Greek people can understand and appreciate the Marxist thesis that bourgeois power, whatever its form, is in the final analysis, a dictatorship, with democracy for the minority and dictatorship for the majority. Our people can appreciate the meaning and implications of the term 'proletarian dictatorship' and the need to uphold socialist power, which will be a genuine democracy for the majority and a dictatorship for the counter-revolutionary minority.

The revisionists were alarmed by the wide response to our Tenth Party Congress and have now chosen as their target the dictatorship of the proletariat, the substance and class character of power in building socialism.

They contend that it cannot apply to Greece, and for the following reasons. First, 'this is no longer the Greece of 1920; it has become a medium-developed industrial-agrarian country.' Second, 'socialist ideas are gaining wider acceptance and, given a correct policy, can win over the vast majority of the people.' Third, those who cling to proletarian dictatorship 'condemn the labor movement to a marginal role to the extent that it remains influenced by this concept.'[4]

Let us take a closer look at these anti-scientific, anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist revisionist 'arguments.'

First, the allegation that proletarian dictatorship does not apply to more or less developed capitalist countries is contrary to all historical evidence. The members of the present socialist community effected the transition from capitalism to socialism at differing stages of development — low, medium and high — but in all these countries proletarian dictatorship proved necessary and constructive.

Second, socialist ideas are winning increasing support largely due to the achievements of existing socialism, which has demonstrated the viability of proletarian dictatorship in widely different circumstances. It is absurd to affirm that the concept of proletarian dictatorship is suited only to conditions in which socialist ideas do not

meet with wide response. We are asked to believe that proletarian dictatorship is necessary only because the majority are against socialism, and if and when that majority accepts socialism, the need for such dictatorship will automatically disappear. As if socialist power can be established without the approval of the majority of working people! We know that proletarian power acts as a dictatorship only against the minority, against the exploiting classes and their remnants, against those trying to prevent or hamper socialist construction.

Third, the idea is intrinsically wrong that the term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' tends to isolate the working-class movement and the communists from the popular masses. The history of the international communist movement and our own experience suggest the very opposite. By way of illustration, we might mention recent events in Greece, notably the 1977 elections. They showed that supporters of scientific socialism, communism, gave ten times more votes to the CPG which upholds that principle, than to the revisionists who reject and condemn it. If the revisionists want to acquire a mass basis by building a social democrat type party — and that seems to be their aim — then one cannot deny them a measure of consistency. But the history of Greek politics furnishes ample evidence that there is no ground for the mass social democrat party they want.

We feel that unanimous approval by the Tenth Party Congress of revolutionary proletarian power, i.e., proletarian dictatorship, as a regularity in building socialism, and the use of this term in our Program, is of cardinal importance for our movement.

The Tenth Congress rejected the well-intentioned but narrow and dogmatic views of some comrades who, in opposing revisionism but influenced by leftist groups, proposed making a fetish of the term 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' They insisted that proletarian power be described by that term and no other. In their view, the Program was 'making concessions' by speaking of power by the working class in alliance with other strata of the working people, or of socialist power, or working-class revolutionary democracy, etc. But the Congress empahsized that the important thing was to show the working people the real meaning of proletarian dictatorship, explain the organizational, economic, political, cultural, moral, educational, defensive and other functions of proletarian dictatorship in the building of socialism. It is not a question of words, for no matter what appellation we use for working-class revolutionary power, the bourgeoisie will never desist in its attacks on it: it is not the name but the substance that matters.

The Congress emphasized that while explaining the logical neces-

sity of proletarian dictatorship, there is no reason to reject any other characteristic of proletarian revolutionary power. Nor should we underestimate the fact that in practice it will be implemented not by the working class alone, but in alliance with non-proletarian sections of the population. Accordingly, our Program says that 'the working people's state will be led by the working class in building socialism.' And the Congress stressed that this is not at variance with Lenin's thesis that the working class will not share state power with anyone. For the central idea of this thesis is to show that the overriding task of the proletarian state will be to assure the triumph of socialist production relations, of which the working class is the vehicle. But it does not follow from this that the working class must discharge its state functions and build socialism alone, in solitude.

The Tenth Congress is now part of party history, the history of 60 years of unending battle in which thousands of communists and supporters have made the supreme sacrifice. Today all members and friends of the party, and above all our cadres, are again with the masses, the working people, as propagandists and organizers, bringing to the people the ideas of our party, the decisions of this Congress, and organizing their realization.

And their banner of struggle and victory is, along with other Congress decisions, the party Program, a program of democracy for the people, a program of socialism and for a radiant future.

1. Cf. article by party General Secretary Florakis, 'Significant event in Greek political life,' *WMR*, September 1978 — *Ed.*

2. Cf. Interview by Babis Drakopoulos, Greek revisionist leader, in the newspaper *Eleftherothypia*, May 23-24, 1978.

3. The other, revisionist-led, youth organization had some 5,000 members a year ago or much less than the YCL. Since then there has been a major split and its membership has been reduced to some 3,000, or less than a 10th of that of the YCL. Its influence on young workers is negligible, and its influence among students, as the last elections to the student union have shown, is steadily declining: support in the student union is down 20 per cent from 1977.

4. Cf. Drakopoulos interview cited earlier in this article.

Lessons of the November revolution

Albert Norden
PB member and Secretary,
CC, SUPG

This year the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and all the people of the GDR will be celebrating the 60th anniversary of the November revolution and the founding of the Communist Party of Germany. Preparations are also afoot for marking another memorable date, the 30th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic, the first socialist state of workers and peasants on German soil.

The November revolution, the first revolution of the German working class against imperialism and militarism, ranks among the outstanding events in our people's history and its lessons and experience have been taken into account by our Marxist-Leninist party from the first day of its existence. The revolution began on November 3, 1918, with the armed uprising of sailors and workers in Kiel, the Kaiser's key naval base. In a few days the revolutionary wave had swept the country. On November 9, at the urging of the Spartacus League, led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and the revolutionary shop stewards at the big factories, a general strike and armed uprising were launched by hundreds of thousands of workers and soldiers in Berlin. On the pattern of the October Revolution in Russia, Councils of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies were set up everywhere and in many places they exercised real power. Reactionary officials were dismissed from the state apparatus, the police and counter-revolutionary troops were disarmed, and armed detachments of revolutionary workers and soldiers were formed.

This revolutionary action by the German working class was crowned with some major successes: the war was brought to an end, the monarchy was abolished, the Kaiser's government was overthrown. Germany became a republic. Democratic and social rights were introduced for which the revolutionary workers had been fighting for decades. These included freedom of association, assembly and the press, universal suffrage, the eight-hour working day, and the right to collective bargaining. The reactionary emergency laws on the status of farm laborers were repealed. All this was a serious blow to the power of the German monopolists, junkers and militarists.

The November revolution was an important element in the chain reaction of mass revolutionary movements that had been set in motion by the Great October Revolution. As Erich Honecker, SUPG General Secretary and Chairman of the GDR Council of State, has stressed, 'the November revolution of 1918 is linked with the first anniversary of October, which ushered in a new era, not only in time but also in meaning.'[1] It is part of the new epoch in world history — the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Subsequent events even more clearly revealed the profound influence of the October Revolution and the world's first state of workers and peasants on the working people's struggle against imperialism. The victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, the fact that the Land of Soviets had repelled the attacks of internal and external counter-revolution gave a powerful impulse to the revolution in Germany. 'Talk to reaction in the Russian way!' became the watchword of the revolutionary German workers and soldiers from November 1918 onwards.

The November revolution eased the position of the young Soviet state and allowed the Soviet government to annul the rapacious peace treaty of Brest, which had been dictated by German imperialism. On Lenin's initiative the Soviet government offered the German workers fraternal aid in the form of grain deliveries. This, however, was rejected by the German government headed by the social democrats. The Soviet government made several peace proposals to the German government, including a proposal to resume diplomatic relations and establish a close alliance between the two countries. But these proposals were also ignored and the Soviet government's position was attacked and slandered.

The ruling classes of the victorious imperialist powers — the United States, Britain and France — at once realized how dangerous the victory of a socialist revolution in Germany and its conclusion of an alliance with Soviet Russia would be for them. They could not allow the workers and peasants to come to power in such an industrially developed country as Germany. They also feared that the victory of socialism in Central Europe would stimulate the revolutionary movement in other capitalist countries of Western, Southern and Southeastern Europe. To preserve their class domination, the ruling circles of the Entente countries were even prepared to support their former enemy — German imperialism — in its war against the revolutionary workers and soldiers. This intention was expressed in the directives addressed to the U.S. mission at The Hague (and telegraphed to Berlin by the German mission in November 1918): 'The Entente is unanimous on the point that concessions with regard to supplies, the armistice and peace negotiations are promised only on

condition that the Ebert Cabinet continues to exist in its present form . . . If the Ebert cabinet is replaced by the Bolsheviks, all the promised concessions become null and void. This would result in renunciation of the armistice and an invasion by the Entente.'[2]

The Entente would have found sufficient reason for carrying out these threats even in the return to Germany of the Soviet ambassador (whom the Ebert government had ordered to leave at the beginning of November). In other words, the Allies were openly threatening military intervention. At this time Germany's social-democratic government cabled a request for food supplies to the U.S. President, accompanying it with a guarantee that the existing order in Germany would be maintained or, in other words, that the revolution would be suppressed. And imperialism continued to intervene quite blatantly in the events of the German revolution.

On the other hand, the tactics of the German monopolists and junkers, supported by the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, was to win as many concessions as possible from the victor powers by scaring them with the 'Bolshevik' or 'Spartacus' menace in Germany. The influential representatives of the ruling classes were so terrified of a possible victory of the revolutionary workers and soldiers that they were even prepared to accept Western military intervention. Major General Max Hoffmann, for instance, who had imposed the rapacious Brest treaty on the young Soviet republic, made the following entry in his diary on December 16, 1918: 'I do not consider the Spartacus movement dangerous at present. If, despite everything, these people do gain the upper hand in Berlin, the Entente will occupy Berlin. Admittedly, this is not a very attractive prospect, but at least it is a safeguard.' This statement testifies to the cynicism and hypocrisy of leading figures among the ruling classes, whose talk of 'patriotism' actually concelaed the overruling desire to preserve their property and profits.

Despite the heroic struggle of the German revolutionary workers and soldiers, the imperialist bourgeoisie managed to maintain its rule. And the reason why this happened was that the right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic Party (SDPG) and the trade unions continued during the revolution to pursue the policy of class betrayal that they had begun during the war years. In October 1918 the leaders of the SDPG and the trade unions entered the Kaiser's government, thus helping to defend the monarchy and the imperialist state from the onslaught of the masses.

When it became clear that the popular uprising could not be prevented, the right-wing leaders of social-democracy did all they could to take the reins of the revolution and guide it into a 'calmer' channel that would present no danger to the imperialist system. The leaders of

the SDPG and the ISDPG (Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany) formed a government which they proclaimed 'socialist' and which, to confuse the masses, they called the 'Council of People's Representatives.' This government promised to carry out a socialist program but its very first steps betrayed its bourgeois and counter-revolutionary character. On the evening of November 10 Friedrich Ebert, the president of the Council of People's Representatives, and General Wilhelm Groener, acting in the name of the Kaiser's Field Marshall von Hindenburg, reached agreement on measures to be taken against the revolution. Later, in 1925, Groener had this to say on the subject: 'The aim of our alliance . . . was the complete defeat of the revolution, the restoration of the established governmental order, the strengthening of this governmental power by military might and the immediate convening of a National Assembly.' By means of this alliance the militarists gained the support of the right-wing social-democratic leaders in their attack on the revolution.

On November 15 representatives of the employers' associations decided to cooperate with leading functionaries in the trade unions in setting up a Central Cooperation Commission, thus consolidating the deal between the right-wing trade union leaders and finance capital. The monopolists celebrated this agreement as a victory for themselves, and not without reason. Hans von Raumer, himself a magnate in the electrical industry, wrote later: 'When all authorities — the monarchy, the state, the army and the bureaucracy — had collapsed, it (the commission — *A.N.*) created a force that kept business and industry in order by bringing together the employers and the trade unions.' The newspaper *Die Rote Fahne,* the central organ of the Spartacus League, aptly described the agreement as an 'insurance premium that the capitalists are willing to pay to safeguard themselves against attacks on the capitalist system.'

During the whole period of the revolution the right-wing leaders of the SDPG and the trade unions remained loyal defenders of the monopolists and militarists. By means of demagogy and anti-communist persecution they succeeded in undermining the working-class unity that had appeared at the beginning of the revolution. They cleverly exploited the fact that the broad masses were confused over the question of power and the ways to achieve socialism, and deliberately added to this confusion.

Most of the workers were unaware of the class, bourgeois nature of the parliamentary democratic state. Together with the bourgeois parties, the right-wing social democrat leaders tried to persuade the working class that the proclamation of a republic meant that the revolution had achieved its aim. In practice, however, they hindered the purging of the state apparatus, the restriction of the economic

power of the arms monopolies and big banks and encouraged preparations for armed counter-revolution. At the First All-Germany Congress of Councils they pushed through a decision to hold elections to the bourgeois National Assembly in January 1919. They were increasingly successful in controlling, damping down and suppressing working-class actions to defend and continue the revolution. The right-wing social democrat Gustav Noske made a characteristic statement in January 1919, when he declared his readiness to play the part of a 'bloodhound' (his own epithet) and put down the militant Berlin workers with the help of the counter-revolutionary troops.

Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered in January 1919. In March the same fate befell Leo Jogiches, who had assumed leadership of the CPG. Thousands of revolutionary workers were also wiped out in the bloodbath of counter-revolutionary terror. When the workers of the main industrial centers organized big strikes in the spring of 1919 and in some places waged armed struggle for the real nationalization of large-scale property, for the rights of the Councils of Workers' Deputies and Production Councils, and when the Councils proclaimed republics in Bremen and Munich, the right-wing leaders of social democracy in alliance with big capital and the militarists again took bloody reprisals against the proletariat.

The bourgeois Weimar Republic — and this is the lesson of its whole 15-year history — could have triumphed only as an anti-monopoly democracy; any other course was bound to lead to its destruction. To avoid retreat, the German Republic should have got rid of all reactionary officials in the state apparatus, placed natural resources, the junkers' estates, the heavy chemical and power industries, and the banks in the hands of the people, and thus deprived the reactionary forces of the economic levers of power. To avoid destruction, the German Republic should have liquidated Prussian militarism, the war-mongers and all the sworn enemies of socialism.

In other words, the republic could have survived only in combat with reaction, and for this it had an exceptional historical opportunity. But the bourgeois-parliamentary republic refused to take this opportunity. In resorting to an essentially anti-communist alliance with the ruling class and taking an active part in suppresing the revolution, the right-wing social-democratic leaders contracted a grave historical responsibility. Their policy had disastrous results not only for the German people, but also for the other peoples of Europe. 'The opportunist policy and ideology of the right-wing leaders of social-democracy,' states the *History of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany*, 'were the main reason why the German working class was unable in the November revolution of 1918-19 to decide the basic question of revolution, the question of power, in its favor. All efforts

to turn the November revolution into a socialist revolution failed. Its character remained that of a bourgeois-democratic revolution.'[3] Although the form of state administration changed there was no basic alteration in the power relationship. In the conditions prevailing in the bourgeois Weimar Republic and under cover of the social-democratic coalition policy, finance capital, the *junkers,* and the military who had not lost its hold, gradually built up its strength, established the Nazi dictatorship in Germany and unloosed the Second World War.

The revolutionary workers' movement was not strong enough during the November revolution to overcome the influence of reformist policies and ideology. The clarity of the position of the Spartacus League on the basic question of revolution, the revolutionary agitation that its leaders tirelessly conducted, and the incomparable heroism of this resolute and purposeful minority was no substitute for the lack of a revolutionary mass party. Ernst Thaelmann spoke of the 'tragedy of the German revolution,' which lay in "the contradiction between the existence of objectively mature revolutionary conditions, on the one hand, and the subjective weakness of the German proletariat, due to the lack of clearly oriented Bolshevik party, on the other.'[4]

In those November days of 1918 the bourgeoisie and the landowners had virtually allowed power to slip out of their hands. The people's action had routed the reactionary Kaiser generals, and their leader, Ludendorff, the Chief of the General Staff, had fled to Sweden. The princes were lying low, the big Junker landowners and magnates of heavy industry were afraid to leave their homes.

On the other hand, the masses were everywhere organizing massive demonstrations, strikes and taking up armed struggle. However, there did not yet exist a Marxist organization that could lead the struggle to satisfy the real urge for socialism. And yet Engels had written as far back as December 1889, 'For the proletariat to be strong enough to win on the decisive day, it must — and this Marx and I have been arguing ever since 1847 — form a separate party distinct from all others and opposed to them, a conscious class party.'[5] And the great October Revolution in Russia had convincingly shown that the proletarian revolution could win only if there was skillful leadership by a Marxist-Leninist party firmly committed to the scientific world outlook.

There was no such party in Germany in those days. The Communist Party of Germany came into being later, but at the height of the revolutionary battles, when a massive centralized strike-force was needed, it did not exist. For many weeks hundreds of thousands of people came out on the streets of cities, including Berlin, but they had

no political organization that could show them the right road and lead them in their struggle.

The exploiting classes had let power slip from their hands, but it was not taken up by the people. The majority of the suffering and starving workers were misled by the slogans of non-resistance with which the right-wing and centrist social democrats confused the masses and restrained them from decisive revolutionary action. 'Socialism is on the March!' proclaimed the government's enormous posters. But behind the scenes it organized the counter-revolutionary déclassé elements that were soon to oppose socialism and take a bloody revenge on the revolutionary workers.

So the experience of the November revolution showed quite clearly that without a revolutionary proletarian party of a new type, a party of the type created by Lenin, which could put down firm roots among the masses and lead them, it is impossible to decide the question of power in favor of the working class and its allies, and all the more impossible to embark on the road leading to socialism. The creation of such a party is the crucial problem of the struggle for the fulfillment of the historic mission of the working-class movement, the Archimedean point of leverage in the fight for social progress.

In the crucible of the November revolution the most progressive contingents of the working-class movement, the Spartacus League and other left-wing revolutionary groups, led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, reached this vitally important conclusion. It was based on the experience of the many class battles that had been waged in Germany, on the November revolution, and particularly on the example of the Great October. On December 30, 1918, the All-Germany Conference of the Spartacus League in Berlin, which was attended by 127 delegates from 56 local organizations, declared itself the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of Germany (CPG).

The main reports delivered by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and also the decisions passed by the Constituent Congress, showed how profoundly the German Marxist revolutionaries had learned the lessons of the November revolution, how unconditionally they had recognized the demands of the revolutionary epoch, and how fully their positions on the basic issues coincided with the positions of the fraternal Bolshevik Party.

At this Congress Karl Liebknecht spoke of the need to form a party 'resolutely and uncompromisingly defending the interests of the proletariat, a party solid and united in its aspirations and spirit, a party with a clear program and with goals and means . . . corresponding to the interests of the world socialist revolution.'[6] In the GCP program drawn up by Rosa Luxemburg the party recognized itself as 'the most clear-purposed section of the proletariat . . . defending the ultimate

socialist goal at each separate stage, and, in all national questions, the interests of the world proletarian revolution.'[7] In the founding resolution the party was declared to be 'a powerful instrument for carrying through the incipient social revolution.'[8]

In sharp contrast to all the petty-bourgeois utopian theories, class-neutral, abstract notions of socialism, the program characterized the socialist society as a result of the revolutionary struggle of the working class. The program was utterly realistic in its understanding of the essence of socialism and the complex objective conditions of making the transition to it.

In view of the historical experience of the German and international working-class movement the program drew the conclusion that every true step toward socialism would be met by the bitter opposition of the bourgeoisie as soon as it felt the danger threatening 'its holy of holies, its profis.' The bourgeoisie would 'incite the backward sections of workers against the socialist vanguard ... by a thousand means of passive resistance it will try to paralyze any socialist measure ... This resistance must be broken step by step with an iron hand and remorseless energy.'[9] The dictatorship of the proletariat is therefore an inevitable historical necessity. The socialist transformation of society can be carried out only through establishing the full political power of the working class, the working people. Fully in accord with the spirit of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, the program proclaimed: 'Such investing of the solid mass of the working people with full political power to carry through the revolution is, in fact, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and therefore it is true democracy.'[10]

Ever since the German communists set up their party they have regarded the struggle of the working class and the transition from capitalism to socialism in Germany as an inseparable part of the world revolutionary process begun by the October Revolution. In accordance with this position they declared their international solidarity with the Soviet state, the first real embodiment of proletarian rule. Immediately after the decision to found the CPG the Constituent Congress sent a message of greetings to the RSFSR.

The Constituent Congress showed that the German communists' attitude to the Soviet state and Lenin's party was not confined to expressions of class solidarity. It also reflected their desire to relate the experience of the victorious Bolsheviks to the German working-class movement, the desire to gain a deeper comprehension of Leninism. For example, in her report Rosa Luxemburg dealt profoundly with the problems of the state and revolution and linked them with the question of the international significance of the October Revolution and its lessons and also with the exposure of anti-Sovietism as an ideology of opportunism and counter-revolution. She

considered creation of workers' and soldiers' councils the ABC of revolution: 'When we hear slander against the Russian Bolsheviks we should never forget to reply: Where did you study the ABC of the present revolution? You borrowed it from the Russian workers . . .'[11]

The decisions of the CPG Constituent Congress and the principled statements of the CPG leaders show that the congress signified a final break with all forms of opportunism and revisionism and was the point where the German communists took their first and decisive step toward mastering Leninism. It was 'a turning point in the history of the German working-class movement. The German working class once again had an organized revolutionary vanguard with a clear Marxist program. The CPG began its road with the aim of bringing the German working class to power and it pursued this aim unswervingly. It was the living embodiment of a force that fought tirelessly to overcome the split in the German working-class movement caused by opportunism and to achieve working-class unity on a revolutionary basis.'[12]

All the successes of the German working class since the founding of the CPG are bound up with the activity of the revolutionary party of the German proletariat: they would not have been possible without the leadership that it provided. The founding of the CPG was the starting point of a development that led through bitter class struggle to the victory of the working class and its allies, to the formation of the German Democratic Republic.

Thanks to the defeat of nazism by the Soviet Union and its allies, the hour of opportunity again dawned for the German people, as it had in 1918. The CPG showed how the new possibilities could be used to bring about a radical turn in German history. The basic requisite for this, as CPG Chairman Wilhelm Pieck noted, was 'that the fundamental mistakes that were made in 1918 and that helped imperialism to recover power, should not be repeated. . . . The warmongers must be finally and completely deprived of power, the state apparatus must be purged of all reactionaries and replaced by a new, democratic apparatus. But the main lesson is that German working-class unity must be established and consolidated.'[13] This decisive conclusion formed the basis of specific political action. In April 1946 the CPG and the SDPG (led by Otto Grotewhol) merged on a Marxist-Leninist basis into a single revolutionary party of the German working class — the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Remembering the lessons of the November revolution, the German Marxist-Leninists aimed the main blow during the first stage of the revolutionary process against monopoly capital and the big estates. 'Our party saw its main task,' Erich Honecker has said, 'in equipping the working class with the ability to exercise guidance of all spheres of

social life and to form a broad alliance with the peasants, the intellectuals and the urban middle strata. This close tie with the masses made it possible to go over to the socialist revolution.'[14]

At this crucial moment the lessons of the November revolution were particularly relevant to the political struggle and theoretical work of the SUPG. In September 1948 Otto Grotewohl delivered a report at a conference of the SUPG leaders. He stressed the need for complete Marxist-Leninist clarity and revolutionary consistency in finally deciding the question of power in favor of the working class and its allies and taking the socialist road. 'Let no one think,' he said, 'that socialism can be achieved by some devious, roundabout way, without the winning of power by the working class under the leadership of its vanguard — the party.'[15] The lessons of the history of the working-class movement, particularly the defeat of the November revolution and its fatal consequences, imperatively demand 'a clear understanding of the kind of state we are aiming at, clear definition of its basic *qualitative* distinctions from the traditional bourgeois state. . . . It is a fatal mistake to imagine that our influence over the state can be guaranteed merely by taking over the commanding posts in the state. . . . *Only a thorough-going transformation of the traditional state can ensure us decisive influence over the new state,*' which must be 'an expression of the will of the new ruling progressive social forces.'[16]

Relying on Marxist-Leninist theory and benefiting from the historical experience of the German and international working-class movement, the SUPG led the working class and its allies to the formation of the GDR. And in October 1949 a state of workers and peasants arose on German soil which, as one of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat, expresses the interests of the whole working people.

Whereas the defeat of the November revolution had led to the Weimar Republic, which was to father the fascist form of imperialist bourgeois rule, the formation of the GDR signified the complete victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie in that country. German imperialism suffered a massive defeat. Socialism was forever established on German soil, bringing about a fundamental turn in the history of our people and a substantial shift in the balance of class forces in Europe.

The central question of any revolution was, is and remains the question of power. Thanks to the November revolution, this truth of Marxism-Leninism has taken deep root in the consciousness of the German communists and will never be forgotten. It has become our chief weapon in all subsequent confrontations with German imperialism. Because our party after the liberation from nazism remained mindful of the lessons of the November revolution and in the course

of a fierce struggle, with the support of the working class and the broad strata of the working people, established a new state power and was always consistently guided by the basic ideas of Leninism, because of all these things we were able to inflict a serious defeat on imperialism and ensure once and for all the dominant positions of the working class in the economy, state and society. In doing so, we carried out the most radical revolution in German history.

Three decades of socialist development have created a new, socialist Germany, a bulwark of peace and anti-imperialist struggle in the center of Europe. Its policy serves the cause of mutual understanding between the peoples. Our country's development has proceeded through the dictatorship of the proletariat, the creation of the foundations of socialism, and the victory of socialist production relations to the building of a developed socialist society, on the basis of the decisions of the Eighth (1971) and Ninth (1976) SUPG congresses. What the working people hoped and longed for at the time of the November revolution — a socialist system and a policy of lasting peace — all this and much else has become a reality in the new Germany, with its guarantees of true freedom and the broadest possible rights for the working people, social security and democracy at all levels of social, political and economic life. Step by step, as conditions permit, the socialist ideals are becoming our realities.

All this demanded strenuous effort. Everything we have won has had to be defended in bitter class confrontations with German and international imperialism. Just as it did during the November revolution, so throughout the three decades of our republic's existence imperialism has constantly tried with the help of diverse weapons from the armory of counter-revolution to prevent the building of socialism on German soil, to undermine and destroy the new system. For decades diplomatic isolation and ideological diversion, economic blockade and methodical sabotage have all been used.

But socialism has taken firm root in German soil and is vigorously growing. The guarantee of all our successes has been the fraternal alliance of the socialist German state with the Soviet Union and the firm place of our republic in the community of socialist countries. These factors have been decisive in preventing imperialism from playing its old trump-card — military pressure up to and including intervention. Worker and peasant power, the guidance of society by the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class have been and will continue to be the decisive basis of our development.

The road traversed by the GDR has shown that socialism can become a reality, and people's dreams of freedom, social security and human dignity can come true, only provided the working class and all working people, led by the Marxist-Leninist party, take their destiny

into their own hands, overthrow the power of the imperialist bourgeoisie, resolutely cut short all attempts at restoring this power, and consistently implement socialist changes in all spheres of society.

1. Joint Session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Supreme Soviet, November 2-3, 1977, to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Verbatim Report.
2. Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED, ZPA, St. 1/105/1.
3. Geschichte der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands. Abris. Berlin, 1978, pp. 39-40.
4. Ernst Thaelmann, Unternehmer und Gewerkschaften in der Weimarer Zeit. In: Deutsche Rundshau, 80 Ig., 1954, Heft 5, p. 433.
5. Friedrich Engels an Gerson Trier, 18 Dezember 1889, in Marx/Engels: Werke, Bd. 37, p. 326.
6. Protokoll des Gründungsparteitages der Kommunistischen Partei Deutschlands 1918 (30. Dezember 1918 — 1. Januar 1919).
7. Ibid., p. 323.
8. Ibid., p. 92.
9. Ibid., pp. 318-319.
10. Ibid., p. 319.
11. Ibid., pp. 205-206.
12. Geschichte der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands. p. 41.
13. Wilhelm Pieck: Der deutsche Imperialismus. Die Lehren aus seiner Entwicklung. In: Ders., Reden und Aufsatze. Auswahl aus den Jahren 1908-1950. Bd. II. Berlin, 1954, pp. 64-65.
14. Erich Honecker. Die Aufgaben der Partei bei der weiteren Verwirklichung der Beschlüsse des IX. Parteitage der SED. Berlin, 1978, p. 8.
15. Otto Grotewohl. Dreisig Jahre später. Die November-revolution und die Lehren der Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung Berlin, 1950, p. 141.
16. Ibid., pp. 116-117.

Worker participation in running society

Constantin Dascalescu
Political Executive
Committee member,
Secretary CC RCP

Building socialism and its all-round development is impossible without constant improvement of the organizational forms for discussing and taking decisions on how this should be done. At all stages, particularly in the last ten years, the Rumanian Communist Party has tried to devise a socio-political system and organizational structure that give the people, the builders of the new society, a true sense of being masters of their country, of assurance that everything undertaken for the sake of their present and future is undertaken with their

knowledge and by their will. As we see it, one of the major results of our country's advance along the socialist road is the creation of a broad, profoundly democratic organizational framework far more effective than any democracy of the past. This framework gives all citizens, regardless of nationality, the opportunity to play their part in guiding socio-economic processes at all stages and levels, in the governance of society as a whole.

Today we can claim that party, state and public activity penetrate to the very heart of economic and political life, that the party cadres, government officials and managerial personnel, and those who work for mass and other public organizations (such as the trade unions) are deeply involved in the people's everyday activity. We feel that with this achievement to its credit our party can be relied on to go on finding the most suitable structures, forms and methods of guiding social development.

The RCP works on the assumption that gradually perfecting the organization of economic and social life and party activity is essential to the building of a developed socialist society and going forward to communism. Hence its fundamental attention to improvement of the state and social system, of the style and methods of work and forms of organization in every sphere of socialist construction, all of which tends to consolidate its role as political leader of the nation, to widen the opportunities for participation of the working class, the whole people in national decision-making, in determining the country's socialist present and communist future.

In a report to the National Conference of the RCP at the end of 1977, Nicolae Ceaucescu, RCP General Secretary, spoke of the importance of this aspect of the party's work in further enhancing the role of the working class in the life of our society and helping the party to perform its function of guidance. He stressed that ' ... a proper organizational framework must also be created by means of which the working class — the ruling class of our socialist nation — could take a direct part in deciding all questions of home and foreign policy. Only by this means can the guiding role of the working class become firmly established in practice, and our party pursue its historic mission of organizing and guiding the people's efforts to build a comprehensively developed socialist society, and advance Rumania toward communism.'*

True to the dialectical-materialist world-view, the RCP regards organizational forms and structures of political, state and economic life as a dynamic, developing process. We apply the general principles of scientific socialism creatively to Rumania's specific conditions on

*Nicolae Ceaucescu. 'Raport la Conferinta Nationala a Partidului Comunist Roman. 7-9 decembrie 1977.' Bucharest, Editura politica, 1977, pp. 43-44.

the assumption that the forms and methods of guidance of practical activity should correspond to the specific tasks of the stage through which our society is passing. The RCP Central Committee is deeply interested in perfecting the system of political and social institutions and keeping them up to date. Thus our party contributes to the science of guiding socialist construction, to the common fund of revolutionary experience.

The RCP's inspiring policy of further improving the guidance of party and state life, of constant adjustment of the social mechanism to current social needs is closely associated with the indefatigable and dedicated activity of Nicolae Ceaucescu, the RCP General Secretary. He is tireless in his efforts to establish the revolutionary, scientific style of work, the dialectical blending of theory and practice, of theory and the specific aims of our country's progressive development, to keep the political and social organizational framework in accord with the guiding role of the Communist Party of Rumanian society, the needs of the country's speedy progress along the road of socialism and communism.

Organization plays an important part in perfecting political, economic and social guidance. It determines the patterns and standards of relations between the various components of society, the methods best suited to the specific conditions at any given stage. It is by organizing that the party puts its political programs into practice, mobilizes all forces, and unites the efforts of millions of people to achieve the vital objectives of each historical stage. New political, economic and social problems are always arising and the party is able to deal with them because it keeps its organizational work in tune with current needs, concrete conditions and specific features. Today, when qualitatively new processes are operating in Rumanian social and political life, our organizational work must be particularly responsive to current changes.

Organization has therefore become a vitally important factor in uniting the efforts of communists, of all the working people to fulfill the RCP Program, the party's decisions, and the targets of economic and social development its main aspect being the mobilization of every professional party worker, every party committee and bureau, every party member to take an active and effective part in fulfilling production targets and solving the problems of social and political life.

The Rumanian Communist party's organizational work is chiefly devoted to guiding the masses toward the economic and social targets, toward ever better results in material production. So its chief criterion of efficient organization is success in carrying out the production plan, the plan for output of export goods, the plan for return

on investment, in sum, the degree of profitability achieved by each enterprise, each economic unit.

Our party sees this as the most rational approach because, as most people know, socialism presupposes a level of development of the production forces capable of satisfying the constantly growing expectations of the population and providing a material and cultural standard consonant with modern civilization, the aspirations of socialist society, its socio-political maturity. So dynamic economic development must take priority in all party organizational and political work at all levels.

As the initiator and instrument of profound social transformations the RCP is itself experiencing profound qualitative changes. The streamlining of the organizational structure with a view to bring the leadership closer to the lower echelons, the increase in party membership over the past decade by more than one million, the increase in the proportion of industrial workers in the membership, from 42 to 51 per cent, the fact that 72 per cent of all Rumanian communists are directly involved in the material production sphere — all these things are clear testimony to the party's consistency in performing its historic mission of being the heart and soul of our whole social system.

The formation of a hard core of experienced party cadres, particularly from the working class, is of decisive importance in this respect. The competence and sense of responsibility with which they approach their tasks, their dedication to the party cause, the persistence they show in overcoming difficulties, their high moral qualities, the keeping of promises, and their sound proletarian revolutionary discipline have won our party cadres considerable prestige among the people. The masses follow them with increasing confidence and trust. It could be said that the work and skill of these party cadres in the state apparatus and all fields of socialist construction have become an inalienable element of our economic and social achievements.

One of the basic trends in party policy over the past decade has been expansion of mass participation in discussing and taking decisions on the crucial questions of national life. New national forums and permanent democratic bodies have been set up in order to deepen socialist democracy. The following forums have been held in the past two years: a congress of People's Councils, which instituted the Legislative Chamber of People's Councils; a congress of workers in political education and socialist culture; and a congress of agricultural workers, which organized a National Council of Agriculture, The Working People's Councils at industrial, construction and transport enterprises and industrial amalgamations also held a congress at which they set up a National Council of Working People.

These congresses, which are held every five years, offer the masses excellent opportunities for discussing and taking decisions on vitally important questions of economic and social development and the international policy of peace and cooperation pursued by the Socialist Republic of Rumania. The setting up of permanent bodies by national forums provides the optimal system of guiding our socialist society and is an eloquent testimony to the constant development of democracy based on direct mass participation in all public life and government.

The practical steps taken by our party show the great importance of the principle that party and state bodies should have all major projects concerning the life of the people or any part of it discussed by the masses. This principle is being realized in practice in our society as one of the basic trends of socialist democracy in Rumania because it is a most effective form of involving the masses directly in government and bringing out their creative abilities.

Just how deeply it has taken root in our system of governance, and how important it is from the theoretical and practical point of view is shown by the nationwide debate on the current five-year plan. The directives of the Overall Plan of Socio-Economic Development for 1976-80, which had been drawn up with the participation of many thousands of party workers, civil servants and managers, were discussed by the whole party, and then by the broad masses in the framework of a truly nationwide referendum, and were then endorsed at the 11th RCP Congress (November 1974). The December 1977 RCP National Conference again analyzed the five-year plan and introduced amendments that gave it even more mobilizing force and greater realism. To gain the support of the nation's most authoritative representatives — the elected deputies of the People's Councils — the party leadership in accordance with the law passed by the Great National Assembly submitted the plan for discussion by a congress of district People's Councils and chairmen of municipal, urban and rural People's Councils, a congress that would provide the broadest and most representative democratic forum in the country.

The congress was preceded by district conferences of the People's Councils, which discussed and approved the five-year plan of socio-economic development for 1976 to 1980 on a territorial basis, i.e., with a view to the needs and aims of their particular districts. This is further evidence of the RCP's constant concern to see that decisions on the basic questions of socio-economic development are born of conscious and businesslike debate by the masses, their collective wisdom and thinking.

The regular working visits made by the RCP General Secretary to all districts, to enterprises and offices, towns and villages are among

the most effective forms of consultation between the party and the broad masses of the working people. These working visits of the leader of our party and state, which are followed with great interest by the whole Rumanian people, invariably develop into moving expressions of the people's unbounded confidence in the party and their great respect for its General Secretary. These frank and friendly dislogues between Nicolae Ceaucescu and working people of various categories help to get problems solved quickly. They are of great use to the local party and state bodies and also help the RCP leadership to see the whole interconnected pattern of phenomena and to take decisions affecting the whole nation.

The RCP also consults the masses on crucial questions of home and foreign policy through public discussion in the mass media of the main draft laws before they are placed before the country's legislative bodies. Experience has shown that the press and other media encourage a broad and fruitful exchange of opinion among the people, a truly nationwide discussion. Such consultations really do help to perfect the draft laws in question, raise their standards and bring them into closer harmony with the needs of society and the aspirations of the whole people.

Today Rumanian communists are trying to make the method of consultation with the masses a major element in the activity of party, state and public bodies at all levels, so that all leading personnel are kept in close touch with the production units and spend the greater part of their working time there. A series of steps has been taken to cut out bureaucratic tendencies, excessive conference holding and to shift the accent of party and state work to the midst of the people's life, to where the material goods and spiritual values are actually created.

In concerning itself with debate at all levels of the state and social system, our party of course realizes that free exchange of views affords an opportunity for the expression of different opinions. We certainly do not imagine social democracy as a rigid pattern reducing different points of view to a common denominator. The political life of socialist Rumania shows that the way to clear up problems and arrive at the best solutions lies through a broad exchange of opinion. A clear-cut process of consolidating the people's socialist unity is characteristic of our society. Open, outspoken discussions are an objective necessity if the individuality of each citizen is to be fully expressed. When taking part in these discussions, citizens show their political and social initiative, take advantage of their democratic rights and shoulder the responsibilities that rest on every politically conscious member of society.

The party intends to go on deepening and extending the democratic

processes. This is convincingly demonstrated by the steps taken by the RCP to bring wider sections of non-party people into the political activities of party, mass and public organizations. This means giving them opportunities for leadership in various fields. The election of thousands of non-party deputies of the People's Councils and Working People's Councils at all levels, and of other democratic organizations indicates a broader exchange of opinion between all categories of people, and closer cohesion of working people of different nationalities, of the whole people united around the party.

The July 1978 Plenum of the RCP Central Committee adopted new measures to strengthen the party's ties with the masses. The Plenum orientated party bodies and organizations toward forming a broad circle of activists from among non-party people, who together with party workers would take a direct part in carrying our RCP policy.

This RCP Central Committee guideline is of great theoretical and practical importance. Party bodies and organizations have followed it by setting up non-party groups incorporating more than a million working people. The groups attached to local party organs have nearly 380,000 non-party activists and those attached to primary party organizations embrace more than 632,000.

What is our party's chief aim in setting up these groups? It wants non-party activists working under the guidance and direct supervision of the party bodies to direct their initiative and efforts toward the accomplishment of definite objectives of party policy, acting in accordance with the level of their general political, cultural, educational and professional knowledge.

The perfecting of party, state and public activity is a complex and manifold process embracing all aspects of the social and political life of Rumanian society. Just as the level of the party's political and organizational work and the activity of state institutions and organizations has risen in recent years, so also has the role of mass organizations in the life of society and there has been a considerable extension of their powers in the economic and social fields.

The trend toward combining party, state and public activity is becoming ever more marked. It finds expression in the closer interaction and link-up of state and public organizations. As a result of the measures taken by our party to perfect the institutional channels for bringing the mass and public organizations into socio-political life, the leaders of the main mass organizations are currently participating in the work of the government with the status of Cabinet ministers, and also in the work of the collegial leading bodies of ministries and departments, and of district, municipal and urban People's Councils. At the level of primary production and socio-cultural units, the chairmen of trade union committees, YCL secretaries and the chairmen of

women's commissions are entitled to a place in collective leadership as deputy chairmen of Working People's Councils.

The Rumanian Communist Party is deeply interested in building up democracy in the production sphere. For many years now such agencies of collective management as the Working People's Councils of enterprises and other economic units have been operating in industry, construction and transport. Not less than 75 per cent of the Council members are workers and foremen directly employed in production. The agricultural cooperatives have similar councils.

New measures were taken recently, on the basis of RCP Central Committee decisions, to enhance the role of the Working People's Councils in guiding enterprises and other units of economy. These measures include increasing the number of industrial workers and other working people on the Councils and having the party secretary simultaneously perform the duties of chairman of the Council, and the director of the enterprise, the duties of first deputy chairman of the Council and chairman of the Council's Executive Bureau. Besides the above-mentioned leaders, there is always one worker directly employed in production who is also a deputy chairman of the Council. It is indicative that in recent months, while the overall membership of Working People's Councils has increased by 45 per cent, the number of elected representatives of the work forces of economic units in these councils has risen by nearly 80 per cent. The proportion of elected representatives of the working people in the collective-management agencies of enterprises now exceeds 48 per cent.

Our party regards the steady increase in the number of women members of councils as a major success. The number of women in the collective-management agencies of enterprises has doubled in comparison with last year.

Similar processes are taking place in the collective-management councils of ministries and other central state bodies. Today 30 per cent of the members of these councils are production workers who have shown themselves to be mature, experienced people with a keen sense of responsibility and communist militancy.

The direct participation of industrial and other workers engaged in the sphere of material production in central and local managerial bodies has had a stimulating effect on socio-economic life, increased its revolutionary drive, helped to blend the experience of the masses with that of leading personnel, and forged deeper unity between the working masses and the leading bodies. And above all, these measures have given the working class, all working people a more responsible attitude to their role as masters of the means of production and enabled them to exercise greater daily direct control over these means and decide how they should be used.

By decision of the RCP Central Committee the secretary of the party organization is simultaneously chairman of the Working People's Council in all production and socio-cultural units. The only exception to this rule is the economic, socio-cultural and scientific units whose subdivisions are territorially far apart and not covered by a single party organization. In such cases the secretary of the party organization is the deputy chairman of the Working People's Council or — in scientific institutions — a member of the academic council.

The party secretary's performance of his own duties and those of chairman of the Working People's Council is not just an organizational measure. It has a revolutionary character and testifies to the RCP's determination to enhance the guiding political role of the party organization and to instill the spirit of party principle, efficiency and discipline in all spheres of economic and social activity.

Thanks to the above-mentioned measures the party organizations can directly exercise the right of supervision. They have the opportunity not only to study production and the main questions connected with plan fulfillment, but can also participate in solving any problems that arise far more quickly and effectively. The present status of the party secretary makes him particularly involved in managerial activity and prompts him to master its whole mechanism, to use all means of political and organizational work to ensure successful economic development.

These new and extremely important responsibilities of the secretary of the party organization of an economic unit, stemming as they do from his function as chairman of the Working People's Council, form an organic element of our party's conception that it is both possible and necessary for some activists to perform both party and state functions simultaneously.

Then years ago the RCP took the requisite measures to blend party bodies and organizations more closely into the life of society. One of the more original moves in this direction was the decision to entrust both party and state leadership duties to a considerable number of party cadres. This approach has been consistently applied at all levels, from the top down. For example, some members of the Political Executive Committee and some secretaries of the RCP Central Committee are working simultaneously in the leadership of state, economic and ideological bodies, and some ministries. At the level of district, municipal and urban party committees, the first secretaries, the secretaries for economic affairs and for propaganda are, in their state capacity, correspondingly chairmen and deputy chairmen of the executive bureaus or committees of district, municipal and urban People's Councils. In the villages the secretaries of the rural Party

Committees perform the function of a *primar* (chairman) of the village council.

All these measures, of course, imply a change not only of forms, but also of the quality, the content of leadership; they reflect the new processes at work in the life of society. As socialist social relations mature, the alliance between the working class and the peasantry becomes closer, and society more homogeneous, more united in all its parts. These processes inevitably lead to deeper interpenetration of the activities of party, state and public organizations. But as our experience has shown, it is not accompanied by an erosion or blurring of their specific functions. Quite the reverse. On the one hand, this interpenetration helps to clarify the powers and spheres of activity of each of these institutions and, on the other, it makes for better coordination of efforts and more rational use of social energy. It helps to make the work of state and public organizations more effective. In the long term all this tends to enhance the leading role of party bodies. After thorough testing our experiment has proved its worth.

The RCP sees the main result of these organizational improvements in the fact that today all party work is concentrated on the most important questions of economic and cultural life and on problems of administration and the state. Appointing the most capable party workers with considerable organizational experience and a mature political outlook chairmen of the People's Councils has made the work of these bodies more effective and dynamic and its style in many respects approaches that of party bodies and organizations. This shows itself in the strengthening of collective and democratic methods, encouragement of criticism and self-criticism, consolidation of ties with the masses, and the establishing of permanent and direct contacts between leading personnel and the population, a more sensitive and prompt response to their comments and requests and, above all, increased attention to the adoption of valuable proposals coming from the masses.

The General Assembly of Working People, the highest forum of leadership at an enterprise, has a vital place in the system of production democracy. It has the legally established right to discuss and pass decisions on all basic questions of development of production and improvement of working and living conditions of a given enterprise. The general assemblies of cooperative farmers enjoy the same rights.

For example, the general assemblies held at the beginning of this year give a vivid idea of the active role played by this forum in worker self-management. They were businesslike and down-to-earth and showed a strong sense of responsibility and revolutionary militancy. The 328,000 speakers were workers, foremen, engineers, researchers

and other working people. The assemblies summed up the results achieved by enterprises and institutions over the past year, analyzed shortcomings in the economic and social fields, and on the basis of criticism and self-criticism brought to light the reasons why some enterprises had not reached their targets for such indices as, for example, physical volume of output, return on investment, and improved efficiency. Speakers submitted a total of nearly 260,000 proposals aimed at improving economic and social activity.

At the same time the general assemblies analyzed and assessed the style and methods of work of the Working People's Councils and their executive bureaus, their performance in the economic and social fields. It was noted that party style and methods are being increasingly adopted by the Working People's Councils, that they have become more competent in analyzing problems, and working out solutions and decisions, that they are going further afield in search of leaders among technical personnel and advanced workers. Some speakers, however, criticized members of the councils and executive bureaus for not living up to their responsibilities. Making full use of their rights, some general assemblies did not re-elect those who had not justified the confidence placed in them and had failed in their commitment.

In accord with the decision of the March (1978) Plenum of the RCP Central Committee active preparations for further improving the economic machinery are going ahead throughout the country. The aim is to create conditions for an even fuller manifestation of all the objective economic features of socialism by strengthening the material and financial levers of worker self-management and the autonomous financial-economic activity of enterprises. Priority is being given to allowing the Working People's Councils more say in drawing up their own plans and budgets and extending their rights to take decisions on questions of the socio-economic development of enterprises. This is, of course, done within the framework of the general unified national economic plan, which ensures harmonious, balanced development of the whole economy. At the same time territorial-administrative units, district, urban and rural People's Councils are to be provided with both the material and financial means and the broader powers needed to make self-management a reality. And finally, the measures outlined by the RCP Central Committee are aimed at further stimulating the working people's interest in accelerating economic development, particularly through direct participation in the profit made by each enterprise.

We are confident that this set of measures will give a fresh impulse to development of the productive forces, growth of the national

income, and thus contribute to our society's general advance and the raising of material and cultural standards.

The organizational framework set up in Rumania offers favorable conditions for free participation of the working class, of all citizens in guiding the life of society. The measures for further strengthening workers' democracy and establishing the guiding role of the working class guarantee that the revolutionary spirit will prevail in all sectors of social life, that organization and discipline will answer the need of resolute advance along the socialist road.

Of course, we realize that organizational forms are not in themselves enough to ensure the proper functioning of socialist democracy. The party and other public organizations and bodies seek to achieve this by giving these newly created organizational forms a real and vital content, so that home and foreign policy is planned and carried out on the basis of actual collective participation of the working people, the whole nation.

Active worker participation in guiding the country's social development is ensured not only by extension of civil rights and freedoms, but also by the consistent policy of the Rumanian Communist Party and the government, designed to steadily expand the horizons of the masses, improve their skills and knowledge of politics and ideology, and cultivate the new, socialist mentality.

Our socio-political practice indicates that the conscious and competent participation of the masses in government, in decision-making is an important condition for prompt and effective leadership. The basic aims of educational work in present-day Rumania are to give every working person, every citizen a sense of personal responsibility for the vital interests of our society, the conviction that personal happiness and well-being are inseparable from the happiness and well-being of the whole people.

The RCP's political, theoretical and ideological-educational work is geared to its political program, to the fostering of new ethical and spiritual values. The Rumanian working class, the whole people have, thanks to this, entered a stage when a deep-going process of raising their ideological-political and professional standards is gaining momentum. This process is helping the masses to understand that socialism and communism are something that they themselves must create, that everybody must do his bit toward building the new system. The party's program for developing the working people's socialist consciousness has the specific aim of turning every labor collective, every production team, into a school of communist education, into a revolutionary citadel where the working person becomes an active fighter, a conscious builder of his own history, of Rumania's communist future.

viewpoints

African panorama

NATO, HANDS OFF AFRICA!

Progressives everywhere have been doing a great deal to expose the moves by imperialism in Africa, where the NATO powers, led by the United States, have lately mounted a big neo-colonial offensive, with the use of diverse ways and means against national-liberation movements, including direct armed intervention.[1] This was best demonstrated in Zaire's Shaba Province, where a popular uprising broke out in the spring of 1978. The subversive acts by imperialism arouse the concern and indignation of honest people all over the world.

WMR asked some of the participants in an international conference of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement held in Colombo, Sri Lanka to comment on these issues. Below are their replies.

Nouri Abdel Razzak Hussein
Acting Secretary-General, Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO)

Developments in Africa over the past several months were marked, on the one hand, by greater activity on the part of the forces of liberation, peace and progress, and on the other, by intensified subversive acts on the part of world imperialism and reaction against these forces, and attempts to establish puppet and reactionary regimes wherever possible and by any means, and to turn the continent into a vast neo-colonial zone.

That is the light in which one should see the events in the south of the continent (Rhodesia, Namibia and RSA), in Zaire, Western Sahara and the Horn of Africa. There is no doubt at all about the motives of the powers which had for centuries colonialized, enslaved, plundered and devastated Africa, exploited with impunity its tremendous mineral and manpower resources, supported feudal, colonial, racist and fascist regimes, and which up to now have very large economic and strategic interests on the continent.

The establishment of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1963 largely helped to strengthen independence and security on the continent. And just as they had resisted the liberation struggle and resorted to aggression against progressive governments in Africa, the imperialists seek to paralyze and undermine the OAU, and to make it abandon the noble goals and principles it has proclaimed. Imperialism is carrying on a broad offensive for fresh conquests to re-colonize the continent.

The offensive has become especially fierce in the recent period. The United States, France, Belgium, West Germany, Great Britain, all the NATO militarists have strained to overthrow progressive African governments, as will be seen from the invasion of Guinea and Benin, the assassination of President Marien Ngouabi of the People's Republic of Congo, the repeated aggressions against Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, and Botswana, and other hostile acts aimed to impose puppet regimes on these countries and to paralyze the armed liberation struggle going forward in the south of the continent.

The imperialist threat to Africa became especially obvious after the Shaba events. The uprising which broke out there gave vent to the broad struggle which the people of Zaire are carrying on against Mobutu's discredited, corrupt, oppressive and puppet regime. NATO carried out the U.S.-coordinated armed intervention in Shaba by sending in French and Belgian troops with the use of technical facilities made available by the United States. Hundreds of Africans were killed in the course of this operation, which the imperialist press said was staged 'to save our citizens' and 'protect Western interests.'

After this, a so-called inter-African emergency force was set up on France's initiative, with the technical equipment entirely provided by U.S. imperialism. Its task is to intervene in countries where popular uprisings break out. This decision is fraught with the most dangerous consequences. One has to ask this question: how African is this force? This quite obviously amounts to Africa's 'NATO-ization,' a criminal imperialist attempt to prop up the shaky and discredited regimes on the continent.

The dangerous nature of the imperialist strategy of destabilization and intervention in Africa was once again confirmed by the coup in the Comoro Islands, staged by French mercenaries under B. Denard, as a result of which the country's President Ali Soilih was killed and imperialist puppets installed at the head of the state. One should also bear in mind that France continues its illegal occupation of the island of Mayotte, so preventing the people of the Comoro Islands to achieve the country's territorial integrity.

Let us note the continuing explosiveness of the situation in the Horn of Africa. Imperialism and reaction have persisted in their plots

in order to rekindle the flames of war and to turn the area into one of constant tension and conflict. This means frustrating its peoples in their efforts to consolidate their revolutionary gains, their sovereignty and independence, and in tackling the chief problems of socio-economic development; this means splitting the unity of the progressive states in Africa and destabilizing their regimes. Attempts are being made to 'internationalize' problems which are basically national and internal, to impel the OAU to interfere in the internal affairs of its member-countries, and so to divert the energy of the organization from the chief and real problem facing it, namely, the liberation of Southern Africa. Here one must emphasize the role of U.S. imperialism as the mainstay of the anti-popular imperialist alliance.

Imperialist strategy is designed to make Africans fight Africans (just as they tried to make Asians fight Asians) and to separate them from socialist-community countries, which are their true historical allies. However, it is the socialist countries that have always given concrete and active support to all the liberation movements in Africa, and we must constantly give reminders of this.

All the progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist forces — including our Afro-Asian solidarity movement — need to realize the real significance and nature of the fresh imperialist offensive in Africa, which is being covered up with lying, fraudulent slogans, and to frustrate the foul schemes of world imperialism.

The AAPSO Secretariat has proposed that every year the week from July 24 to 31 should be marked as a week of solidarity with fighting Africa. We urge greater vigilance, and a tireless fight against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, foreign military bases in Africa, and for the continent's full and final liberation. The enemy must be thrown out of Africa!

P. Peirson-Matthey
Assistant Professor, Brussels University, Member, Belgian Committee Against Colonialism and Apartheid

In Africa, the imperialist powers have now gone over to the offensive so as to keep the continent under a neo-colonial yoke and to deprive the national-liberation movements and the newly-independent states of the fruits of their victory, whatever the price.

We in Belgium were naturally most of all stirred by the events in Zaire's Shaba Province in the spring of this year. We find in these events cause both for optimism and for grave apprehension.

The struggle being carried on under the leadership of the Congo National-Liberation Front is a source of optimism. This struggle, assuming various forms — patriotic action, demonstrations, popular uprisings — shows once again that despite the burden of oppression,

poverty and economic chaos from which the people suffer, despite the criminal acts of imperialism seeking to keep the country under its control, the same people has succeeded in setting up its National Front, which is fighting to establish a regime, a society from which economic, social and cultural exploitation will be eliminated for good.

The imperialists dare talk about foreign intervention meaning the socialist countries which have always displayed solidarity with the liberation struggle, above all the USSR, Cuba and the GDR, and also the African states which originated in the flames of liberation struggle, like the People's Republic of Angola. But the struggle waged by the people of Zaire has blasted this criminal lie and the imperialist claims that the acts caused by the policy of oppression and exploitation pursued by Zaire's neo-colonial regime, and the imperialist powers' efforts to save the regime, are due to external interference.

But the events in Shaba are also a source of grave apprehension.

The overt armed intervention by imperialism, notably by France and Belgium, supported by the United States and the FRG, and also — we have to state with regret — by some African countries, has shown very well that in situations of crisis, like the events in Shaba, the imperialist governments objectively turn out to be allies of the RSA apartheid regime.

We were deeply shocked by the manipulation of pubic opinion in our countries designed to justify the armed intervention by the West, manipulation which is reminiscent of the methods used by the apartheid regime.

We were outraged by the racist character of the 'humanitarian intervention' which was designed to 'save' one category of human lives, namely, that of the European agents of the economic interests of imperialism.[2]

We were outraged by the scandalous injustice of the situation in which, on the one hand, the African peoples of Namibia, Rhodesia and South Africa are being constantly subjected to savage reprisals and decimation, in which independent African countries, like Angola and Mozambique, are targets of repeated armed aggressions by the South African minority racist regimes, and on the other, a situation in which the imperialist powers hasten to intervene in the events in Zaire so as to 'save the lives' of Europeans, of whites, while refusing to intervene to stop the killing of Africans.

The recent events in Shaba make it even more imperative to take coordinated and united action against the neo-colonial policy of imperialism, so as to isolate the apartheid regime in South Africa, and to support the national-liberation movements: the African National Congress (ANC, South Africa), SWAPO (Namibia) and the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front.

Sam Musialela
Member, CC SWAPO, Namibia

The fighting people of Namibia have condemned the NATO powers' conference on security in Africa (May 1978). Such security can be maintained only within the framework of the OAU, an organization set up to defend the interests and aspirations of the peoples of our continent, and it is the natural forum for seeking solutions to political or military crises in Africa.

Security and stability on the continent are threatened by the white minority governments of Smith and Vorster, which are supported by the imperialists of the United States and other Western powers. The brazenness of Pretoria's illegal regime, which has refused to pull out of Namibia for many years, springs from its confidence in the support on the part of the imperialist powers. The latter have invested vast amounts of capital in Namibia, Zimbabwe and the RSA, and make fantastic profits there on the sweat and blood of the native population.

The Vorster regime has also acted in the same brazen manner with respect to Angola. Since its overt invasion in August 1975, the RSA regime has given open support to every attempt by the puppet, reactionary UNITA outfit to destabilize the government of the MPLA — Party of Labor. The mercenaries of UNITA and FNLA, a similar puppet and reactionary grouping, are being trained on RSA bases in Namibia. At the same time, the racist regime wants to involve them, like the refugees who were forced to leave Angola during the civil war, in an election on the eve of Namibia's independence so as to increase the chances of the so-called Turnhalle Democratic Alliance.[3]

Taking a broader view of the situation, one could say that the problems of Ethiopia, the crisis in Zaire in connection with the Shaba events, the situation in Western Sahara and the RSA army's criminal raid on the territory of Angola to kill our refugees in the village of Kassinga, all provide concrete evidence that the NATO powers are trying to recolonize Africa. They also seek to do away with genuine national-liberation movements in the south of the continent: the African National Congress of South Africa, the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front, and SWAPO.

We peoples fighting for national liberation declare to the NATO powers: take your dirty imperialist paws off Africa, stop undermining the OAU and its Charter!

The struggle for national liberation is gaining momentum. The imperialists and all the reactionaries of the world cannot stop it. We are sure that an inglorious end is at hand for colonial rule in Zimbabwe, the RSA and Namibia. The triumphant experience of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bisseau, and the earlier triumph of the

Vietnamese revolution show that the peoples of the world have risen in one common thrust to put an end to the ignominious acts of imperialism and to win complete liberation, independence, peace and social progress.

Philemon T. Makonese
Secretary for Organization, Zimbabwe African
People's Union (ZAPU)

The imperialist powers have trotted out their old bogy, claiming that a 'Soviet-Cuban invasion' of Africa is under way. They think that they will scare us by saying that Soviet-Cuban assistance is communism. But our friendship with the USSR, Cuba and other socialist countries has an ideological basis. Besides, our relations with the socialist countries are an expression of the anti-imperialist content of our movement and growing solidarity of the international proletarian movement.

We are also aware that some independent African countries now play the part of agents-provocateur. Confronted with grave internal problems, their leaders have forgotten about the existence of the OAU and have turned to the imperialist powers for aid, as President Mobutu, the Zairean friend of the imperialists, has done. After all, he could have turned for help to the OAU, if he had believed that Zaire was facing an aggression. However, he turned to the imperialists.

Take Zimbabwe. The notorious 'internal settlement' is no more than an imperialist-designed way of dampening the revolutionary spirit of ZAPU and the Patriotic Front.[4] It was the British imperialists who advised Smith to resort to this internal settlement in the hope of depriving us, all the patriots of Zimbabwe, of our footing. In order to make the internal settlement appear to be acceptable to the people of Zimbabwe, they found reactionary elements among the Africans themselves, whose chiefs — Muzorewa, Sithole and Chirau — joined Smith in a transitional council which now nominally rules Rhodesia.

But unfortunately for the imperialist architects and their agent Smith, the people of Zimbabwe have been stepping up their revolutionary liberation struggle. It is this struggle that marks the watershed between the enemies of the people of Zimbabwe and their friends, between those who support Muzorewa and Sithole, and those who support the struggle led by the Patriotic Front.

The imperialists and their agents in Rhodesia seek to destabilize the Patriotic Front and to cast doubt on its political approach to the solution of the Zimbabwe problem. The British imperialists, who are aware of their weakness, want to hide behind the backs of the U.S. imperialists. But we insist that the British colonialists have the Rhodesian problem on their conscience, it is their responsibility.

They can take advice from anyone they like, including the United States. We, too, can take advice from the Soviet Union, Cuba and the GDR. But the proposals we put forward are our own.

The socialist countries are natural allies of the national-liberation movements in Africa. Africa cannot be scared by heart-rending shouts about a 'Soviet-Cuban invasion' of the continent. This is a bogy used by the imperialist powers, the NATO countries, pursuing their policy of destabilizing independent African states and seeking to appear as the 'liberators' of Africa. Just now, the imperialists advise Africans to set up a so-called inter-African armed force, which will actually be under NATO's command. This force could evidently also be used against the struggle of the Zimbabwe people. The imperialists claim that the people of Zimbabwe will never win without Soviet and Cuban assistance. But that is only a pretext for armed intervention. The Soviet Union and Cuba can help us — above all by supplying military equipment — and teach us how to use it. But the liberation of Zimbabwe is our own business, and we shall carry it on to the end.

Khauta Khasu
National Chairman, Basutoland Congress Party

The African peoples are aware that the Soviet Union and Cuba are seeking to help Africans to attain independence, and have been doing this as their true friends. The imperialists cannot cite a single instance, a single case in which the Soviet Union and Cuba have demanded for themselves even a small scrap of African land.

In Zimbabwe, there is not a single Soviet or Cuban citizen fighting submachine gun in hand. The war is being waged by the patriots of Zimbabwe themselves. Those who are fighting against them are the British and Americans helping Smith. Smith is also getting help from the FRG and all the other NATO countries. They allow recruitment of mercenaries in their countries for war in Zimbabwe. The British government asserts that there is no law in Great Britain prohibiting the recruitment of mercenaries. But in the present conditions the British should have prohibited such recruitment. But since it is going on, we believe that the patriots of Zimbabwe are also fighting a war against Great Britain.

A few words concerning the stand taken by the government of the People's Republic of China on African issues. It is a stand at which we are surprised, to put it mildly.

The PRC government claims that it adheres to Marxism-Leninism. But progressive people in Africa say that the present PRC leadership has turned its back on Marxism-Leninism and has sided with imperialism. Indeed, what are Cuba and the Soviet Union doing in Africa? They are helping fighters for freedom. Meanwhile, the PRC

leadership has firmly taken the other side. Let us recall that the OAU Charter lays down that there must be no violation of post-colonial borders in Africa. But what is the issue of the African Horn? It is a border issue. Anyone who is not biased will realize that Ethiopia is carrying on its struggle within the framework of the OAU Charter. Consequently, the 'Soviet-Cuban intervention' is merely an unseemly invention. If there are Soviet and Cuban people in the Horn of Africa, the only thing they are doing there is helping us Africans abide by the OAU Charter. Is that a bad thing?

As for the PRC, in the conflict in the Horn of Africa it has sided with Somalia, and in Zaire it has acted hand-in-glove with the imperialist forces. That is why we cannot say that the PRC leadership is following the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The Chinese were members of the AAPSO. They were not expelled, but stopped cooperating with this organization. We Africans do not, of course, want to interfere in the PRC's internal affairs, but we favor consistent observance of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. And we have not forgotten the old saying: 'Tell me who your friends are, and I will tell you who you are.' The PRC leadership is now working hand-in-glove with the United States, France and other NATO powers. They have been talking about a great leap forward. Everyone now sees that they have executed a great leap back, from the Africans' standpoint, at any rate.

Ganga-Mbala
Section Head, Foreign Relations Department, Congolese Party of Labor; Head of Department of Congolese Association of Friendship among Nations

Our continent now finds itself in a dramatic situation. Chairman of the party's Military Committee Joachim Yhomby-Opango recently spoke out quite clearly on this matter. He specifically emphasized two questions: Western Sahara and the establishment of an inter-African force, which were considered by the Franco-African Conference in Paris.

On the question of Western Sahara, our standpoint has been repeatedly recorded in the OAU. This is a highly urgent matter which must be solved swiftly, because it is necessary to close our ranks, the ranks of the progressive states, against foreign intervention. Western Sahara is an important base for reaction, for NATO, for French imperialism. The situation here is clear. The OAU Charter clearly lays down that each African state must maintain the borders inherited from colonialism. Since Morocco and Mauritania have been independent for a long time, it is quite natural for the Sahraoui people to determine its own future itself. Let us bear in mind that so long as

Western Sahara was a Spanish colony, neither France nor Morocco helped its people's struggle against the colonialists. They are attracted to this territory above all by its resources, by its key strategic location. That is why the NATO countries do not want a popular regime to be established there, they do not want to allow the people of Western Sahara to decide its own future.

Furthermore, the Congo believes that the decision of the Franco-African summit conference to set up a so-called inter-African emergency force will have exceptionally grave consequences. There is not a single African country that has not been shocked by this decision.

It is clear to us that the imperialists, with their backs to the wall, find it ever harder to contain the popular forces on the African continent. That is why the African countries regard the decision to set up an 'inter-African emergency force' as a decision to support unpopular regimes threatened by their own peoples.

With the revolutionary pressure in Africa steadily building up, the imperialists and reaction are looking for new means of resisting the rising peoples. That is why they have been shouting so loudly about the need for 'defense against Soviet-Cuban intervention.'

With this noise as a background, the leaders of NATO have decided to extend the sphere of its activity to the south of the Tropic of Cancer, a decision which fits neatly into the framework of the policy of destabilizing progressive regimes and re-colonizing Africa.

Imperialist propaganda has been trumpeting about the Soviet Union and Cuba's sinister schemes in Africa. Wherever there are disorders, loud noises are made about Europeans falling 'victim to the Cubans.' Of course, one can say almost anything. But can anyone point to a single socialist country that has colonized this or that African country?

1. See 'The imperialist policy of destabilization and the developing countries,' *WMR*, September 1978. — *Ed.*

2. According to the Zaire Red Cross, the 'second war in Shaba' left 855 killed, of whom 136 were Europeans and other expatriates, 419 soldiers of the Zaire army and insurgent detachments, and 300 Zaire civilians (*Le Monde*, July 19, 1978, p. 4). — *Ed.*

3. An alliance of right-reformist white and African leaders in Namibia, set up by the Vorster regime to counter SWAPO. — *Ed.*

4. See Joshua Nkomo's interview, *WMR*, February 1978. — *Ed.*

The people's will is invincible

Naim Ashhab
PB member, CC, Jordanian CP

IMPRESSIONS OF A TRIP TO THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

Anyone who has recently visited Democratic Yemen must have seen its leaders' enthusiasm and vigor. Since the defeat of the deviationist clique, headed by former chairman of the Presidential Council Salem Rubayi Ali, the United Political Organization — National Front (UPONF)[1] has worked to solve a number of fundamental problems as soon as possible. One of these is the establishment of a vanguard party on the principles of scientific socialism. This is to be done in October 1978.[2] There is also the task of adopting the second five-year economic development plan. This is to be followed by general elections[3] and the formation of a Legislative Council, the final phase in the shaping of the country's constitutional organs.

All these are constructive tasks in the further development of the South Yemeni revolution. But Arab reaction, led by the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Egypt, is doing all it can to prevent their fulfillment, especially the establishment of a vanguard party.

What are the roots of the struggle which was fought over a period of years between the nucleus of the revolutionary leadership of Democratic Yemen and the Salem Rubayi Ali clique?

The conflict originated in the early years of Democratic Yemen, or, to be more precise, in the period when the right-wing group, headed by President Qahtan ash-Sha'abi, was removed from power in June 1969. That was when Salem Rubayi Ali became Chairman of the Presidential Council and began gradually to concentrate extremely broad powers in his own hands. He interfered literally in everything, hampered the normal operation of some Ministries and prevented fulfillment of the decisions taken by the Political Bureau of the National Front.

In 1972, the struggle between the NF leadership and the Presidential Council Chairman became explicitly political. Salem Rubayi Ali's views and actions began to be influenced by Maoist conceptions, especially in assessing the role of the three main contingents of the world revolutionary movement. In 1975, Salem Rubayi Ali and his

clique tried to prevent the merger of the country's revolutionary-patriotic forces into one organization. The struggle came to a head in September of last year, when the Seventh Penary Meeting of the Central Committee of the UPONF adopted a decision to set up a vanguard party of the working class and its allies to work on the basis of scientific socialism. Salem Rubayi Ali opposed the decision, thereby challenging the authority of the CC Plenary Meeting.

Information which the UPONF Central Committee had at its disposal before Salem Rubayi Ali's removal from power shows that more than political or ideological differences were involved. In order to strengthen his own positions, the former President sought allies abroad. He began with the rulers of Egypt, and then established contacts with Saudi Arabia and the United States. These were the 'friends' who insisted on his hitting out at the party leadership.

The open conflict between the UPONF and the Salem Rubayi Ali clique also involved other important aspects of the activity of the party and the state. Characteristically, the clique's stand, like that of any opportunistic movement, alternated between ultra-leftist and ultra-rightist. Thus, objecting to the establishment of a vanguard party based on the theory of scientific socialism, the former President's henchmen pushed the process of nationalization beyond reasonable limits, and this in an economically very backward country. The 'total' nationalization which they proposed was bound to turn broad sections of the petty bourgeoisie into enemies of the revolution, and this, given the extreme weakness of the existing industry and the small size of the working class, was fraught with highly dangerous consequences. The clique was also responsible for a number of excesses in implementing the land reform.

In foreign policy, Salem Rubayi Ali opposed closer relations with the socialist-community countries, notably, the Soviet Union, while urging development of ties with Saudi Arabia and the imperialist powers. He kept saying, among other things, that there was a need to 'diversify'' the sources of the arms the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was getting.

At one point, the Saudi Arabian rulers felt that concrete steps had to be taken in support of Salem Rubayi Ali. Following his visit to Al-Riyadh in the summer of 1977, they announced the granting to Democratic Yemen of two credits totalling 120 million Saudi riyals. In addition, they agreed to resume supplies of crude oil to the oil refinery in Aden (this is one of the largest oil refineries in the Middle East, with a capacity of up to eight million tons a year. Since the country's independence, it has been more or less idle because of the boycott by the oil companies and Saudi Arabia). However, Saudi Arabia refused to honor its widely advertised promises, having soon realized that

with the existing balance of forces in the country the Salem Rubayi Ali clique could not reorient Democratic Yemen's development.

The final round in the struggle between the revolutionary leadership and the Salem Rubayi Ali clique opened with the decision of the UPONF Central Committee on a purge of the state apparatus and the armed forces as a necessary measure before the establishment of a vanguard party. Many supporters of the former President were naturally affected by the purge. This was the situation in which he staged his provocative act, when he planted a bomb in the briefcase of his special envoy to Ahmed Hussein al-Ghashimi, President of the Yemen Arab Republic, who was killed in the explosion.

The main purpose of that crime was apparently to provide Salem Rubayi Ali with an opportunity to resume his extraordinary powers under the pretext that the country was on the brink of war with North Yemen. His next step would have been to do away with the party leadership, revoke all the earlier decisions, above all the decision to establish a vanguard party, and to change the country's general line.

At an emergency meeting of the UPONF CC, which was called immediately upon the report of the assassination of the President of the Yemen Arab Republic, Salem Rubayi Ali tried hard to prevent any discussion of the causes of that crime, sought to intimidate those present with the prospect of war and insisted that the necessary measures be taken. At the same time, he was preparing to eliminate the nucleus of the party leadership. Arms and military men discharged in the purge were prepared for the operation scheduled for June 30. He had his supporters in some of the outlying parts of the country, especially in the third Governorate, where he was born and where he could rely on his tribal connections.

However, his calculations were overtaken by events. The UPONF Central Committee forced the President to resign because he had been involved in the assassination of al-Ghashimi and the struggle broke out before the date he had set. The party's vigilance deprived the mutineers of the opportunity of making use of the stockpiles of weapons (notably an arsenal with a large stockpile of Chinese weapons near the center of the third Governorate) and of winning over vacillating elements in the military units and mass organizations.

Developments in both Yemens, i.e., the Yemen Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, since the end of June have made it perfectly clear that they are connected with the ever more active conspiratorial moves by the forces of imperialism, Zionism and reaction against the progressive regime in Democratic Yemen.

There are various facts confirming the international character of the conflict over Yemen. Thus, the U.S. press has admitted that the

failure of the Salem Rubayi Ali conspiracy was a body blow to U.S. policy. Characteristically, U.S. ruling circles, together with reactionary Arab regimes, have been doing everything to push the North Yemen rulers into an aggression against Democratic Yemen. This goes hand in hand with a wild propaganda offensive and attempts to distort the character of the progressive regime in Democratic Yemen. The United States announced a 30-fold (sic!) increase next year in the volume of military aid to North Yemen (from about $5 million to $150 million). French armored carriers, paid for by Saudi Arabia, are already being delivered to that country. Military specialists and advisers from Egypt and several other Arab countries have also been arriving in the country. The expenses are also being financed by Saudi Arabia, which heads the conspiracy against Democratic Yemen.

Thus, following the failure of the plans to eliminate the progressive regime in Democratic Yemen from inside, i.e., with the aid of Salem Rubayi Ali and his clique, the imperialist circles and Arab reaction have turned to external aggression. Nor is North Yemen the only instrument. Oman or Egypt could also act in this capacity.

The conspiracy against Democratic Yemen and the attempts to destabilize the situation in the country are a part of the offensive mounted by the forces of imperialism, Zionism and reaction on the scale of the whole region by way of a 'revenge' for the revolution in Afghanistan, the consolidation of the revolutionary regime in Ethiopia and the defeat of the aggression in the Ogaden. Its architects assume that Democratic Yemen's economic condition and geographic situation make it the weakest link in the anti-imperialist front. Hence the special importance of the defeat of the conspirators and the victory of the progressive regime in Democratic Yemen, a victory which shows that there are real possibilities for frustrating the machinations of imperialism, Zionism and reaction, and that these are ensured above all through the unity of the healthy forces in society.

At the same time, the Yemen events testify to a sharpening of the class struggle in our region, and a further demarcation of forces in the Arab world, which began with Sadat's cap-in-hand visit to Jerusalem. The working class of the Arab countries, its parties and trade unions, and a number of anti-imperialist Arab regimes have resolutely sided with Democratic Yemen, against the reactionary bloc headed by Saudi Arabia. Spokesmen for North Yemen's patriotic and democratic organizations have declared that they will not remain uninvolved in the event of an aggression against Democratic Yemen. A similar stand has been taken by progressive forces in other Arab countries. Firm support for Democratic Yemen has come from the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. Relying on broad

international solidarity, the people of Democratic Yemen are fully determined to rebuff any aggression.

The experience of the revolution in Democratic Yemen over the past 15 years is rich and instructive, and is highly valuable for the patriotic, anti-imperialist democratic forces in the Arab and other developing countries.

The revolution began as a patriotic movement with the primary goal of attaining political independence, but within a short period it has acquired a national-democratic character so as to go on to socialist construction under the vanguard party based on the principles of scientific socialism. The experience of this steady advance is especially remarkable as compared with the revolutions in the Arab world which reversed their course after taking some concrete steps along the road of social progress. A study of this experience helps one to understand the causes for the 'roll back' of the revolutionary process in other countries of the Arab world, and will facilitate the struggle to eliminate these causes.

The methods used by the leading political party, which enabled it to overcome, in a very backward country, the inertia of tribal and patriarchal ties among the masses and to rally them round it also merit the closest attention of the democratic forces. The main factor in this great victory, I think, has been the training and education of party cadres profoundly loyal to the cause of progress, democracy and socialism.

There is another remarkable feature which is expressed in a slogan that one will frequently find in Aden and other towns of Democratic Yemen: 'It is the party that directs the rifle, and not the other way!' This is highly important not only for our Arab world, but also for many developing countries.

Finally, the establishment of a united vanguard party on the principles of scientific socialism is an achievement which is of tremendous importance not only for Democratic Yemen but also for the whole of the Arab national-liberation movement. We know of the bitter experience of some Arab countries where one organization or party has been imposed from the top for the purpose of concentrating power over the whole of society in the hands of certain sections of the bourgeoisie. By contrast, the party based on the principles of scientific socialism in Democratic Yemen is the product of a democratic dialogue between the various revolutionary contingents, and it exercises the power of the working class and its allies who make up the overwhelming majority of society.

Democratic Yemen has succeeded in avoiding all the reefs on its course — and they were many. All the schemes of imperialism and

reaction failed to divert it from its chosen course and goals. This has taken place, first, because of the solid unity of the revolutionary forces which have held aloft the banner of genuine progress and which have been guided by the advanced world view of the working class. Second, because shoulder to shoulder with the young forces of freedom that have emerged in the Arabian Peninsula stand the freedom-loving forces of the whole world, above all the mighty Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. The perseverance of this small republic, with its very limited potentialities, and the victory of its dedicated and courageous people over the dark forces of reaction are an inspiring example to the peoples of other countries fighting imperialism, for peace, democracy and genuine social progress.

1. UPONF was set up in October 1975 through the merger of three progressive political organizations: the National Front (the largest), the Democratic People's Union, and the People's Vanguard Party. — *Ed.*
2. This article was written in September 1978.
3. Elections to a Legislative Council are to be held in November of this year.

The chauvinistic content of the 'three worlds theory'

Walery Namiotkiewicz
Department head, Institute
of Basic Problems
of Marxism-Leninism, CC,
Polish United Workers' Party

The 11th Congress of the Communist Party of China in 1977 adopted the 'three worlds' doctrine[1] as the ideological platform of China's present foreign policy. A few months later an official interpretation of the doctrine was given in a long (six-page) editorial article in the *Jenmin jihpao*, entitled 'Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds Is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism.' It was issued as a pamphlet in a large printing and translated into many languages. Its content has been extensively advertised by Chinese publishing houses turning out literature for foreign countries.

There is every indication that this is the Chinese leadership's most

important ideological act over the past decade. The *Jenmin jihpao* presented the 'three worlds theory' as a 'scientific Marxist assessment of present-day world realities,' which 'provides the international proletariat, the socialist countries and the oppressed nations with a powerful ideological weapon' and 'a correct orientation in the present international struggle.' It is also claimed to be a 'new classification of the world's political forces,' providing the basis for formulating a 'new global strategy.'[2]

Consequently, this is claimed to be the ideological principles for long-term foreign policy activity not only of the Chinese leadership. A concept has been put forward under the banner of Marxism-Leninism claiming to lay down lines for all the revolutionary forces of our day on the cardinal problems of international class struggle. Such a concept which bears on matters which are of concern to communists cannot, of course, remain unnoticed.

What is the essence of this 'theory?'

Here is how Mao formulated the 'three worlds theory.' In 1974 he declared: 'In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the second world. We are the third world. . . . The third world has a huge population. With the exception of Japan, Asia belongs to the third world. The whole of Africa belongs to the third world, and Latin America too.'

So, the 'first world' consists of two states with opposite social systems, the 'second' of developed capitalist and also of most socialist countries which, according to the Peking leaders, do not deserve to be called 'socialist,' and the 'third' is made up of developing countries, oppressed nations and some socialist countries.

We find that this scheme for dividing the world is 'peculiar,' to say the least. Capitalist and socialist countries — forces with an antithetical class nature — turn out to be in the same worlds. On the other hand, similar-type class forces — socialist countries — find themselves in each of the three invented worlds.

It goes without saying that any typology or classification of countries must be based on some kind of criteria. What are they in this case? The Peking ideologists assert that this scheme does not mean 'abandoning of class principles' or 'preaching of reactionary theories of geopolitics.' On the contrary, they claim, 'in principle Chairman Mao's differentiation of the three worlds completely accords with the criterion set by Marx and Engels. . . . Similarly, it accords with Lenin's classification of the world into three types of countries[3]. . . . It is a logical development from their theories on differentiating the world's political forces.'

In short, the Peking ideologists seek to leave the impression that

their three-worlds scheme springs from the methodology of Marxism-Leninism and accords with the class approach.[4] That obviously is also the purpose of the futile attempts to rely on numerous extracts from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the use of the Marxist conceptual apparatus (terminology). But despite the Peking ideologists' camouflage, 'Chairman Mao's differentiation of the three worlds' is, in fact, a complete break with Marxism-Leninism. Let us look at the criteria on the basis of which the worlds are differentiated in this 'theory.'

The Peking ideologists' first criterion is the capability to 'contend for world hegemony.' It is said that the United States alone of the present-day imperialist powers has this 'capability.' This is a clear distortion of the present-day picture of actual inter-imperialist rivalry, from which the countries of Western Europe and Japan are excluded. But that is not all.

The Soviet Union is declared to be the other side in 'contending for world hegemony' confronting the United States. Of course, even the Peking ideologists are aware that such foreign-policy goals are alien to a socialist country. Accordingly, they resort to falsifications and hold forth about a 'degeneration' of the Soviet social and state system. The Soviet Union is said to be a 'superpower,' a term used by Peking to imply not just that it has greater economic and military strength than many other countries. Peking's view is that the distinctive feature of a 'superpower' is that 'its state apparatus is controlled by monopoly capital in its most concentrated form.'

Domination of monopoly capital in the USSR! Even the wildest anti-Sovieteers have stopped short of voicing such absurdities. The Peking ideologists are, naturally, incapable of backing up their inventions with any facts from socio-economic life in the USSR. There are no such facts. In the USSR, it is social property in the means of production that is dominant, with the realization of the principle: from each according to his ability, to each according to his work, a principle which rules out capitalism not only in its monopoly, but also in any other form. No wonder, then, that the Peking ideologists' whole 'argumentation' about the conversion of the Soviet economy into 'a state-monopoly capitalist economy' boils down to the simple claim that supposedly 'Everyone knows this.' Slanderers have always used this trick of palming off a lie as something generally accepted.

Having presented the world's first socialist country as a country of monopoly capital, the Peking ideologists have no difficulty in completing the construction of their 'theory.' The USSR is presented as a force that is 'antagonistic' to other countries and peoples, as 'aggressive and adventurous imperialism,' as a 'dangerous source of world war,' and so on, and so forth. The Peking ideologists have a simple

technique of slander: first they put forward the false premise that the USSR is a country of monopoly capital, and then ascribe to the USSR everything that the domination of monopoly capital generates in international relations.

The criteria on the basis of which the Peking ideologists divide all the other countries into a 'third' and a 'second' world in contrast to the 'superpowers' are also nebulous, and leave much room for subjectivism and arbitrary constructs. Thus, included in the 'third world' are countries and peoples 'standing in the forefront of the struggle against the two hegemonists,' i.e., the USSR and the United States. But is there a single country in the world to which this criterion can be applied? After all, even the Chinese leaders themselves take a different attitude to the USSR and the United States. Their anti-Sovietism is beyond doubt. But the facts show that they are far from being 'in the forefront of the struggle' against U.S. imperialism.

Furthermore, they put forward this criterion of 'third world' membership: those who 'constitute the main force combating imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism.' Well, who is that 'main force?' It turns out that this force is not made up either of most of the socialist countries, of the Soviet Union or of the international working class and world communist movement, which, incidentally, has no place at all in the 'three worlds.' But this 'third world' includes countries with reactionary, fascist and racist regimes and also regimes coming out against the national-liberation movement.[5]

The criterion for referring a country to the 'second world' is its 'dual character,' or its 'stand in contradiction with both the first and the third worlds.' We have just seen that both the 'first' and the 'third' worlds are a hodge-podge of class and political forces. The 'second world,' which is defined through its attitude to the other two worlds, naturally has the same appearance. Alongside imperialist countries, acting together with U.S. imperialism against world socialism and the national-liberation movement, it contains most East European socialist countries, including Poland. Why, for instance, has our country a 'dual character,' what are its 'contradictions,' say, with the socialist community and the national-liberation movement, how can it be placed — from the standpoint of the alignment of world political forces — in the same camp with the West European imperialist countries — all of this remains a mystery, to say the least. Nor can one ignore that when speaking of the Polish people and the working class, and of Polish-Soviet relations, as of other socialist-community countries, the Peking ideologists resort to foul insinuations and patent frauds and juggle the facts.

What has been said shows very well that the Peking ideologists have vainly tried to back up, as an afterthought, Mao's differentiation

of the 'three worlds' with a semblance of class criteria, juggling concepts like inter-imperialist rivalry and anti-imperialist stand. Indeed, they are faced with a problem which has no solution. After all, this differentiation was initially effected on a basis that is alien to any class approach, such as the level of a country's economic development, and economic and military potential. These indicators were, apparently, taken because the differentiation of the world on such a basis met a very definite ideological purpose, which was to obscure and to play down what is most fundamental in the class approach to present-day phenomena, namely, consideration of the basic contradiction of our epoch, the contradiction between the two social systems — socialism and capitalism — and consideration of socialism's leading role in world development, a role which is the key guarantee of further successes in the class struggle.

It is quite clear what the relation is between the 'three worlds' scheme and the realities of the modern world and world politics. It is based on the groundless claim that 'what was once the socialist camp no longer exists, nor do historical conditions necessitate its formation for a second time.' The authors of this scheme have simply crossed out the fact that the socialist community exists with its prospect for further development and growth.

This scheme conflicts with the scientific view of the present arrangement of class forces in the world, according to which the world socialist system, the international working class and the national-liberation movement are the motive forces of the anti-imperialist, revolutionary process, with the political watershed in the modern world running along the line which separates the policy of peace, social progress and freedom of nations, from the policy of aggression and reaction.

The 'three worlds' doctrine is clearly Sinocentrist, because it lays down political watersheds on the map of the world where they do not exist. It presents China as a country which belongs to the 'third world' and will remain within it. It is suggested that China is not only a part of the 'main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism,' but also a disinterested champion of the interests of the countries seeking political and economic independence. The Peking ideologists urge the establishment of 'the broadest possible international front against hegemonism' and are prepared to act as its initiator and ideological stimulator. It is noteworthy that when speaking of this 'international front' and characterizing its political orientation, they drop the word 'imperialism.' This is not accidental, because according to the *Jenmin jihpao* article, imperialism is 'a force that can be joined.'

Such, in general terms, is the picture of the modern world as presented by the Peking ideologists.

The 'three worlds' scheme is not the first foreign-policy concept expounded by Chinese propaganda. Clearly unscientific schemes of international relations were put forward in Peking back in the 60s. Thus, Chinese propaganda proclaimed the division of the modern world into 'big' and 'small' countries. Then it went on to divide the world into 'rich' and 'poor,' and 'strong' and 'weak,' and 'developed' and 'backward' countries. There is also the Peking ideologists' thesis about a division of the globe into a 'world city' and a 'world village.'

In general, many diverse schemes for dividing the world have been put forward, and frequently existed side by side. All of them obscure the most essential element of the social reality of the modern world: the contradiction between the social system of capitalism and the social system of socialism. All these schemes shunned the Marxist, class approach in analyzing reality, while the attendant explanations amounted to crude anti-communism. But let us draw attention to the fact that all these schemes were based on a division of the world into two parts. Now there is emphasis on its division into three parts. This question arises: why have the Chinese leaders abandoned some of the schemes proclaimed in Peking earlier, and have now put forward the idea of differentiating the world into three parts? What is their purpose? What has been the crucial factor in this change of Peking's ideological propositions?

We think that it is connected with the evolution of the Chinese leadership's foreign policy over the past few decades.

Having broken its ties with the international communist movement, the Mao group first concentrated its foreign-policy activity on penetrating into the developing countries. The Chinese leaders sought above all to establish ideological and political hegemony over the liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America, over the countries which, as Peking propaganda then loudly proclaimed, constituted the 'main area of revolutionary storms.' The Chinese leaders expected that hegemonic status among the developing countries, and their isolation from the socialist community and the international communist movement, would secure for China much more advantageous positions in the political bargaining with imperialism. In retrospect, this scheme stands out very clearly. This line was ideologically substantiated by diverse conceptions of the division of the world into two parts, which were destined to suggest that China had a special mission in the former colonial and semi-colonial world, and in its relations with the 'West' and the 'North.'

This political strategy, which the Mao group conducted in the 60s, did not bring the desired results. Despite its numerous efforts and

attempts, China was unable to secure hegemonic status among the developing countries or become their ideological and political center. There was too great a gap between Peking's ambitions and the real potentialities for realizing them. What is more, it proved to be insuperable.

Following upon this clear failure, the Peking leaders opted for a different strategic program — re-directing Peking's political, economic, scientific, technical and military ties to the imperialist countries, arranging political collaboration with imperialism with anti-socialist and anti-communist aims and now no longer acting as a leader and spokesman of the developing countries, but only on its own behalf. In the early 70s, Peking's foreign policy was marked by all manner of diplomatic acts designed for political rapprochement with the imperialist countries. In that period, this was best illustrated by the official visit to China by the then U.S. President Richard Nixon.

One of the specific features of Peking's foreign policy in that period was its reliance on the extreme rightist forces. The Peking leadership established political contacts with extreme rightist opposition groupings in the developed capitalist countries. It made special efforts to slow down the successfully advancing process of détente. Chinese propaganda extolled the advocates of the cold war and sought to induce them to act for its own benefits. By inducing the rightist forces to put pressure on government circles, the Peking leaders hoped to break down the barriers hampering the extension of China's ties with the industrialized capitalist countries. At the same time, Peking has allied itself with reactionary regimes and governments.

This was accompanied by an anti-Soviet campaign which was being stepped up from month to month. It was designed to show, and did actually show, Peking's capitalist partners the true intentions of its leaders. It was, in a sense, confirmation of Peking's readiness for political rapprochement with imperialism and reaction on an anti-Soviet and anti-socialist platform.

What are the results of this version of the Chinese leaders' foreign-policy strategy? Its main goal, namely, slowing down the process of détente, was quite obviously not attained. The ruling circles of the imperialist countries benevolently watched the stepping-up of the anti-Soviet hysteria in China and markedly changed the tone of their propaganda against it. But at the same time, they displayed much less readiness to give Peking access to modern hardware and technology, especially military hardware. The tendencies toward an extension of economic ties with Peking, which were being plugged by some extreme reactionary circles in the capitalist countries, met with strong resistance in these countries which sprang

from the fairly realistic consideration of the possible profits and losses. Representatives of big monopoly capital and the international concerns were much more willing to back Peking's anti-Soviet attacks than its great-power hegemonistic ambitions.

As for the liberation movements and developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Peking's strategy of direct alliance with imperialism caused profound disappointment even among those who followed the Maoists. China's prestige dropped. This also explains the marked slowing down of Maoism's ideological influence in the international arena. China's policy of aligning itself with imperialism developed into a peculiar process of the Maoist ideology's self-exposure.

In view of the obvious failures, the Peking leaders began to cast around for a new ideological formula for their policy. It was a quest for doctrinal principles that would meet at least two conditions. First, to help reliably camouflage from world public opinion the Peking leadership's real intentions in world affairs, and its great-power and hegemonistic ambitions, and second, to help pursue a policy of further political rapprochement with imperialism, without harming China's positions in the developing countries. In short, this was a fresh substantiation of China's geopolitical 'mission,' and justification of its policy of alliance with imperialism and simultaneously of its policy of expanding its influence on the developing countries, the policy of ranging these countries against the socialist community.

The theoretical articles about 'the need to study the history of the world,' which appeared in the Chinese press in 1972 and 1973, were a reflection (however camouflaged and certainly deformed) of this quest. A peculiar result of these attempts to work out a new doctrine for the purpose of veiling the compromised hegemonism, was the above-mentioned speech by Teng Hsiao-ping in April 1974, in which he expounded the 'three worlds theory' from the UN General Assembly rostrum.

The present version of the 'three worlds theory' contains some corrections as compared with the version put forward in the early 70s. It is worthwhile to look at some of these corrections, because they help to gain a clearer idea of some of the trends in the Chinese leaders' current foreign-policy line.

The Peking ideologists now specially stress that if they 'undiscriminately put the two superpowers on a par,' they would be 'blurring the primary target in the struggle against hegemonism.' The difference between the two 'superpowers,' the Peking ideologists emphasize, is that all the United States can do at present is 'to strive to protect its vested interests and go over to the defensive in its overall strategy.' By contrast, the USSR has allegedly 'decided to employ an offensive

strategy to encroach on the sovereignty of all other countries and weaken and supplant U.S. influence in all parts of the world in its attempt to establish its own world hegemony.'

The suggestion is, in other words, that the United States is allegedly 'an objective of expansion' by the Soviet Union. Thus, U.S. imperialism now has a quality which in the earlier edition of the 'three worlds theory' belonged only to the countries of the 'third' and the 'second' worlds. By means of this trick, the United States is included in 'the broadest international united front of struggle' against the Soviet Union which the Peking leaders would like to set up for their self-seeking purposes. The political meaning of these correctives in the 'three worlds' scheme is clear: they create a peculiar ideological foundation for China's alliance with U.S. imperialism on an anti-Soviet platform. There is no doubt that the Peking ideologists are taking yet another stride along the way of anti-Sovietism.

However, the United States was simultaneously described as a 'superpower' and left in the 'first world,' which, according to the 'three worlds theory,' is a force hostile to China. This is a way of emphasizing the Peking leaders' allegedly 'anti-imperialist' stand.

Consequently, in the present version of the 'three worlds theory,' China is presented as a country which seems to have two faces, each of which is designed for a different audience. The anti-Soviet face can be turned to the forces of imperialism and reaction, while an 'anti-imperialist' and nationalistic face can be presented for the progressive developing countries. That is the political meaning of the new formula of hegemonism, which, as its architects hope, should help to create anti-socialist alliances with the forces of imperialism, without loss of contacts with the national-liberation movements and the progressive forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Of course, only one of these faces is the true one, and it is determined by the main content of the Peking leaders' foreign-policy practices. The facts leave no doubt at all that Peking seeks to establish anti-socialist alliances and engage in political collaboration with the forces of imperialism and world reaction. Meanwhile, China's 'anti-imperialism' has gone no farther than words and declarations.

Another corrective to the 'three world theory' bears on the problems of war and peace. As in the past, the Peking ideologists keep talking about the inevitability of another world war, which allegedly springs from the 'contention for hegemony between the two superpowers.' But now, first, they seek to present the Soviet Union as the 'most dangerous source of world war,' and second, emphasize that this war will have the specific features of being 'just' and 'progressive.' How have the Peking ideologists motivated this character of the war? They claim that it will involve not only the 'superpowers,' but

also the 'second world' countries, above all, the capitalist countries of Western Europe, which will be faced with the problem of warding off aggression and the threat of enslavement, and defending their national independence.

Thus, the Peking ideologists have given the policy of imperialism moral sanction and seek to undermine the ideological foundations of the peoples' struggle for peace, détente and disarmament.

At the same time, the 'three worlds theory' amounts to outright provocation and incitement to a new war. The Peking ideologists have set themselves up as zealous advertisers of the worn-out myth of imperialist propaganda about a 'Soviet menace.' Their interpretation of this myth also has two aspects. Addressing the imperialist countries, they hold forth about the dangers of trying to divert the 'Soviet menace' to the East, and claim that it is greater 'peril' to the 'West' than it is to China. Addressing its own people, Chinese propaganda makes great play with inventions about a 'surprise attack.' The purpose is obvious: Peking seeks to frustrate the détente and to increase the military confrontation in Europe and the world, while stepping up China's militarization.

Among other noteworthy corrections in the 'three worlds theory' are those which are apparently designed to give greater room for the Peking leaders' moves with respect to the socialist countries and the international communist movement. As in the past, the Peking ideologists try to separate the Soviet Union from the other socialist countries and to range these countries against it. Now, however, they have divided these countries into two categories: 'third world' socialist countries which, they claim, are unconditionally hostile to the USSR, and 'second world' socialist countries, a force with which China could unite against the USSR. This produces an ideological formula which helps Peking to step up its splitting activity with respect to the world socialist system and the socialist community of states.

With respect to the communist movement, we also find some new elements in the 'three worlds theory.' For a long time, Chinese propaganda used to designate many communist parties as 'revisionist.' Against these parties, Peking has fostered and supported various Maoist groups which styled themselves 'Marxist-Leninist parties' and which declared China to be the 'center' of world revolution. Now, according to the new 'three worlds theory,' it is not the 'revisionist character' of this or that communist party, but its attitude to the Soviet Union that is crucial in determining China's attitude. The Peking ideologists have revised their earlier view of communist parties, and have put forward anti-Sovietism as the price for which they are prepared to forgive them the 'trespasses of revisionism.' For

their part, they have withdrawn the demand on the communist parties to recognize China as the international ideological center.

Thus, one must reckon with the fact that the 'three worlds theory' does create an ideological basis for Peking's continued subversions with respect to the international communist movement as well.

The 'three worlds theory' provides ideological justification of the Chinese leadership's foreign-policy strategy.[6] This is, in effect, a great-power and hegemonistic strategy, resting on chauvinistic Sinocentrism and die-hard hostility with respect to the Soviet Union and the socialist community. It is a strategy which envisages the establishment of anti-socialist alliances with the forces of imperialism and reaction and, simultaneously, flirtation with the developing countries and progressive forces by means of 'anti-imperialist' demagogy. This strategy's new ideological formula is designed merely to cover up the totally unprincipled readiness to set up blocs on an anti-Soviet platform with all comers. That is the purpose of all the verbal juggling of the 'three worlds theory.'

1. This doctrine was first made public by one of the Chinese leaders, Teng Hsiao-ping, at the Sixth Special UN General Assembly in New York in 1974. It is now said in Peking that the doctrine was authored by Mao Tse-tung and co-authored and interpreted by Chou En-lai, Teng Hsiao-ping and Hua Kuo-feng.

2. Here and elsewhere the quotes are from the November 1, 1977, editorial article in the *Jenmin jihpao*. — *Ed.*

3. A reference to Lenin's picture of the world after the First World War. When considering the redivision of the world as a result of the war, Lenin brought out the following groups of countries: oppressed colonies and countries which were defeated and relegated to the condition of colonies; countries which maintained the old status but became economically dependent on the United States; and countries in which the capitalists made use of the redivision of the world (see V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, pp. 215-235). We find that this classification has nothing at all in common with the 'three worlds' scheme.

4. The Peking ideologists' special accent at present on the correspondence of the 'three worlds theory' to the class approach and Marxist methodology is apparently due to the fact that those who have long supported Peking have now turned their back on the 'theory.' Thus, in July 1977, the Albanian newspaper, *Zeri i popullit,* rebuked the authors of the 'three worlds theory' for their 'non-class, opportunistic approach in assessing the modern world, which ignores the basic contradictions of our epoch.'

5. There are essential differences between the developing countries from the standpoint of the class nature of their political regimes, their attitude to imperialism, their choice of way of social development, and these differences acquire increasing importance in the present-day arrangement of class and political forces. This is not only ignored and played down by the Peking ideologists. They have invested the 'third world' concept with a geopolitical content which is independent of social-class changes either in the developing countries, or in the world arena.

6. Characterizing Peking's present foreign-policy line, Fidel Castro said: 'Is it so strange then that China's government now supports Pinochet's fascist and bloody regime and other repressive regimes in Latin America! Is it surprising then that Peking collaborates with Mobutu and NATO's interventionist forces! It will not be strange at all if it joins the RSA against Angola, Somalia, against the Ethiopian revolution, if it supports Egypt's traitorous and separatist policy, joins with the

conservative and reactionary forces of Britain, the FRG, with NATO in Europe, and with U.S. imperialism all over the world, and brazenly preaches the inevitability of a third world war.

'But the most repugnant of all of these crimes of China is its hostile line with respect to Vietnam. . . . It has criminally and highhandedly undermined Vietnam's efforts to revive a country that was devastated in a savage war started by imperialism. The Chinese leadership's stand reminds us of the U.S. policy against Cuba.'

'National exclusiveness' and the road to socialism

Cesar Barreto
Peruvian journalist

The revolutionary struggle to change the world is winning the support not only of the working class. Today it attracts other strata of society, whole nationalities and countries that used to be centuries removed from the highroad of development of world civilization and, as part of imperialism's colonial system, only existed to be robbed of their natural wealth and resources. An outstanding example is Peru, a country that long before Columbus discovered America had created a spiritual and material culture that even today stuns the imagination, a country with the richest historical traditions but doomed by foreign imperialists and the local oligarchy to remain outside the mainstream of the world historical process. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, which proclaimed the rights of the working people, the rights of the oppressed peoples across the world and set an example of how to realize them in practice, initiated the collapse of the colonial system and revealed the bright vistas of socialism for the Peruvian people and all humankind.[1]

However, the strength of feudal survivals inherited from the age of Spanish colonialism and the pressure of the imperialist monopolies and their local servitors were so great that it took another half a century for the working people and the Peruvian people as a whole to realize that they themselves could acquire control over their own lives by fighting for genuine national emancipation. The Cuban revolution and the building of socialism in Cuba had a tremendous transforming effect. In Peru today not only the class-conscious workers, but other social strata as well, have begun to realize that the changed balance of forces in favor of socialism has made it possible to resist imperialist domination, to end dependence and achieve social progress. The

anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic and anti-feudal activity of Peru's patriotically-minded military in 1968-75, supported by the broad masses, the peasantry and the working class led by the Communist Party, reflected these progressive changes in the distribution of the social forces, their ideology and social psychology. The people, the workers have gone a long way in effecting these changes.

This awakening, this creative urge to make history, to take an active part in the nation's political life brought out the weaknesses as well as the strengths of the process of change in Peru. And this was bound to affect the pace of the process, and the kind of supporters it acquired, and its results.

There can be no doubt that the predominant historical tendency of our time is the steadily growing revolutionary and transforming role played by the working class, the upswing in its political activity and organization. In Peru there has also been a perceptible growth in the influence of the Communist Party and the General Confederation of Working People, which consistently adopts the positions of the working class. The growth of the proletariat, however, has also been accompanied by certain negative phenomena. The reinforcement of the working class with intermediate elements from town and country has infected it with petty-bourgeois prejudices and illusions, thus generating significant contradictions involving the level of political maturity and class organization of certain strata of the proletariat. As Lenin pointed out, such 'recruits' of the working class are capable of assimilating 'only certain aspects of Marxism, only certain parts of the new world outlook, or individual slogans and demands, being unable to make a determined break with all the traditions of the bourgeois world outlook . . .' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 16, p. 348). This is why the proletariat has not yet been able to achieve complete unity of the trade union forces.

This situation has been directly encouraged by Maoists, Trotskyites and other enemies of the working class, who have penetrated its ranks. They have been exposed as stooges of imperialism and the oligarchy advocating a split in the trade union movement and opposing the policy of unity.

Such a situation often leads to political instability and ideological wavering in the working class and makes certain strata of the proletariat and the liberation movement susceptible to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois reformist ideology that is poured out by imperialism's powerful propaganda machine. All this finds expression in various non-Marxist political trends and theoretical constructs.

The ideological struggle over how the peoples that are still oppressed by imperialism should seek further development is becoming a matter of great urgency. The apologists of capitalism employ various

means in their efforts to discredit Marxism-Leninism. Their weaponry includes 'caveman' anti-communism combined with blatantly fascist methods of suppressing the democratic movement and, on the other hand, anti-communist studies that claim to be highly scientific. Active encouragement is also given to falsification of the Marxist-Leninist legacy, to the notorious 'national' interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. The opportunist trends and revisionist ideologists started with attempts to 'nationalize' Marxism, so as to divorce it from Leninism, which is declared to be a 'specifically Russian' phenomenon. The next move, under the pretext of overcoming alleged dogmatism, 'freezing' and 'confinedness,' is to dissolve clear-cut scientific propositions in an 'open-ended' eclectic hodgepodge of ideas that can be mechanically adapted to the latest bourgeois fad in ideology. Of the integral doctrine on the revolutionary transformation of the world nothing is left but a few miserable fragments that present no danger to exploiters and oppressors, the mere fag-ends of revolutionary phrases which can be used to beguile politically inexperienced audiences, but which do nothing to foster genuine revolutionary struggle by the masses for the abolition of foreign imperialist oppression and social injustice.

In Latin America, as in other parts of the world, incidentally, rather a lot of people have appeared who want to 're-adjust' Marxism-Leninism, to revise it on the grounds that this is required by the 'demands of the age' and 'national exclusiveness.'

Highly instructive from this standpoint, so it seems to us, is the zigzag road travelled by Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, leader and theoretician of the so-called American People's Revolutionary Alliance (the Peruvian APRA party). His evolution provides a clue to the logic, if one may call it that, of political betrayal, of gradual retreat from progressive, anti-imperialist even revolutionary positions by way of intermediate stages to overt apologetics for imperialism and oligarchy, to openly reformist and counter-revolutionary positions. What makes his evolution all the more instructive is that 50 years ago Haya de la Torre published a book called *For the Liberation of Latin America*.[2] Even then the leaders of the young communist movement in the Latin American countries managed to expose his erroneous conceptions, which were later to produce such prolific growth.

In the days before this book appeared Haya de la Torre, despite some vacillations, had on the whole maintained anti-imperialist positions. He had begun his political career by taking part in the student movement for university reform of 1918-19 and had been exiled by the Leguia government. While abroad, he kept in touch with other political emigrés, with the progressive opposition, and helped to set up an organization of the united anti-imperialist front, which became known

as the American People's Revolutionary Alliance (there were Marxist elements in it at the time). In 1925 the front proposed a general program for struggle against U.S. imperialism, liquidating the U.S. colonial enclave in the Panama Canal zone, confiscating landed estates, and raising the working people's living standard. This general program denounced capitalism as a system contradicting the vital interests of the peoples. In his role as an anti-imperialist and revolutionary Haya de la Torre undertook a visit to the USSR and published a number of articles in the Soviet press. Castigating U.S. imperialism as the historical enemy of the Latin American peoples, he praised the Soviet people's example in transforming society, and exposed the injustice of the capitalist system. This period is described in his book *Militants and the Unemployed,* in which he duly acknowledges the October Revolution and its brilliant leader, Lenin. Haya de la Torre made contact with the leadership of the Communist International and helped to organize the 1927 World Anti-Imperialist Congress in Brussels, in which he took part.

There was, however, another side to the activity of Haya and his associates. Rather than consolidate the APRA as a united anti-imperialist front, they wanted to turn it into a bourgeois-nationalist political party which, like the Chinese Kuomintang, would dominate both the leadership of the working class and other anti-imperialist and anti-feudal sections of the population. Jose Carlos Mariategui, the founder of the Peruvian Communist Party, which celebrates its 50th anniversary this year, firmly rejected the plan to create a 'nationalist' party and came out boldly in defense of the historical necessity of organizing a class party of the proletariat and its inalienable right to independence within the framework of a united anti-imperialist front. This was when the process of complete ideological split between the APRA and communism began to accelerate.

Haya de la Torre brought out his anti-Marxist theses rejecting Lenin's scientific definition of imperialism and opposing it with an eclectic definition enabling the APRA to go along with U.S. imperialism and justify its unrestricted penetration into Peru.

On the international plane his phraseological camouflage, such as the expression 'wealth shall not be taken from those who possess it,' helped to prevent the Latin American peoples from restoring their sovereignty over natural resources. Specifically, in the case of our country this meant justifying the preservation of the property of the U.S. International Petroleum Company.

So the complete denial of Marxism, with its prelude of lying, falsification and misrepresentation of the facts, brought Haya to the point, in the early 1930s, during the sharp deterioration of the international situation and imperialism's preparations for armed aggression

against the USSR, where he invented 'anti-communist anti-imperialism.' For this purpose he declared Marxism-Leninism, first in the political and then in the theoretical sphere, a 'frozen doctrine' and claimed to be able to transcend it by means of his eclectic conception. In this article we do not intend to discuss the methodological defects of Haya de la Torre's philosophical relativism, since a study of this aspect has already been made by Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Uruguay.[3] What interests us is the question of how Haya's attempt to 'transcend' Marx and Lenin from nationalist positions, in exactly the same way as the 'Sinicizing' of Marxism decades later, ultimately brought him to the position of kowtowing to U.S. imperialism.

Haya de la Torre wrote that he had begun to consider the problem of imperialism 'in a new light or, in other words, by subjecting this question to a more precise reinterpretation, as compared with the European Marxist standpoint. Unlike the adherents of communism in these latitudes, we refuse to join the chorus of people who repeat the theoretical conceptions evolved on a continent historically and geographically far removed and distinct from our own.'[4]

He condemned Mariategui for espousing 'things foreign' and 'Europeanism,' and called Marxism-Leninism an imported doctrine that was alien to national realities. At the same time he presented the APRA as 'an autonomous movement free of any foreign influence.' These conceptions not only accelerated his evolution from anti-imperialism to anti-communism. They also prompted him to deny the Peruvian working class' right to lead the political struggle of the masses on the grounds that it had 'not yet matured.' This assertion was in direct support of reactionary syndicalism.

He defined the idea that the APRA was a multi-class party when in fact it was rapidly becoming a bourgeois nationalist party that masked its anti-communism with anti-imperialist demagogy. At that time the rightist leaders of the APRA still readily proclaimed their adherence to the idea of the 'anti-imperialist state,' although they had already renounced criticism of capitalism.

In a resolute rejection of Haya de la Torre's anti-Marxist chauvinism Mariategui wrote: 'Naturally, socialism is not an Indo-American doctrine, but that is something that no other doctrine, no contemporary system, can be. Although socialism, like capitalism, was born in Europe, it is not a specifically European phenomenon. It is a worldwide movement from which no country is exempt . . .'[5]

Because he understood the internationalist character of the proletarian movement in the epoch of imperialism, Mariategui was able to discern the prospects of the future social and economic changes in Peru that were to grow out of the steadily increasing militancy of the

working class. Accordingly he devoted all his energies to the colossal task of integrating the actions of the working-class movement in the campaign to build socialism.

During and after the Second World War, Haya de la Torre completed his break with his anti-imperialist past. Deliberately misinterpreting the fact of the United States' participation in the anti-Hitler coalition, Haya even went so far as to make 'inter-American solidarity' the basis of APRA policy and to support the formation of a military-political bloc of American states under the aegis of U.S. imperialism. After the war he declared that the main enemy of the peoples of Latin America was not the Yankee imperialism that was exploiting them, but their natural ally — world socialism and above all the USSR.

Thus the evolution of the advocates of 'national exclusiveness' reaches its logical conclusion. In absolutizing the specific nature of the conditions of one country they, as Haya's instructive evolution indicates, exaggerate the individuality of national features and try to impose their nationalistic dogmas on the communists as well. In so doing they ignore the fact that the communist parties of all countries are linked mainly by their common Marxist-Leninist ideology, their common aims, and the international character of the struggle against capitalism. Experience has shown that the accent on nationalist trends, if not firmly combated, inevitably leads to a Communist Party's self-isolation, its divorce from the international communist movement or retreat to the positions of social-democracy and abandonment of the revolutionary struggle. In denying the existence of general regularities of revolution and the building of socialism, the anti-communists and the reformists claim that revolution in each separate country develops according to its own peculiar laws. The 'theories' of the advocates of national or continental exclusiveness evince a negative attitude to the Soviet Union, to the world socialist system and to the international communist and workers' movement. The practice of actually building socialism, the policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties, of the socialist countries is crudely attacked and slanderously distorted, and the theory of scientific socialism revised.

Defining the essence of political sectarianism, Marx wrote 'The sect sees the justification for its existence and its point of honor not in what it has in *common* with the class movement, but in the *particular shibboleth* which distinguishes it from the movement.'[6] In our time the ideologists of anti-communism have realized that their strategic plan of undermining the revolutionary forces, which includes splitting off the national-liberation movement from the world socialist system and the international working class, is in line with the sectarian

positions of those who parade the idea that revolution in their country is 'not just the same as everyone else's,' that it is 'permeated with an exclusively national culture,' the positions of those who deny any kind of regular pattern in the building of socialism and the experience gained in creating a new society in a country where socialism exists as a reality.

However, the universality of the laws of revolution, the regularities of the building of socialism are, as we know, determined by objective conditions. They spring primarily from the fact that the essence of the capitalist system, which the socialist revolution is destined to overcome, is the same everywhere. Capitalism always has been and always will be an exploiting, oppressive system, regardless of the level of any given country's development, its history and geographical position. So the regularities of revolutions aimed at abolishing this system are bound to be essentially of one type. No matter what peculiarities capitalism in one or another country may possess, the socialist revolution — and without this it cannot be called socialist — sets itself the aim of eradicating all forms of class exploitation and abolishing the rule of the exploiters. It is our firm belief that the regularities of the development of socialist revolution are bound to be general regularities, although the specific conditions in which the revolution takes place do, of course, influence its character and form. And finally, the essence of the socialist system resulting from the revolution, regardless of differences in form that it acquires, must, as a study of the history of all socialist revolutions would show, inevitably center upon certain obligatory elements that characterize socialism itself as such. Their content ultimately consists in the creation of a system without exploitation and oppression, a system in which the leading and guiding role is played by the modern working class.

From the first days of its experience the Peruvian Communist Party stressed the universal significance of Lenin's ideas in evolving the strategy and tactics of the party, its organizational principles, and relied on the experience of the October Revolution in Russia. The Peruvian communists are convinced that this extremely rich and varied experience is valid (with due consideration, of course, for the conditions under which it is applied) in all countries both during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and during further socialist construction.

The universality of the regularities of the socialist revolution do not, however, mean denial of the specific nature of the transition to socialism in different countries, as the ideological opponents of communism would have us believe. Marxist-Leninists have always assumed that, since the revolution arises on national soil, it is bound to

acquire certain characteristic features reflecting national realities. 'All nations will arrive at socialism — this is inevitable,' Lenin wrote, 'but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of social transformations in the different aspects of social life' (Vol. 26, pp. 69-70).

Various circumstances determine the specific roads that different countries take to socialism: the peculiarities of the economic structure, the degree to which the revolutionary situation has matured, the historical traditions, the balance of world forces, the position of the given country in the system of other states, and so on. But regardless of the character and scale of such differences, '... the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance' (Vol. 30, p. 108). This was how Lenin stated the question. And this is how the Peruvian communists state it. They see their objective not in restricting themselves to the narrow confines of national specifics, but in learning to apply the general and basic principles of Marxism-Leninism to the unique features in the objective advance to socialism that are inherent in every country.

Marxism-Leninism not only demands that the specific conditions in each country be taken into account. It actually develops on the basis of the experience gained by the communist parties in the struggle for the victory of socialism in various countries at various times on the basis of the revolutionary practice of the international communist movement.

In striking contrast to the treacherous anti-national line of the APRA the internationalist and at the same time deeply patriotic line charted by the Peruvian communists in accordance with the behests of Mariategui has justified itself historically. The Peruvian communists, true to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, are firmly and consistently fighting to overcome the country's economic and social backwardness on the basis of an alliance of the working class, the peasantry, the urban middle strata and the patriotic elements among the local bourgeoisie.

In this struggle against imperialism and for the people's happiness, for peace, democracy and socialism, proletarian internationalism and cooperation with world socialism and the national-liberation movement are of crucial importance.

Conversely, the APRA works hand-in-glove with U.S. imperialism and the Peruvian reactionaries and does all it can to block the advance of the democratic, progressive and revolutionary forces. 'While remaining the main anti-communist, political force of the right,' *Unidad,* the PCP newspaper, writes, 'it is gradually sliding toward fascism. Behind its hypocritical banner it hides a sharpened knife to be

used against the communists and the popular forces. The APRA is the trump card in the conspiratorial plans of imperialism's fascist wing. In practice the methods of struggle employed by the APRA party are based on terror. This makes it the main bastion of the reactionary, oligarchic and pro-imperialist circles. With alarm that increases daily the Peruvians watch the maneuvers of the APRA designed to intensify the penetration of big monopoly capital, which its leaders are serving.'[7]

Defining the treacherous and pro-imperialist nature of the APRA, Jorge del Prado, General Secretary of the Peruvian Communist Party, has also exposed the dangerous fascist proclivities that emerge not only in its programmatic conceptions associated with the setting up of the so-called Economic Congress,[8] but also in its support for such anti-democratic measures as the anti-communist law of 1962, the repressions against the guerrilla movement in 1965, and other similar measures. What is more, the Peruvian people have not forgotten that Haya de la Torre was one of the first, as far back as 1962, to support the anti-Soviet position of Mao Tse-tung, urging North American imperialism to cooperate with the Maoists on an anti-Soviet basis.

Experience has vindicated the political line taken by the Peruvian communists, who have for long maintained that the country's national sovereignty can be strengthened and social progress achieved only through reliance on the mass of the people, only with the support of Peru's natural allies, and not in collusion with its sworn enemies.

The APRA in alliance with international capital, above all U.S. imperialism, whose interests were substantially affected by the Peruvian revolution, eagerly contributed to the destabilization of Peru's political regime, urging the armed forces to abandon the revolutionary program of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic transformations launched in 1968, to relinquish the progressive foreign-policy course, and submit to the dictates of the International Monetary Fund. In the face of this danger Jorge del Prado vigorously urged the working people, peasants, intellectuals, progressive and democratic popular circles, and the revolutionary organizations to set up a broad anti-imperialist popular front to defend the people's gains and counter the attacks of the pro-oligarchy and pro-imperialist reactionaries in Peru. He pointed out that 'the most serious threat to the interests of the Peruvian people emanates not only from the International Monetary Fund, which is trying to impose increasingly onerous terms on our people that will radically worsen their material position, but also from internal reaction and particularly the APRA, which seeks to recover its lost political positions and achieve a return to the past.'[9] The essentially treacherous and reactionary nature of the APRA is making itself quite clear. The APRA was shaped by the false notions of Haya

de la Torre on 'national exclusiveness' and imperialism and his claims to be able to transcend Marxism-Leninism. This was the culmination of his political evolution, an evolution that turned him into an avowed enemy of all the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic gains that the Peruvian people have made in recent years, and that have launched Peru on the road of national and social progress.

1. It evoked an unusual surge of energy among the Peruvian proletariat, which under the leadership of Jose Carlos Mariategui, on October 7, 1928, founded the Peruvian Communist Party.

2. V.R. Haya de la Torre. *Por la emancipacion de la America Latina*. Buenos Aires, 1927. This book was subjected to a Marxist criticism by Mariategui in the journal *Amauta* and by one of the founders of the Communist Party of Cuba, Julio Antonio Mella, in his book, *Que es el APRA? (What is the APRA?)*

3. R. Arismendi. *Problemas de una revolucion continental*. Montevideo. 1962.

4. V.R. Haya de la Torre. *Treinta anos de aprismo*. Fondo de cultura economica, Mexico, 1956, p. 55.

5. J.C. Mariategui. *Ideologia y politica*. Empresso Editora Amauta, Lima, 1969, p. 248.

6. Letter to I.B. Schweitzer, October 13, 1868. *Selected Correspondence*, p. 214.

7. *Unidad*, Lima, May 12, 1977.

8. Economic Congress — a fascist corporative-type assembly for representatives of working people and employers, national and foreign. The latter are to be appointed by investors and transnational imperialist companies. — *C.B.*

9. *Unidad*, Lima, October 13, 1977.

Imperialism and border conflicts

Julio Laborde
CC member, CP Argentina

U.S. and British imperialist expansionism on our continent ranges from economic pressure to armed intervention. An important element of this policy has always been inciting and interfering in border conflicts. As the United States has forced Great Britain out of Latin America, U.S. interference in relations between our countries has steadily increased. This is by no means a sign that Britain's finance capital has stopped its provocations and intrigues. More often than not it goes on plundering the continent hand in glove with U.S. capital.

Imperialism pursues many goals in starting fratricidal wars. Channeling the people's hatred, not against their oppressors, but against their neighbors means weakening militant anti-imperialist solidarity and creating even more favorable conditions for the monopolies to

interfere in Latin America's internal affairs with the pious intention of 'judging' the conflicting sides and 'helping' nations that have been wronged.[1]

This may also be done in an attempt to topple progressive regimes and build up monopoly-serving reactionary circles capable of launching brutal reprisal campaigns, mainly against communists. And there is the added motive of stepping up the arms race to rake in superprofits on arms sales, and to penetrate into strategically important regions rich in raw materials.

So, although the goals may vary, they nevertheless boil down to strengthening imperialism's economic, political and military domination. Controversies over poorly defined boundaries — a legacy of colonialist times — are often used by the imperialists to start fratricidal wars. Whereas given normal conditions and a mutual desire, these controversies could be settled peacefully. And this is the problem we shall attempt to deal with in this article drawing on a number of historical examples.

In the 1930s a bloody war erupted between Paraguay and Bolivia, known as 'la guerra del Chaco.' The Bolivian writer Tristan Marof wrote: 'Prior to the discovery of oil this hostility over Chaco was no more than an old quarrel between the foreign ministries which, sooner or later, would have been justly settled. The issue became complicated when a powerful company (Standard Oil — *J.L.)* won huge concessions to exploit the oil deposits in the Chuquisaca, Santa Cruz and Tarija departments. Bolivia was drawn into a war for the interests of this Yankee oil company.'[2]

But in Paraguay there also were forces interested in oil. The British Royal Dutch concern laid claim to the oil deposits in the area of conflict and backed the Paraguayan government. In August 1934, the journal *Actualidad* wrote: 'For two years now, thousands of Paraguayan and Bolivian working people in Chaco Boreal have been suffering from hunger or thirst or have been killed for the interests of Standard Oil and Royal Dutch.' Julio Alvarez del Vayo, chairman of the League of Nations commission investigating the conflict, said in his report that 'the Chaco war' was started over oil.

Our countries' vital needs are skillfully and egoistically exploited by the monopolies, and the 'Chaco war' is a good example. Bolivia's determination to have a port on the Paraguay river played a big role in starting the war. 'The port that Bolivia is so anxious to have (understandably so),' wrote Tristan Marof, 'is also urgently needed by the Yankee company which intends building a pipeline from the oil deposits to the Paraguay river. In this case the Bolivian government will get no more for "its" oil than a miserable 11 per cent commission as stipulated in the contract the irresponsible government signed with

Standard Oil. The port on the Paraguay will belong to Standard Oil and not to Bolivia. The Bolivian flag will flutter in the breeze, . . . but the money and accounts will remain in the hands of foreign companies.'[3]

Like other border controversies, the more recent conflict between El Salvador and Honduras, in 1969, shows that in these years imperialism's criminal nature has not changed a bit. The hand of imperialism and local reaction was clearly visible in this short but bloody war, the consequences of which are still felt today and which the bourgeois media sarcastically called the 'football war' in an attempt to hide its economic and social causes. To preserve its economic domination over both countries, U.S. imperialism has leaned heavily on the landed oligarchy in El Salvador and Honduras. The time came, however, when the economic interests of the ruling classes in both countries clashed. The Central American Common Market, which was profitable for El Salvador because it provided an outlet for a large part of its products, meant a loss for Honduras, as is seen from the following figures. Six years of Central American integration brought a great change in the development level of the two countries where as the value of industrial goods produced by Honduras in 1960 was 78.5 per cent of the Salvador figure, by 1967 it had dropped to 47.8 per cent.

However, it was not the people of El Salvador who gained from the favorable market conditions but the U.S. companies and the local oligarchy, who were in control of the key branches of the economy. In order to deflate the pressure of the urban and rural population, the El Salvadoran oligarchy, tied to the imperialist monopolies, tried to resolve its difficulties at the expense of Honduras by bargaining for better conditions to sell its goods and encouraging part of the population to emigrate, mainly the poor peasants who were forced to work for low wages. The oligarchy in Honduras, however, refused to carry this cross because it had its own serious and worsening difficulties.

The ruling classes in both countries fear a revolutionary upheaval. Sensing intuitively that such an upheaval was close at hand, they tried to avoid it at any cost. And just what did Latin America's chief gendarme do? The North American monopolies, whose interests in economic integration (most profitable for them) coincide with those of the Salvadoran oligarchy, started encouraging the government's aggressive policy without, however, losing their contacts with the oligarchy in Honduras. 'One of two goals are pursued by starting or threatening to start a war,' says a July 23, 1976, statement of the CP Honduras, 'either to force the government of Honduras to return to the CACM, or to overthrow it so that the government that takes its place should join the CACM.'[4] Instead of resolving the conflict, the

OAS prolonged it, thus whipping up an arms race in both countries to the delight of the arms manufacturers in the United States and other countries.

Amid this climate of rampant chauvinism and false patriotism, the communists of El Salvador and Honduras pointed to the real reasons for the conflict. One of their joint statements in 1976, an example of true patriotism and internationalism, pointed out that 'Yankee imperialism, particularly the Ford and Kissinger administration, the Pentagon and the CIA and the reactionary Latin American hardhats, notably the clique of fascist generals in El Salvador, are the ones who are endangering the peace between our countries and in all of Central America. It is they who are again trying to involve the two fraternal nations in a war that would slaughter their sons — and the profound desire of both peoples for emancipation and a better life. They try to hide these vicious criminal intentions behind the facade of false patriotism. If they are realized, however, it will bring our countries under still greater domination by North American imperialism and our people will be subjected to still more brutal exploitation and oppression.'

The tiny country of Belize with a population of only 150,000, lying between Guatemala and Mexico in the southeast of the Yucatan Peninsula, is one of Britain's last colonies in America. The growth of the national-liberation struggle and the changing balance of world forces made Britain declare its readiness to grant Belize full independence. However, every time it was about to carry out its promise the ultra-reactionary government of Guatemala would begin to rattle its military hardware and threaten invasion.

In 1859 Guatemala and Britain signed a treaty defining the territorial boundaries of Belize, which at that time was called British Honduras. Under this treaty Britain and Guatemala were to build a highway at a cost of £80,000. It never was built but the Guatemalan dictatorship continues making territorial claims on Belize on the basis of this clause in the treaty.

At the 1973 OAS meeting Dudley Thompson, delegate from Jamaica, said that juridically and historically Guatemala's claims to annex Belize were outdated and did not conform with reality.[5]

The real reasons for Guatemala's aggressive policy were to be found elsewhere. 'Only when the problem of energy sources caused a world crisis did Guatemala lay special claim to the southern part of Belize, more precisely, to the region of Toledo where, it is believed, there are riches potentially important to the oil companies,' said Belize government ministers Perdomo and Shoman in an interview for the Costa Rican newspaper *Libertad*, August 18, 1976.

In Guatemala the U.S. monopolies have a free hand and their

occupation of Belize would mean extending the rule of U.S. concerns into this rich country. In 1975 the Cuban newspaper *Granma* wrote: 'The United States administration is backing Guatemala, encouraging its expansionistic ambitions. The banana, cocoa, sugar-cane and citrus plantations are monopolized by the old United Fruit Company and if it is true that there are rich oil deposits in the northeast it will excite the appetites of such companies as Standard Oil, which is striving to establish its complete economic domination in the area.'

Economic and strategic interests are closely intertwined. The Pentagon-dependent Central American Defense Council is intent on making Guatemala a gendarme for this region, just as the Pentagon itself is striving to make the Brazilian dictatorship the policeman of South America.

Faced with Guatemala's aggressiveness, the communists of that country have boldly expressed their patriotic and internationalist views. The position of the Guatemalan Party of Labor is clearly stated in its program. 'The revolution,' it says, 'will protect the right of the people of Belize to free self-determination and will help them in their struggle against British colonialism. . . . It will likewise establish and strengthen friendship and cooperation between the peoples of Guatemala and Belize.'[6]

Bolivia, it will be recalled, has neither a seacoast nor roads to the Pacific Ocean and has, therefore, neither its own port nor even an enclave or 'free port.' This was not always so, however. In 1825 when Bolivia became independent, it had an extended coastline along the Pacific with four ports — Cobija, Tocopilla, Mejillones and Antofagasta.

The fact that today Bolivia is 'landlocked' with no outlet to the ocean is the result of the 1879-83 Pacific War, one of the first wars provoked in Latin America by British imperialism to create a zone of economic, financial and political influence by changing the historically formed borders between three neighboring states: Bolivia, Peru and Chile.

The first to profit from Chilean troops occupying Bolivia's maritime department and Peru's Tarapaca Province were the British companies maneuvering to monopolize the guano and saltpeter deposits, which were then in great demand in Europe.

Bolivia's ruling classes often distorted the meaning of the just demand for an outlet to the ocean, imparting to it either a revanchist a pragmatic character, depending on the circumstances and the political problems they confronted, but never taking into account the real interests of the nation. In this respect Banzer's agreement with Pinochet's proposal, which precludes any solution, was highly significant.

After agreeing that Bolivia's demand was justified, the dictators Pinochet, Geisel and Banzer undertook a sinister maneuver in 1975 that was wholly in the interests of the fascist government in Chile, the Brazilian expansionists and U.S. imperialism. Pinochet replied to Banzer's concrete proposal, saying that Chile was prepared to let Bolivia have a strip of territory about ten kilometres wide in the northern border area if Bolivia would give up part of its territory as compensation. This looked like a 'brilliant' deal since the strip Pinochet was offering had belonged to Peru prior to the Pacific War. But by the 1929 protocol this territory could not be ceded by Chile either as a whole or in part to a third power without the consent of Peru. The point is, however, that in 1975 Peru had a revolutionary-democratic government that did not suit imperialism and which Pinochet, on orders from the United States, intended to isolate and then help to topple. Meanwhile Pinochet's troops, generously armed by the Pentagon, were preparing to invade Peru. Incidentally, Peking considered itself obliged to support Pinochet and gave him credit and technical aid.

Speaking at a Central Committee Plenum of the Communist Party of Peru in December 1976, General Secretary Jorge del Prado said: 'There is nothing extraordinary in the fact that, as we have said on various occasions, Pinochet's fascist government — an obedient tool of U.S. imperialism — has in these circumstances again raised the question of Bolivia's access to the sea, thinking not of the legitimate aspirations of the Bolivian people, but of exciting tension against Peru. Despite the fact that Peru's armed forces government, since the days of Velasco, has been doing everything possible to neutralize these provocations, the threat of war has invariably been an effective means of counter-revolutionary blackmail aimed at changing the domestic and foreign policies of the Peruvian government. The reactionary and centrist circles in the armed forces took advantage of these (and other) threats to eliminate those among the military who took up left positions.'[7]

In connection with the chauvinistic bellicose campaign unleashed in the military junta's press, the Communist Party of Chile pointed out: 'We emphatically condemn all that helps to incite a conflict between the peoples of Chile and Peru. Those who, in one or another country, or from outside, as the U.S. imperialists are doing, strive to create a hostile climate are harming the present and future interests of the peoples of both countries.'[8]

But this carefully devised plan came up against such difficulties as the firm stand of Peru's government and the strong opposition to the plan by Bolivia's democrats, including those in the armed forces, and the people of Chile and Peru.

A solution to the question of access to the sea, say Bolivia's communists, must take into consideration the interests of the people of Bolivia, Peru and Chile. It must be founded on the ideals of social progress, peace and security in the region.

The imperialist monopolies and local chauvinists also tried to foment border trouble between Venezuela and Colombia in the region of the Gulf of Venezuela, where there are oil deposits. To fan a war psychosis, Venezuela's 'nationalists' launched an anti-Colombian press campaign. And ultimately they became suppliers of arms manufactured in Britain. The Venezuelan government turned a blind eye to all this.

Attempts to provoke trouble between these two countries failed thanks to the efforts of the democratic forces and the explanatory work by the communists of both countries. In a joint statement in 1974, the Communist parties of Colombia and Venezuela declared, 'The growth of chauvinistic campaigns in Venezuela and Colombia are without a doubt directly connected with attempts by the imperialists to retain control of the natural wealth of these countries. On the one hand, these campaigns are meant to place the Venezuelan government in a difficult position and prevent it from carrying out plans to nationalize oil and, on the other, they seek to stop the mounting struggle of the people of Colombia in defense of their natural wealth, particularly oil. Obviously the CIA and the Pentagon want to inflame chauvinistic feelings in both countries, creating tension and launching an arms race and undermining the Andean Pact and other progressive initiatives. The simultaneous timing of certain actions and the similarity of the planning prove that in both Colombia and Venezuela the machinations against the historical fraternity of our countries emanate from one and the same center.'[9]

The two fraternal parties appealed to the working class and to all democratic circles in Venezuela and Colombia to mobilize their forces against the militarist campaign and settle problems peacefully without interference by the imperialists.

In 1977, following the ruling of the British court of arbitration on Beagle Channel, the border controversy between Argentina and Chile flared up sharply.[10]

Pinochet's regime — offspring of Yankee imperialism — tried to use the British ruling for its own expansionistic plans on the basis of a geopolitical 'theory.' In Caracas, the newspaper *El Nacional* said 'that in contrast to the positive measures of the Salvador Allende constitutional government, the military junta's policy toward its neighbors is tough.'

The people of both countries are dissatisfied with this conflicting situation because the friendship between them dates back to the days

when these states were founded. In the war for independence Chileans and Argentinians shed their blood in historical battles against a common enemy. Subsequently they joined forces with other Latin American peoples against British and North American imperialism, and personal and family ties exist between hundreds of thousands of Chileans and Argentinians.

The Communist Party of Argentina passed a fitting judgment on the ruling of the British Crown. It pointed out that reactionary Latin American regimes are falling apart, particularly Pinochet's fascist structure. So the dictator has been trying to resolve his difficulties with the help of external political ventures. Meanwhile the extreme rightists in Argentina, dreaming of a Pinochet-type regime, are using international complications to realize their own plans and to take the people's minds off the serious domestic problems.

Bilateral talks are the most effective way of settling differences, say the communists of Argentina. These could bring about an agreement acceptable to both sides in the spirit of Helsinki. The danger lies in U.S. imperialism's interfering in these controversial issues because of its claims to the natural wealth, and the strategic importance of the zone of conflict.

And oil is the key issue. U.S. geological surveys carried out two years ago discovered a 'lake of oil' containing approximately 200,000 million barrels of oil in the area off the Argentine coast running south of the Malvinas Islands. There are also extensive deposits on the islands themselves which, by rights, should belong to Argentina, but which are controlled by British imperialism. There is a rich animal and vegetable life in the South Atlantic and large deposits of minerals, including magnesium.

It is likewise a key zone in terms of world strategy. For several years now the Pentagon has been working to create a strong base there and hammer together a South Atlantic treaty organization similar to NATO. The many difficulties in the way of these plans have prevented them from being realized so far, but there can be no doubt that U.S. imperialism will do its utmost, through intrigue and exploiting the reactionary elements in both countries, to gain control of this zone.

If imperialism is able to consolidate, here, it will be in control of two key approaches to the Atlantic — from the Pacific through the Strait of Magellan, Beagle Channel and Drake Passage; and from the Indian Ocean past the Crozet, Prince Edward and Bouvet Islands and Antarctica. From the Cape of Good Hope a southern route cuts across the Atlantic to the Latin American continent in the region between Bahia Blanca and Rio de Janeiro. And the United States is by no means indifferent to the strategic Malvinas Islands, lying as

they do at the meeting of the two oceans. In 1977 the Argentine journal *Ultima Clave* wrote that for the United States these islands are 'an appropriate place to build a large naval base from which it could control the approaches to Antarctica and the confluence of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans south of Cape Horn.'

What is at stake here is not the small islands themselves, inhabited by friendly penguins. This is a question of economic and strategic plans, of the danger to the peace and security not of this region alone but of the whole world, unless the conflict is resolved in the spirit of Helsinki with due consideration for the interests of the people of Argentina and Chile.

Such are only a few examples of border conflicts demonstrating imperialism's aggressiveness.

Lenin believed that controversies between states should be settled peacefully and condemned wars 'as a bestial means of settling conflicts in human society' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 8, p. 565). The great achievements of the founders of Marxism-Leninism are that they showed convincingly that already in capitalist conditions the proletariat must have an independent international policy, actively oppose the foreign-policy steps of bourgeois governments and continually expose their violations of international law. Marx and Engels pointed out to the working class that it had the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics, to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments, to counteract them, if necessary by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations. 'The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes' (Karl Marx, Frederick Engels. *Selected Works*. In Three Volumes, Vol. 2, p. 18).

True to these behests the communist parties of Latin America march in the vanguard of the struggle against imperialism and for democracy and social progress. They strive to guide the working people in the spirit of international friendship and proletarian solidarity and untiringly expose the manueverings of the main enemy of our countries. By all their activities in the sphere of foreign policy they help to strengthen peace and security in this part of the world.

1. It is not the Latin American and Caribbean countries that enjoy such 'privileged' attention. Imperialism has always done the same in Asia and Africa. The present Chinese leaders are following a similar policy. To carry out their great-power hegemony they interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states, incite border clashes and try every means to pressure and influence neighboring countries.
2. Tristan Marof. *La Tragedia del Altiplano*. Buenos Aires, 1934, p. 169.

3. Ibid., p. 163.
4. *Estudio,* August 1976, No. 3, p. 22.
5. La Declaracion Conjunta de los Partidos Comunistas de Honduras y de El Salvador. 1976.
6. Programa de la Revolucion Popular. 1970, p. 32.
7. Jorge del Prado. *El PCP ante la Eneruciada Politica.* December 1976, p. 23.
8. *Desde Chile hablan los comunistas!* Ediciones Colo-Colo, 1976, p. 180.
9. Declaracion Conjunta de los Partidos Comunistas de Colombia y Venezuela. Caracas, 1974.
10. In 1971 the governments of Argentina and Chile asked Britain to arbitrate in the question of Beagle Channel.

ALLENDE'S CHILE an INSIDE VIEW

"an informative and sobering affidavit"
— KIRKUS REVIEWS

by Edward Boorstein

In the U.S.

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

Cloth $12.50, Paper $4.25 (U.S.)

In Canada

PROGRESS BOOKS
487 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5V 1T4

Cloth $16.50, Paper $5.45 (Can.)

exchange of views

The economic crisis and the developing countries

Professor *Georgi Skorov*
D.Sc. (Econ.), USSR

The world capitalist economy has been in a highly feverish state for the fifth year running. It is true that the 1974-75 economic crisis (in the proper sense of the word as the phase of falling production in the cyclical movement of capital) has already passed, but the revival and the sluggish and intermittent upturn that followed did nothing to reduce the multimillion army of unemployed or load the idle capacities. These typical crisis phenomena are still in evidence. What is more, the uncertainty of the economic outlook is such that no one can say for sure how the capitalist economy will develop over the next few months, and many research centers in the capitalist world, including the Secretariat of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris, believe that a fresh decline in production and a further increase in unemployment may well occur before the end of this decade.

This morbid, unstable state of the capitalist economic system, with post-crisis phases of development alternating with slowdown and interruptions of growth and downturns in production, springs from the specific character in which the general and the cyclical crisis of capitalism are interlaced, and from the vast deepening of all its contradictions.*

Together with the over-accumulation of fixed capital, massive unemployment and partial employment of manpower, this state is also marked by a low rate of investment in fixed production assets and of growth of order books for new equipment, unprecedented inflation in peace-time, disruption of the international monetary system and periodical crises of the chief currencies, a return to protectionism in international trade and an undeclared trade war between the chief centers of contemporary capitalism, and record deficits run up by

We continue the discussion of the crisis of capitalism. See *WMR*, January, March and June 1978.

*For details, see M. Schmidt. 'Capitalism after the 1974-75 crisis.' *WMR*, March 1978.

most capitalist and developing countries in their trade and payments balances. All of this should be seen against the backdrop of steadily declining real incomes of the working people and a continued growth of monopoly profits.

External factors

The developing countries, a component part of the capitalist world economy, have felt the full impact of the economic upheavals of the 70s. The peculiarities of the crisis in these countries stem from the fact that it is caused mainly by external factors. The epicenters of the crisis are located in the industrial zone of capitalism, while on the outskirts it is a derivative and secondary phenomenon introduced from outside. The reason is that the capitalist mode of production there is undeveloped and relatively immature, and that nowhere — perhaps with the exception of some middle-development capitalist countries in Latin America and some industrial centers in Asia — has it yet reached the 'critical mass' which could impart to it a cyclical movement of its own. Consequently, the fluctuations of production in the developing countries reflect the cyclical movement of social capital in the world capitalist economy.

Insofar as the share of the developing countries' product which is involved in world commerce and which is injected directly into the reproduction of capital in the industrialized capitalist countries tends to grow, there is an ever stronger interconnection between the center and the periphery, and with it a greater synchronization of cyclical fluctuations, which make the blows of the crisis ever more devastating.

The manifestations of the crisis in developing countries are also peculiar. In contrast with the industrialized capitalist countries, where the decline in production and growth of unemployment, resulting from an over-accumulation of capital, are the main signs of the crisis, in the economically lagging and mainly agrarian or agrarian-industrial countries, where massive unemployment and partial employment are chronic and involve between a quarter and a third of the labor force, the balance of payments (next to the size of the crop) is the key indicator of the state of the economy. It shows whether a country can sell its own goods to pay for the imports vital to its existence and development. If it cannot, how is it to cover the deficit, or to what extent should imports be cut back to balance out its expenditures and receipts? The hypertrophied role of the balance of payments in the less developed countries' economy reflects their heavy dependence on the world market and the course of reproduction in the industrialized zone of capitalism.

The crisis phenomena in the developing countries' economy are

also a reflection of the internal contradictions of their development: the contradiction between the requirements in building up a modern system of productive forces, and the backward relations of production which are still burdened with pre-capitalist survivals; the contradiction between the patently inadequate volume of the national accumulation fund, and the vast scale of investments required for development and technical restructuring of the national economy; the contradiction between the urge of the ruling élite and all the exploiting sections to obtain maximum incomes, and the social imperative to raise the still appallingly low living standards of the masses; the contradiction between the narrowness of the national market, and the high productivity of modern hardware and technology geared to mass production; the contradiction between the objective social need to involve millions of unemployed and partially employed in productive labor, and the urgent need to raise the labor productivity of those who are already working. The periodical aggravation of all these and other contradictions, which cannot be resolved in the capitalist way, is just as inevitable as the flare-ups of contradictions in developed capitalism.

Effects of the crisis

Economic crises in the developing countries usually run the following course. The cyclical decline in production in the developed capitalist countries leads to a sharp cutback in demand for raw materials, the developing countries' main export products. This results in a varying reduction in the prices of raw materials, a contraction in the volume of world raw-material trade, and a shrinkage in the young countries' export earnings. That is roughly how events in the 70s developed.

Following a raw-material boom at the start of the decade, there was a marked reduction in 1974-75 of the prices of most raw-material commodities, and especially of copper, zinc, rubber, cotton, timber, copra and palm oil. Meanwhile, inflation in the industrialized capitalist countries, the energy crisis and the aggravation of the world food problem kept the prices of goods and services imported by the developing countries on a steady upgrade — about 15-20 per cent in some years. This included food, fertilizers, machinery and equipment, oil and oil products, insurance, freight and the services of technical specialists.

As a result of world prices moving in these two opposite directions and of the growing gap in the export-import exchange proportions, there has been a rapid growth of deficits in the less developed countries' balance of trade.

Two other factors beyond the control of the developing countries intensified this trend: (1) a falling-off in earnings from tourist travel,

an important industry in the countries of the Mediterranean and the Caribbean, Mexico and some other countries, in consequence of the lowering of living standards in Western Europe and North America; (2) smaller remittances home by immigrant workers in developed capitalist countries. On the eve of the crisis, they were estimated to number 12 million in Europe, and together with legal and illegal immigrants in the United States and Canada, almost 20 million, which naturally made their contribution to the balance of payments of many countries significant.

Under the impact of growing unemployment in the crisis period, capitalist governments (as in Switzerland and France) began to introduce restrictions on the entry of foreign workers. At the same time, reactionary political parties and groupings (notably in Britain) started flagrantly chauvinistic and racist campaigns against immigrant workers from developing countries.

The operation of all these factors, combined with the depreciation of the leading currencies of the capitalist world, and the periodical upheavals in the international money markets since 1971 led to a sharp increase in the young countries' balance-of-payments deficits, which became chronic.

LDCs' balance-of-payments deficit ($bln)*

1973	*1974*	*1975*	*1976*	*1977*	*1978*
8.0	24.5	40.0	26.3	22.5	33.5**

*Without oil exporters; **Estimate.

Source: *OECD Economic Outlook.* December 1977, p. 64; *The Financial Times,* May 30, 1978.

The growth of BOP deficits confronted the developing countries with the need sharply to cut back imports of vital goods, something that could not always be done. Thus, the famine in India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, the Saharian zone of Africa, Ethiopia and some other countries put definite constraints on cutbacks in food imports. Reductions in the use of oil could not be effected all at once without serious upheavals even in the underdeveloped economies. Cutbacks in machinery and equipment imports also required a definite period because cancellation of orders placed before the crisis entailed the payment of vast amounts in forfeits.

For that reason, while pursuing a harsh austerity policy, the developing countries were forced increasingly to look to foreign sources to cover their deficits. In the past, they had compensated for the shortage of their internal resources mainly in two ways: by importing foreign government capital in the form of long-term loans, credits and subsidies, and foreign private capital, mainly in the form of direct invest-

ments in the economy. But with the leading capitalist countries unable to cope with their own economic difficulties, it was unrealistic to expect any marked increase in the influx of government capital. So, the developing countries were faced with the alternative of obtaining fresh loans on private money markets, notably petrodollars and Eurocurrencies.

Here, the interests of the multinational monopolies, with their available loan capital, appeared to coincide with those of the developing countries. The multinationals, financial groups of the military-industrial complex, commercial banks and newly-rich oil sheiks were seeking profitable investment for their 'hot money,' and the developing countries — a source to cover their multibillion-dollar deficits. The over-accumulation of loan capital, which was evidenced by the drop in the discount rate on the Euromoney market from 14 per cent to 6 per cent in 1974-75 favored such a financial operation on an unprecedented scale.

*LDCs' growing external debt**

1955	*1965*	*1970*	*1973*	*1974*	*1975*	*1976*	*1977*
8.7	37.1	72.9	112.4	137.2	172.9	206.8**	250.0***

*Without oil exporters; **Preliminary; ***Estimate.
Source: UNCTAD Secretariat.

All of this created the premises for a new twist in the spiral of the developing countries' financial exploitation, with its characteristic features of rapidly growing indebtedness by the young states, a marked shift in its structure, and relation between the sources of coverage.

These data show that the external debt of the developing countries (oil exporters apart) increased by nearly $140 billion, i.e., more than doubled, and was 30 times the 1955 figure (in current prices).

In 1977, roughly $70 billion consisted of private commercial credits, the most onerous form of external financing both from the standpoint of deadlines and terms, with non-governmental institutions on the whole covering something like 45 per cent of the LDCs' requirements in loan facilities, as compared with 30 per cent at the end of the 60s. While these changes did signify a marked toughening up of the terms of debt servicing, the young states were forced increasingly to resort to private loans and commercial credits to repay principal and interest under earlier financial obligations.

This has produced a vicious circle: in order to repay their old debts, the developing countries have to incur new and even more onerous ones. In the mid-70s, the repayment of principal and interest cut a big swath in their export earnings: in Brazil 15 per cent; Zaire 17 per cent;

Mauritania 19 per cent; Sudan 21 per cent; Argentina 22 per cent; Mexico 26 per cent; Chile and Egypt 35 per cent; Peru 39 per cent, and Uruguay 46 per cent. This means that much of the money going from the developed to the developing countries in the form of 'aid' is being returned to the private monopolies and banks. Loans to developing countries for repayment of their multibillion-dollar debts are becoming a major source of enrichment for the owners of loan capital. Interest on such loans, for instance, accounted for one-half of all the profits made by New York banks in 1976 and 1977.

Such is one of the latest expressions of the developing countries' neo-colonial exploitation by the imperialist powers and the capitalist monopolies in the post-crisis state of the capitalist economy in the late 70s. No wonder the debt problem has become the second most important issue after raw materials in the discord between the developing and capitalist countries in the intricate and still ineffective negotiations on establishing a 'new international economic order.'

There is yet another aspect to the developing countries' financial indebtedness which is connected with the process of reproduction in the developed capitalist countries. This indebtedness ultimately reflects the transfer of real, material and not monetary resources to the developing countries, and although the value of these resources — goods and services — must in principle be reimbursed, together with an increment in the form of a part of the surplus-value created in the developing countries, at each given moment it is a substraction, a withdrawal of economic resources at the disposal of the developed capitalist countries. Had there been no such withdrawal, had there, in particular, been no transfer over the past four years by the capitalist states to the developing countries of goods and services worth $140 billion on credit, there would undoubtedly have been an ever greater over-accumulation of capital in the commodity form and this would have made it even more difficult for the capitalist economy to move out of the current economic difficulties. Consequently, the withdrawal of a part of the product from the circuit of social capital in the developed capitalist countries and its transfer to the developing countries in the form of 'aid' is yet another factor which helps state-monopoly capitalism to maintain a definite level of production and employment. Of course, this is not the only or perhaps not even the main purpose of the 'aid' to the developing countries, just as giving the capitalist economy a shot-in-the-arm is not the main purpose of the arms drive, but both have a definite role to play in the reproduction process of contemporary capitalism.

Growing differentiation

Up to now I have considered the main expressions and consequences

of the economic crisis in the developing countries in their totality, an approach which is required to bring out the general regularities in the cyclical movement of capital in that sector of the world economy. But to stop there would mean losing sight of the specific impact of the crisis on the individual countries or groups of them. It is all the more necessary to get a view of this impact considering that the less developed world consists of nearly 120 countries, and is much more diverse than the socially homogeneous group of developed capitalist countries, numbering less than 20, but in each of which the economic cycle runs a different course.

In terms of the impact of the crisis, the developing countries fall into these four groups: (1) countries which have substantially strengthened their financial and economic positions despite the crisis; (2) countries which have in the main managed to maintain or have slightly worsened their positions; (3) countries which have suffered considerable economic losses, and (4) countries which have suffered most.

The *first group* includes the oil-exporting countries that the post-1973 'oil-price revolution' brought a total of almost $400 billion, which is equal to one-third of the value of all the shares quoted on the stock exchanges of New York, London, Paris and Frankfurt-on-Main. Although these countries have sustained tangible losses because of some over-production of oil in 1977 and 1978 and the steady depreciation of the dollar, the recycling of petrodollars, which means their return to the capitalist economy as means of payment, has turned some OPEC members (notably Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates and Iran) into major exporters of capital, with new investments running higher than those of such imperialist powers as Britain, France, the FRG and Japan. The total foreign holdings of the OPEC countries (mainly in the form of deposits in the banks of the United States and other capitalist countries and also in the form of government securities, bonds and shares of industrial companies and investment in real estate, and other assets) are estimated at about $180 billion. In effect, a new financial center of capitalism has emerged in the Middle East, controlling roughly one-third of all the liquidity in the capitalist world.

The *second group* comprises three categories of countries: (1) small states and territories with developed industries and rapidly growing exports of manufactures (Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea and Hong Kong). In the 70s, the national companies and the subsidiaries of multinationals operating there managed to outstrip Japanese and West European monopolies not only in Asia and Africa but also in Western Europe and the United States; (2) countries exporting strategic or scarce raw materials like uranium, bauxites, tin and

phosphates (Malaysia, Morocco and others); (3) countries close to the middle level of capitalist development like Brazil, Mexico and Argentina. Because of the relatively high level of prices for their exports and the influx of foreign capital, countries of this group managed on the whole to cope with the economic difficulties better than other developing countries.

The *third group*, the most numerous one, includes roughly 50 countries (the other developing countries, minus the countries of the fourth group), which have variously suffered from the crisis and still feel the burdens and effects of the continuing economic difficulties in the capitalist economy. Because of the worsening financial and economic condition, most of them have had either to fold up or defer their national-development programs.

The *fourth group* consists of 45 countries, including 29 which are classified by the United Nations as the least developed,* and also insular and land-locked countries. It also includes the two major countries of the Indian subcontinent — India and Pakistan — which are at a higher stage of economic development than the other countries of this group but which rank among the poorest in the world in terms of GNP per head. These countries account for the bulk of the world's population, over 1 billion, who live in total poverty (according to the terminology of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 'below the poverty line').

Of course, this classification is relative because none of the groups is homogeneous in social, economic or political terms. The watershed in the developing world runs between the states oriented upon capitalism and those looking to socialism. But this classification clearly shows the extent of the stratification of the developing countries by economic indicators, especially by GNP growth per head.

These data show that in the period of crisis the GNP per head in the oil-exporting countries continued to grow, going up to 24.3 per cent a year, while all the other developing countries saw it drop to 0.5 per cent, and the group of countries with income per head under $250 actually had a minus rate, which testified to the absolute impoverishment of the population.

The recent crisis hit all the developing countries without exception, but while the socialist-oriented states did all they could to spread out the economic burden with an eye to the property status of the population, the capitalist-oriented countries presented a different picture. There the ruling and exploiting élite connected with international monopoly capital and other privileged sections continued to live in luxury and make vast fortunes while peasants, workers, artisans and

*Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Butan, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Empire, Chad, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Haiti and others.

the lower urban strata which have to live on a per-head income of $100 or less a year have been plunged into the most dire straits by these economic upheavals. In many countries there is an absolute decline in the level of mass consumption, a return of the population from town to country, and a growth of subsistence farming.

LDCs' differentiation by GNP growth per head (1970-75)

	1975 Population, mln.	1975 GNP $	Growth GNP (%) 1970-1973	Growth GNP (%) 1973-75	Growth per head 1973-1975	Growth per head 1973-75
All LDCs	1,867	382	6.3	7.9	3.7	5.3
Main oil exporters	293	606	10.4	27.5	7.6	24.3
All other LDCs	1,574	340	5.5	3.0	2.9	0.5
Countries with rapidly growing export of manufactures	107	1,008	7.3	3.4	4.4	0.6
Other countries						
With a per head income of $250 and over	450	638	6.8	3.3	4.0	0.6
With a per head income of under $250	1,017	138	2.1	2.1	−0.2	−0.2
Least developed countries	245	128	2.7	2.3	0.2	−0.2

Source: *The Recent Economic Experience of Developing Countries in Relation to United Nations Development Objectives*. Report by UNCTAD Secretariat, April 13, 1977, Table I, p. 6.

Nothing of this is, naturally, shown by the averaged-out data of official statistics, but the marked growth of social inequality in the developing world over the past three or four years has to be borne in mind when one analyzes the effects of the economic crisis in the developing countries and assesses the most probable trends in their development in the late 70s and the early 80s.

The sluggish and intermittent upturn in the economy of the industrialized capitalist countries has done nothing to ease the condition of the developing countries. The slowdown in economic growth rates in the leading capitalist countries in 1977 and 1978, as compared with 1976, has led to a reduction in demand and a fresh depression of prices for many raw-material commodities. It is true that as compared with the 50s and 60s, which are sometimes called 'the cheap raw-material era,' the prices of raw-material commodities are, on the whole, fairly high. However, it is not the absolute level of prices, but their relation with the prices of other commodity groups, above all, manufactures, that matters. Following a short-term tilt in favor of the

developing countries in 1973 and 1974, this relation has been steadily tilting against them.

With the low and unstable growth of the industrialized capitalist countries, the economic condition of most developing countries is not likely to improve. Their economic growth is also being retarded by growing food imports, the cost of which reduces their limited resources for shaping the accumulation fund. According to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the developing countries' imports of cereals went up from 4 million tons in the late 60s and early 70s to 19.7 million in the mid-70s, and could well go up to 21 million tons by 1985.

Galloping inflation is a grave problem facing many developing countries on a scale unequalled in the capitalist world over the past period. It is generated by and continues the inflationary processes in the industrial zone of capitalism, but it has acquired a momentum of its own under the impact of deficit-financing by means of which many governments seek to find their way out of the current economic difficulties. In the past several years, it has been given a fresh impetus by the changing price proportions in trade, connected, in particular with the rising prices of primary energy resources. The operation of these factors pushed up the inflation rate in 1976-78 in the group of developing countries to roughly 30 per cent, including Nigeria 20 per cent, Tanzania, the Ivory Coast and Iran 25 per cent, Mexico and Sri Lanka 30 per cent, Colombia, Peru, Kenya and Zambia 40 per cent, Uruguay 50 per cent, Zaire 80 per cent, Ghana 85 per cent, and Chile and Argentina over 100 per cent. The unsettling impact of inflation on such a scale on the economy of the young states can hardly be exaggerated. As in the developed capitalist countries, it is the working people that have to bear the brunt of it.

The main conclusion suggested by the analysis of the impact of the economic crisis on the developing countries is that all of them have variously suffered from the crisis and continue to incur heavy economic losses. The most important result of the crisis is the large-scale one-shot transfusion of the developing countries' national income into the industrialized countries, which was only partially offset by the growth of incomes in a small group of countries, mainly the oil exporters. This transfusion supplemented the systematic redistribution of the gross social product within the framework of the world capitalist economy in favor of the industrialized countries through international trade, export of capital, technological transfer, and the appropriation of surplus-value in the sphere of production through the exploitation of labor-power in the developing countries by the multinationals.

This redistribution of the world's gross product is made possible by

the present system of international economic relations, which is inequitable, exploitative and plunderous, and enables monopoly capital to continue shifting the burden of economic crises, inflation, unemployment, upheavals of the financial and monetary system, and other expressions of the haphazard workings of the capitalist market on the peoples of the less developed countries. That is why an important task of world development in the years ahead is a radical restructuring of the international economic relations which capitalism has set up and continues to maintain, the establishment of the principles of equality, a struggle against every form of exploitation, diktat and discrimination, elimination of the deep-going contradiction between the new independent political role of the young states and their continued economic subjugation.

POLITICAL ECONOMY

VOLUME ONE: CAPITALISM
VOLUME TWO: SOCIALISM

Editor: **G. Kozlov**

First printing 1977

New, comprehensive, easy-to-use books on Marxist-Leninist basics

Ideal for textbook use or personal reference and study

(Volume One not to be confused with *Political Economy of Capitalism* by Afanasayev)

Each volume $4.95

Set of two volumes $8.95

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

Guiding socialist culture: some pressing problems

Lyudmila Zhivkova
President, Committee on Culture,
People's Republic of Bulgaria

A higher level of social guidance, with the use of new, more effective forms and mechanisms in directing public life, is one of the principal features of developed socialism. This applies to every aspect of life in a developed socialist society — its politics, economy, social relations, ideology, science, education, etc. It applies especially to the many and varied phenomena and processes in the realm of culture — the mass media, literature and the arts, and to cultural institutions (clubs, libraries, creative unions, etc.) that contribute to the all-round development of the members of socialist society.

Guidance of socialist culture is an *element* of social guidance. The overall guidance, or management, schema (defining relations between subject and object) is essentially the same as in other areas of socialist society, in directing economic processes, for instance. In the cultural field we use the same basic forms of guidance, such as formulating the aims of the appropriate institutions and organizations, i.e., the objects of guidance; decision-making on basic directions of cultural development, supervision of decision fulfillment and functioning of cultural organizations, etc.

But the guidance of culture should also be seen as a *special, specific* element of overall social management, reflecting the essential features of cultural activity. Hence, guidance in this sphere must fully accord with the objective regularities of cultural development in socialist society, and take into account the totality of multiform cultural trends, phenomena and processes in all their intricate interconnections and relations. In short, use should be made of all modern means and methods of analyzing and prognosticating the numerous phenomena that go into culture and comprise an integral system.

The cultural revolution in socialist Bulgaria has gone through several stages, and at each of them it accorded with the social, economic, political and cultural characteristics of society. And the dynamic development of society required the introduction of new guidance methods and mechanisms.

In documents adopted in the past few years, the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee formulated the historic task of achieving comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual as a basic requirement of socialist society. These decisions are based on the *new stage* in the building of socialism, in which culture plays an exceptional role, and also on the laws governing cultural development in mature socialism. Attainment of this goal requires a *new approach* to the guidance of culture and *new forms* of directing cultural processes. Now, some ten years after the introduction of the new guidance system, we can examine our experience, assess the scale and character of what we have achieved and single out problems awaiting solution.

Improving the system of cultural guidance is closely linked with the general development of our society and is necessitated by the deep-going changes at the present stage of the socialist cultural revolution.

What does this imply?

First, *changing the place and role of culture in the life of society, expansion and intensification of its functions in our people's advance to communism.*

The 11th BCP Congress singled out three main and interconnected directions in the continued building of socialism:

— completing the material and technical base of socialism;

— perfecting social relations and consolidating the socialist way of life;

— comprehensive development of the individual.

Spiritual culture plays an important part in all these three areas. The further our society advances, the greater, in terms of scope, responsibility and influence, is the role of culture in its development. It is an essential factor in the creation of material values, the evolution and assimilation of new life styles, in everything, in fact, connected with the shaping of the new consciousness.

The December 1972 CC Plenum of our party gave us a more precise Marxist-Leninist understanding of the essence, role and importance of cultural activity in the life of society. The program it approved stressed the need to equalize satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society and each of its members. This was a qualitatively new proposition based on the experience accumulated in building socialism and on long-range development plans. It provided the preconditions for a more mature and profound approach to the problems of culture.

We had first to overcome the narrow and restricted understanding of culture as something self-sustained and isolated from the wider socio-political processes. The new stage of socialist construction made it necessary to re-emphasize the leading role of the cultural

factor in forming and developing individual and social consciousness.

As an integral system of organizations and units and of diverse forms of activity, the cultural front has an active part in raising the subjective factor to the level achieved by the material-technical base, social relations and the overall system of social management. For without raising the cultural and general-knowledge standards of the masses there can be no solving the problems of economic and social development, or overcoming the contradiction between the growth of the material base and the lag of the subjective factor.

The uniform system of production, political and cultural aspects of developed socialist society provides the conditions in which the cultural, labor and social activity of the individual finds reflection in social production and influences the social and cultural practice of society as a whole. In this situation spiritual culture penetrates into other spheres of public life to become an equal element of the integral process of building mature socialism.

The changing social functions and increasing role of culture are but a reflection of the increasing importance of the subjective factor in the building of communist society. They reflect, also, a regularity of our social development, namely, that high quality and effectiveness of all labor and public activity, creative initiative, organizational skill, managerial ability, competent and principled decision-making must become the determinative characteristics of the new type of social activity, and intrinsic traits of every member of developed socialist society.

It should also be clear that such objective changes in socialist culture require new judgment criteria both of our general cultural policy and activity and of the way we carry out cultural projects. The new situation calls for higher standards in all our cultural undertakings, in the work of everyone engaged in this complex and sensitive sphere, and in the methods we use in directing cultural processes.

A new approach to the guidance of culture is necessitated also by the *gigantic scope of cultural work* since the historic April 1956 Central Committee Plenum. Recent years have seen a sharp increase in the *scope and volume* of production, distribution and consumption of what we call 'cultural goods.'

The process is measurable in the following figures:

— We put out 4,000 books a year in a total printing of more than 50 million copies (Bulgaria holds a top place in per capita book publishing), and more than 400 feature, documentary, popular-science and other films;

— We have 3,580 cinemas (yearly audience 115 million), more than 50 drama and puppet theatres (yearly audience over 6 million), 204 museums and art galleries (15.5 million visitors a year), and over

10,400 libraries with more than 62.6 million books and nearly 3.5 million subscribers;

— 17,600 amateur art groups with nearly 460,000 participants (the respective figures five years ago were 15,000 and 430,700), amateur concert attendance now stands at 25.7 million, compared with 19.3 million in 1973.

Obviously, cultural activity on such a scale, involving many different units, requires an effective organizational and administrative structure capable of assuring proper distribution of cultural values on a national and regional scale and of building up the material basis of culture.

Nor is it merely a matter of the vast scale of cultural activity. Let us take a closer look at the last figure given above. It clearly shows that we are experiencing not only a quantitative growth of culture, but also qualitative changes in the functioning of the cultural system and appreciable expansion of its social base by bringing the broad masses into the process of creating spiritual values and in guiding culture — in short, from an object of culture, the people are becoming its active subject.

These objective trends, based on the growing educational and cultural level of the population, create the conditions for essential changes in public consciousness and for stimulating the potential spiritual forces of the nation. In this respect, too, there is need for new guidance methods and mechanisms.

Lastly, an important subjective basis for perfecting the guidance of culture at the present stage is the effort of cultural workers to attain the goal set by the party, namely, *more effective functioning of all cultural institutions and organizations,* elimination of shortcomings in their work, including the disproportions in the development of some cultural spheres, the discrepancy between demand and supply of 'high' culture, the need for differentiated cultural services to meet the real (objective and subjective) demands of various population groups.

In this context we are faced with the problem of continued improvement of professional skills among cultural workers, and of raising the quality, ideological and aesthetic level of their productions in literature and the arts. However, this does not imply simply denouncing 'failures,' or taking a nihilistic attitude toward what we have achieved. What it does imply is bringing culture into accordance with the requirements of developed socialist society and making it contribute to the communist education of the people.

The cultural requirements of all strata of the population have undergone profound qualitative change, and only highly artistic works can fully — from the standpoint of social effectiveness — contribute to the building of mature socialism and to the cultivation of the new,

socialist personality. Pseudo-art or hackwork are alien to the very nature of socialist society, socialist culture and the socialist man.

That is why, in this as in other areas of social life, the main and decisive thing at the present stage is to raise the level of cultural activity and improve its quality. This applies to all varieties of artistic culture, all creative workers in literature, music, painting, the theatre, cinema — in short to every sector of the cultural front.

Nor can this problem be resolved by applying the old traditional methods of cultural guidance, which no longer accord with the changed objective characteristics of the function of culture in society and with the more intricate task of communist (ideological, moral, aesthetic) education of the working masses.

Under socialism, the guidance of culture has not been, and never can be, an aim in itself. It should be seen exclusively as a means of charting a correct course for the rapid development of culture in the interests of socialist society and its members.

If competently and purposefully used, the laws and regularities that govern the development of art and culture and are expressive of their essence and nature, can direct the processes, tendencies and phenomena that objectively emerge in this sphere into the required channels. But we cannot agree with methods that disregard the specifics of cultural processes and are based on tutelage and gross interference in artistic creation and impose on the artist rules and models contrary to the very essence of artistic thought and cultural activity.

Cultural processes are objective and proceed in accordance with objective regularities. Organizations entrusted with the guidance of culture can operate successfully only if they do not try to revoke or change the inherent laws of culture, but create the necessary objective and subjective preconditions for their effective operation.

What, essentially, is the new approach to guiding the development of culture in Bulgaria? A magazine article allows for only a brief summary, and I single out these three main distinctive features.

First, *forming an optimal organizational structure* which takes into account on the one hand, the continuous growth of artistic skills in literature and the arts generally, and, on the other, expansion of the social base of culture. The idea is to combine effective supervision with profound democracy by giving cultural workers and the public a meaningful share in the administration of cultural activity.

To secure closer contact between culture and other areas of social life, and closer coordination in the work of cultural institutions, we adopted a new guidance principle based on *joint public and government direction of all aspects of cultural development*. The new public-cum-state structure owes its origin to the socio-economic and cultural-political development of socialist Bulgaria. It stems directly

from the ultimate aim and distinguishing features of developed socialism.

The new system was introduced in 1966 and has since been further developed parallel with the development of our general system of social guidance and the introduction of new, scientifically-substantiated management techniques.

The central authority under the public-cum-state system is the Committee on Culture which coordinates and integrates the work of all cultural institutions. Its other major function is to bring the broad masses into the process of culture and its guidance.

The new structure provides for elections: the Committee on Culture is elected by the Cultural Congresses held every five years and includes prominent cultural personalities, representatives of public organizations and of the different population groups. Local cultural committees work on the same principle.

On the basis of accumulated experience we can safely say that this combination of public and government effort in working out an integral cultural policy makes it possible, first, to bring the broad masses, different sections of the population, into the direction of cultural processes as the chief component of our entire system of culture. Second, the new structure makes for closer coordination of efforts by all institutions that create and disseminate cultural values to raise cultural standards. Third, the men and women who create these values now have a more active part in guiding cultural development.

Second, we now have a *comprehensive approach* to evaluation of cultural processes and phenomena: culture is no longer seen as the sum-total of individual efforts, but as an *integral system,* in which different — in some cases only distantly related — forms are treated as components of the cultural process. In short, the idea is to optimize planning of cultural activity (including investment and selection of the 'main direction'), unify (with due account to the specifics of different branches) the system of indicators by which we compare and appraise cultural activity, etc.

A striking example in this respect is the way we built up the material base of culture as part of a town planning system. In pursuance of the 11th Party Congress decisions, the March 1977 Central Committee Plenum called for a qualitatively new approach to town planning, with each community forming part of an integral system. This offered new opportunities for more rational location of cultural facilities and, hence, for bringing the population into direct association with cultural endeavor.

Another example of a comprehensive solution is our new approach to assessing the efficiency of cultural organizations and institutions. Art, and cultural activity generally, are now at a turning point, and

this makes it necessary for cultural leadership bodies to assure a more effective 'creation-dissemination-impact' cycle, and in practice this means closer unity and consistency in the functioning of various artistic and creative organizations and cultural institutions, more favorable conditions for the spread of culture, making it accessible to the mass of the population, and cultivating new cultural requirements.

Third, the guidance of culture is being put on a *modern scientific basis,* with the use of the latest methods and principles of social management — computerization, cybernetics, etc.

A proper information service is still another major element of our cultural structure. Its purpose is to assure close two-way contact with our 'consumers' in order to properly assess, and react to, the situation on various sectors of the cultural front. But the organization of such an information service involves solution of a number of complex economic, social, cultural, ideological and other problems and the evolvement of effective means by which cultural institutions and organizations can use the information thus obtained.

Wide use is also being made of the so-called multiplication approach, that is, the organization of various aspects of cultural work to produce a multiple effect.

Our guidance methods should rely not only on the new management techniques, computers, etc., but also on the social, humanitarian sciences. For, as indicated above, effective guidance of cultural work is impossible without knowledge and mastery of the appropriate objective laws. And here we can rely on Marxist-Leninist philosophy and sociology, ethics, aesthetics, psychology and other sciences.

Of special importance in this respect is scientific data pertaining to the laws and principles of forming and developing individual and social consciousness, the function of culture in socialist society, the specifics of various branches of culture, the arts, etc.

The guidance principles described above have been concretized in Bulgaria to produce a system of organizational forms assuring proper direction of cultural processes at various levels and of 'culture as a whole,' both on a national and regional scale.

In 1974, in accordance with the public-cum-state principle, we founded the national Culture Complex, which includes all the mass media — television, radio, the press — all the arts — music, the theatre, painting, etc. — and also the numerous institutions engaged mainly in the preservation or dissemination of cultural values and the training of personnel (libraries, clubs, conservatoires, drama and art schools, etc.). The Complex extends to all 11 creative unions, public organizations, ministries and other government departments in one or another way associated with culture.

Administrative direction of the Complex is exercised through a

wide network of art and culture councils founded in practically every town and rural area. They bring together representatives of the creative unions, public organizations, and government departments concerned with culture, and also representatives from all sections of the population (at present the Councils have a total elected membership of 20,250).

And still one more vital link in the cultural structure: the 'program and coordinating' center in which are concentrated research and information, planning, programming, prognostication and international cultural cooperation. This is matched by a 'creative and productive' center, composed of seven national creative-productive organizations (cinema; television; radio; press; music-theatre-circus; fine arts, cultural and historical heritage and libraries; and amateur art), also a guidance center that supervises artistic education, financing and capital construction.

To this should be added that the administrative structures of all the organizations under the Committee on Culture work on the same principles, but with due account to certain specifics, and employ the same scientific management methods. As a result we are putting into practice an idea valuable both in its theoretical and practical implications: independent full-fledged creative and production organizations covering the entire production and dissemination of cultural values cycle.

Besides, in line with the decisions of the March 1977 Central Committee Plenum, we have introduced a new structural pattern for the Culture Complexes. Each now has a definite place in its community and makes a definite contribution to national cultural projects.

In their aggregate, these improvements in directing cultural activity have markedly increased the effectiveness of all our cultural work.

The new integrated guidance mechanism has made for closer integration of the various branches of art and the different types of cultural activities of regional and national cultural institutions.

Application of the public-cum-state principle has helped to bring wide sections of the people into cultural activity and also give the creators of artistic values a meaningful part in the guidance of culture. All this has enhanced the role and responsibility of the artist in shaping the national consciousness. The present work of our creative unions makes it possible, on the one hand, to devote more attention to individual branches of artistic creation and cultural work and, on the other, draw up a common policy in the guidance of culture.

The use of modern management techniques in organizing and directing cultural work has made for the more effective functioning of cultural institutions and organizations and has raised the quality of their leadership.

However, it has to be emphasized that restructuring the guidance system was a very complicated task and at various stages encountered difficulties. In some cases there were serious shortcomings, for example, there was a period of discordance between the proclaimed principle of public-cum-state leadership of culture and its practical application. This was sharply criticized at the 10th Party Congress and the Second Cultural Congress.

Nor are we satisfied with the work of the research auxiliaries of the national Culture Complex. We are working to improve their performance, concentrate their forces on theoretical and applied research. It is also necessary to coordinate the work of the Complex's units (Institute of Culture and the Information Center) with institutes of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and the universities.

Application of the public-cum-state principle has enabled the Culture Complex to organize and operate a wide network of cultural units. The aim is to make it a uniform organization and management mechanism exercising central direction of all cultural work. This in turn will necessitate continued development and application of scientifically-grounded methods of analysis and assessment of the state and prospects of our cultural processes.

The formation of a social mechanism embracing all branches of production and dissemination of cultural values and also assessing their effect on forming the national consciousness, is a formidable task. It can be accomplished only through close coordination of all the elements of the national Cultural Complex. We will achieve our goal only if the Complex becomes a center directing the formation of the Bulgarian people's consciousness in the line with the strategic aim of the party and the ideals of communism. Our national Cultural Complex has everything needed to achieve that momentous goal, and our cultural workers will stint no effort to hasten its achievement.

A COURSE OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Leonid Brezhnev. *O vneshnei politike KPSS i Sovetskogo gosudarstva. (On the Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State).* Speeches and Articles. Third, enlarged edition. Moscow, Politizdat, 1978, 759 pp.

This new edition of Leonid Brezhnev's book describes and analyzes the lofty, realistic and concrete aims of the Soviet Union and other socialist-community countries for world peace, freedom and independence for all peoples, social progress, democracy and socialism, and the tireless efforts to achieve them.

His speeches and articles from 1964 to 1978 reflect the main lines of the Soviet Union's foreign-policy activity, which are based on Leninist principles that are being creatively implemented in the present dynamic international situation.

Characterizing the Soviet Union's foreign policy, Leonid Brezhnev said that it 'is aimed to ensure favorable international conditions for building communism in the USSR, strengthening the positions of world socialism, supporting the peoples' struggle for national liberation and social progress, preventing aggressive wars and consistently implementing the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems' (p. 626). It goes without saying that the practical tasks put forward by the CPSU and the Soviet state tend to change depending on the concrete developments, but the main directions remain the same.

One of the most important of these is the strengthening and successful development of the socialist world. The formation of the world socialist system and of the community of fraternal countries and peoples based on a common ideological foundation, a common social system and vital interests and goals was 'a powerful accelerator of the historical progress inaugurated by the Great October Revolution' (p. 158). Imperialism is now confronted with a large family of

equal socialist countries on three continents, a factor whose importance tends steadily to grow. The book shows why the further strengthening and cohesion of the socialist community is such an important element of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. Brezhnev gives a clear picture of the all-round cooperation among the fraternal parties, state organs and production collectives, and sets forth the fundamental line that 'in its relations with the socialist countries, the CPSU has firmly adhered to this time-tested rule: to work in a spirit of genuine equality and concern for each other's successes, and to formulate decisions in the light not only of national, but also of international interests. Whatever the problems that may arise, it is our conviction that they must be tackled in a spirit of growing friendship, unanimity and cooperation' (p. 508). The author emphasizes that in shaping a type of society unprecedented in human history, in the course of constitutional construction, and with each country's political, economic and cultural development, common experience is accumulated, and this helps the communist and workers' parties to find optimal decisions in concrete national conditions for the most diverse and complicated problems in the light of socialist internationalism. Life shows that it is this approach to the various development problems that best meets the interests of each people and the requirements of the advance of the socialist community as a whole, and ensures the further strengthening of its international prestige and influence, so helping to strengthen world peace and security.

Considering the major features of our epoch, Brezhnev stresses the vast importance of the elimination of imperialism's colonial system in its classical forms and the rise to international activity of former colonies and semi-colonies, whose population totals more than two billion. It is characteristic that many young states now take a socialist orientation; they reject the capitalist way, which fails to ensure genuine economic emancipation, and which preserves and deepens social inequality and exploitive relations. Together with world socialism and the international communist and workers' movement, the national-liberation movement is a part of the overall revolutionary process of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale.

Brezhnev repeatedly emphasizes in all his works that the Soviet Union has steadily adhered to the Leninist principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries and peoples, and has displayed profound respect for their sacred right to choose their own way of development. But that does not mean that it is indifferent to the destiny of other nations. The CPSU and the Soviet state have always shown solidarity with the struggle against imperialism and its local reactionary allies. Brezhnev says: 'In the

developing countries, as everywhere else, we are with the forces of progress, democracy and national independence, and regard them as our friends and comrades in struggle' (p. 513). The Soviet Union welcomes the developing countries' growing role in world affairs, their weighty contribution to the improvement of the international climate, and the positive role of the non-aligned movement.

A reading of the book brings out the consistency, purposefulness and vigor of the CPSU and the Soviet state's policy on such burning issues as war and peace, which affect the destiny of the whole of mankind. Brezhnev has done much for the theoretical and political elaboration of these problems, and the formulation and implementation of the Soviet Union's present foreign-policy is intimately associated with his name. With respect to the capitalist zone of the world it means persistent struggle to implement the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence. In February 1976, Brezhnev said: 'Struggle to establish the principles of peaceful coexistence, for lasting peace, for a reduction and, over the long term, for a removal of the danger of another world war has been the main element of our policy with respect to the capitalist states' (p. 516).

Here we have a broad panorama of struggle for these goals. The most important positive changes in the international situation fall within the time-frame covered by the book, especially the 70s. They were the result of the Soviet Union's efforts in implementing the Peace Program put forward by the 24th Congress of the CPSU and then elaborated and organically continued in the decisions of the 25th Congress. The substance of these changes is the switch from the imperialist powers' cold-war policy to international détente. The author says: 'These changes are tangible and concrete. They consist in the recognition and consolidation in international documents of a kind of code of honest and fair relations among countries, which creates a legal and moral-political barrier in the way of those who like to engage in military gambles. They consist in the achievement of the first few, albeit modest, understandings, which block some avenues of the arms drive. They consist in a ramified network of agreements covering many fields of peaceful cooperation among states with different social systems' (p. 678).

It is in Europe, where good neighborliness and mutual understanding among nations have on the whole developed successfully, that the changes for the better are most visible. This is the result of many years of effort to convert Europe from a continent on which two world wars broke out into a continent of peace and cooperation. The 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which ended with the signing of the Final Act, was a major milestone along this way. The CPSU and the Soviet state, firmly adhering to the

Helsinki accords, the author emphasizes, attach much importance to strengthening diverse ties with all the European countries, big and small.

Elimination of the threat of another world war and strengthening of peace crucially depend on the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. In this area, important positive changes also took place in the early 70s. Unfortunately, some influential circles in the United States seek not only to frustrate any further development in this direction, but to invalidate what has already been achieved. Brezhnev's articles, speeches and statements brought together in this book clearly show that the USSR has consistently advocated the development of sound and mutually advantageous relations with the United States. But, the author emphasizes, such relations can rest only on the basis of equality and non-interference in each other's affairs, and with simultaneous efforts by both parties.

On the whole, substantial prerequisites have now been created to make the process of détente stable and irreversible. But, as Brezhnev says, present-day international relations are now 'at something like a crossroads, with alternative ways leading either to growing trust and cooperation, or to growing mutual fear, suspicion and stockpiling of weapons' (p. 679). Materialization of the détente, and especially its extension to the military sphere, would be of paramount importance in the present conditions. Brezhnev stresses: 'We are profoundly convinced that the task of arms limitation is the main one for the preservation of peace and the further development of the détente. If this insensate drive is not stopped, we shall once again find ourselves on the brink of the unpredictable, as in the cold-war years' (p. 645). Of course, this requires a reduction of armaments that does not upset the equilibrium of forces, and does not give any unilateral military advantages that would jeopardize the security of other countries.

It is common knowledge that the deepening and materialization of the détente and efforts for a radical advance in the matter of disarmament are being slowed down by the intensified activity of militaristic forces in the capitalist world and the feverish military preparations by the aggressive circles of imperialism behind a screen of loud and false talk about a 'growing Soviet military threat.' China's present leaders have joined these circles which have, judging by everything, decided to seek revenge for the political weakening of imperialism. In line with its policy of great-power chauvinism and hegemonism, the Peking leadership has been openly building up international tensions and has sought by every means to harm the socialist community and all the revolutionary forces of our day. In these conditions, the author emphasizes, it is vital resolutely to resist every attempt to undermine the process of détente, scrupulously to observe the principles of peaceful

coexistence, and to exert further efforts for peace and international cooperation. That is precisely the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. It expresses the sincere desire of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist-community countries and meets the vital interests of all progressive and peaceable forces.

The in-depth scientific analysis of pressing problems in international relations, the clear-cut and convincing substantiation of the principles and goals of Soviet foreign policy, the impassioned dedication to the ideals of peace and progress, the well-grounded arguments, and the lucid style, all of this makes Leonid Brezhnev's book invaluable in the struggle for strengthening the détente, for a world without wars, for socialism. It is sure to have a broad readership in many countries.

Y. Potyomkin, D.Sc. (Econ.)

LABOURITES, MONOPOLIES AND THE WORKING CLASS

Colin Crouch. *Class Conflict and the Industrial Relations Crisis.* Compromise and Corporatism in the Policies of the British State. London, Humanities Press, 1977. 302 pp.

Class Conflict is a study of the strategies pursued by alternating Conservative and Labour governments designed to keep labor and its aspirations within certain confines. What emerges, almost imperceptibly, is the changing role of the Trade Union Congress (TUC) and national unions, particularly of the leadership, from being representatives of the rank and file to that of labor consultants for the firms. The TUC and unions' potential for meaningful class actions is never completely written off by the author, the door is left ajar, but . . .

One should not assume that *Class Conflict* refers to class struggle. One can only detect it in trying to fathom what is behind and beneath all the problems of relations between the organized working class and employers, problems which the author refers to as 'dilemmas,' which the 'managerial' element is for ever trying to contain, simplify, systematize, legalize, institutionalize, heirarchize with the help of the state, in spite of the state or compelled by the state for the 'general good.'

Part II, titled *Incomes Policy,* and Part III, titled *Policies of Industrial Relations Reform* (chapters 4 to 10) are the most revealing and interesting sections of the book. By 'Incomes Policy' is meant the strategy pursued by monopoly capital and the state in limiting the total national wages fund. Three approaches stand out. First, to limit the wages fund within a set percentage of the GNP. Second, to

equalize wages between the various economic sectors so that gross discrepencies should not lead to a break-down of the national limit set for the wages fund. Third, to use the national average rise of labor productivity as the only possible avenue for an increase in wages.

By 'Policies of Industrial Relations Reform' is meant, in essence, the organizational and administrative set-up necessary to carry out the 'Incomes Policy.' The author traces developments from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s, from the 'Compromise' following World War II between the Labour government and the TUC,[1] right up to the Labour government 'Social Contract.'[2] The author enumerates and analyzes various government bills which were the finished product of government thinking on the role of labor, he examines the Industrial Relations Act, the various national commissions and councils on prices, productivity and incomes and draws a convincing picture of Whitehall's course, zig-zagged in its daily application but persistently leading to a hobbling of the trade union movement, of its incorporation into the apparatus of state monopoly capitalism. He does not say that this is a trend to the right. Instead, he refers to the growth of 'Corporatism' — 'statist,' 'voluntarist,' etc.

Although Colin Crouch deals primarily with the area of industrial relations he manages to avoid refering to monopoly capital and multinationals. Both are mentioned only obliquely at the beginning and end of the book.

The author brings out many semantic cover-ups: class contradictions become a dilemma; working class action is a countervailing force and capitalist society appears to be something composed of management,[3] subordinates and the state.

Despite the above, the study serves a valuable purpose in compiling in one book the major strategies pursued by British monopolies and the state in trying to keep the British working class 'in its place.'

Central to these strategies is the effort to eliminate all possible loopholes which trade unions have been able to take advantage of in collective bargaining over wages, conditions of work and fringe benefits even though they never challenged capitalism. The proposals for the elimination and solution to all these 'loopholes' includes tripartitism (government-management-labor) and turning the trade union leaders into representatives of the state and of the management.

Avoiding the Marxist concept of labor power as the source of all new values, the author is unable to give a convincing explanation of why 'management' has so much more difficulty with this one particular commodity — labor power than with any other commodity. This was best expressed, in typical ruling-class English, by Mr. A. Jones, Chairman of the National Board for Prices and Incomes, who said that the unions were 'intertwined with a whole set of emotions and

feelings about social justice in a way that the problem of business monopoly is not' (p. 149).

Capitalist theoreticians may hold forth about the irrelevance of Marxism-Leninism for 'industrial societies' but the monopolists themselves are proving that Marx was right, that the value of labor power is not determined by 'fairness,' 'justice' or 'comparability.'

The author, as the study reveals, is not unsympathetic to the problems faced by labor. He notes the dilemma of the Labour Party in carrying out its policy which finds embodiment in the 'Social Contract,' an English version of tri-partitism. 'For the Conservatives,' he points out, 'the crisis concerned the nature of the measures needed to reassert dominant interests. . . . For Labour, the conflict was between supporting dominant or subordinate interests' (p. 261).

The author reveals twenty years of conspiracy against labor in Britain. That is a positive contribution. However, the strategy for turning labor into a successful 'countervailing force' will have to be sought elsewhere.

Peter Boychuck

1. A policy pursued by the first postwar Labour government. It implied balancing the high hopes of labor following thc defeat of fascism and the demands of monopoly capital. This was possible for a limited time, as the author says: 'A short postwar period — full employment, industrial expansion and a moderate rate of state intervention combines to provide a relatively comfortable and non-conflictual context for industrial relations' (p. 272). — *P.B.*

2. 'Social Contract' refers to the agreement made between the Labour government and the trade unions. In exchange for an agreement to confine wage increases below the rate of inflation (which actually amounted to a reduction in real wages), the government undertook to create full employment, increase public expenditure on social services and control prices. In fact it was a fraud. While the workers' real wages were reduced the government failed to carry out its side of the bargain. Unemployment grew, prices continued to rise and there were actual cuts instead of increases in government spending on the social services, as the British Communist Party warned would happen. — *P.B.*

3. 'Management' is the term used by the author when speaking of huge corporations, as well as individual capitalist owners of the means of production. — *P.B.*

Truth vs. slander

Jose Miguel Varas
Chilean journalist

THE MASS MEDIA AND THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

The Chilean Communist Party's experience of developing the workers' press goes back a long way. It dates from 1912, when the party's founder, Luis Emilio Recabarren, became the first publisher of the workers' paper *Despertar de los Trabajadores* (Awakening of the Working People). In 1937 the Communist Party launched its first national daily *Frente popular* (People's Front). In 1940 this paper was replaced by the *Siglo* (Century), which right up to the time of the fascist putsch of September 11, 1973, was the Communist Party's central organ.

The experience has been rich and varied. But to evaluate the role of the media in the revolutionary process we shall try to examine the period when the Popular Unity government was in power, because this was the period when all that knowhow appeared in concentrated form.

During the 1970 election campaign and even in November of that year, when Salvador Allende became President of the republic, the balance of forces in the mass media was by no means in favor of Popular Unity. The total circulation of the four national dailies with a Popular Unity orientation was only 30 per cent of the total newspaper circulation in Santiago, and only about 20 per cent of the country's overall circulation. Popular Unity had practically no papers of its own in the provinces, and all the big-circulation weeklies belonged to right-wingers or Christian-Democrats.

Things were even worse in radio and television. Not one of the 168 private stations (there was no state broadcasting in Chile) belonged to the Popular Unity parties. In other words, these parties could at best count on the support of a few small stations, whose owners were sympathetic to the popular parties or to Salvador Allende as presidential candidate.

Admittedly, the Popular Unity parties were able to put across their views through many, including the most powerful stations by means of paid advertisements and hiring broadcasting time (for some important project or when they wanted to get a certain speech broadcast). Free access to the air, with no discrimination, was a democratic gain

that had been won only a few years before the victory of the Popular Front by steady pressure from the masses and parliamentary struggle. It was this struggle that resulted in several clauses on the mass media being written into the electoral law. One of them stated that radio stations that acknowledged the right to spread political propaganda could not reject the propaganda of any party.

The left-wing parties' persistent campaigning also had an impact on television. A law passed after nationwide debate — in university and public circles, and also in Parliament — granted the state and the universities a monopoly in the use of television. Private channels were abolished and the national TV network covered nearly the whole country. In addition there were four other channels, which belonged to the universities, including two based in the capital — the Chile University and Catholic University channels. The law also provided for equal participation of the various parties in political discussion programs. On the other hand, news bulletins conformed to the political orientation of those controlling the given channel. This meant that in 1970 only the information programs of Chile University were giving any favorable coverage to Popular Unity. This channel concentrated on programs that it produced itself. On all the others U.S. influence was predominant, thanks to the showing of movie serials dubbed into Spanish and taking up 70-80 per cent of TV time.

The North American AP and UPI press agencies had almost an absolute monopoly in the sphere of international information. Their influence reached even to some left-wing publications. Only the communists' newspaper *Siglo* made regular use of TASS, Prensa Latina, ADN and some other agencies of the socialist countries. Prensa Latina was also used by the evening paper *Ultima Hora,* which was socialist-oriented.

An important channel of imperialist information was commercial advertising, which provided the basis for funding the majority of periodicals, radio stations and television. The lion's share of advertising was controlled by the U.S. agencies operating in Chile.

The fact that Popular Unity won the 1970 presidential election despite the unfavorable media situation is no indication of the weakness or ineffectiveness of media political persuasion. The Popular Unity victory was due to a set of factors that may be outlined as follows:

First, the depth of the socio-political crisis and the developing revolutionary process.

Second, the extensive agitating and organizing by the Popular Unity parties during the election campaign, a campaign which lasted a whole year and which the leadership of Popular Unity rightly described as a mass struggle with all the various demands put forward

by the different sections of the population flowing into one stream and acquiring a political character and political form.

Third, it should be noted that during the election campaign there was no polarization of forces between the candidates from the Popular parties, on the one hand, and reaction, on the other, because there was always a third candidate, from the Christian-Democrats, who offered a program of progressive reforms that in its key aspects coincided with Salvador Allende's program.

Four, efficiency, militancy and unity of political orientation in using the media that were at the disposal of Popular Unity in this period also played their role.

The election victory and conquest of executive power gave the Popular parties extensive opportunities to develop their own information media. Above all, they gained access to the state information agencies. They also obtained a source of funds — state advertising, which had been used in the time of bourgeois governments for generous subsidizing of the reactionary media.

The situation in the press did not change very much, however. In 1972 Santiago had 11 national dailies; five of them supported the Popular Unity government and six were violently opposed to it. In the provinces the superiority of the opposition, which had gained the support of the Christian-Democrats, was even greater. The total circulation of opposition newspapers in the capital was 655,000, against a total of only 350,000 for Popular Unity.

The situation took a different turn on radio and television. During this period six radio stations in the capital supported the Popular Unity line. Three of these were of nationwide importance. There were also 22 radio stations in the provinces supporting the line. One of the capital's radio stations was now, for the first time, in the hands of the Communist Party, two belonged to the socialists and another, to the United Trade Union of the Working People of Chile.

The opposition, on the other hand, had seven radio stations in Santiago and 33 in the provinces, and their total transmitting power was more than double that of the Popular Unity stations. Dozens of local stations continued to support reaction.

Popular Unity was unable to establish full political control over national television, although it did have a fair amount of influence there. Most of the administration, technicians, artists and journalists were still Demochristians or belonged to the extreme right. It was impossible under law to dismiss them. So the leaders appointed to the Popular Unity government encountered fierce opposition at various levels when they tried to put across the government line. In addition the TV channels carrying the Catholic University transmissions very soon became a bastion of the reactionary forces. Only the Chile

University channel put out programs supporting the popular government.

It is true that after nationalization of the big Zig-Zag printing combine, which formed the basis for the Quimantu state publishing house, the Popular forces acquired a powerful means for distributing books at reasonable prices and on a scale hitherto unknown in Chile. There was a sudden profusion of political and satirical periodicals and special journals for women, children and young people, some of which became very popular. But the counter-revolution still maintained its advantage in the media. This was largely responsible for the further deterioration in the balance of forces, which ultimately brought about the defeat.

The subjective factors operated in the same direction. Whereas the reactionary camp had been demoralized and thrown into disarray by the 1970 victory of Popular Unity., with a corresponding effect on the media under its control, the financial and diplomatic measures taken by imperialism, and particularly the secret operations of the CIA, played the main role in the regrouping of the forces of the counter-revolutionary front. At the same time a new strategy was evolved. A united center, operating with the help of CIA specialists, was set up to control and coordinate all propaganda campaigns pursued by the reactionary media. The powerful Mercurio publishing association, which controlled big newspaper chains in key areas of the country, was directly financed by the CIA to the tune of one and a half billion dollars. The result was that the counter-revolutionary forces quickly became extremely efficient in operating the widespread network of powerful modern media at their disposal.

So the course of events ran counter to the aims of Popular Unity. Moreover, the relatively wide powers that the government had over the mass media did not lead to their effective and coordinated use. What was more, the unity that had existed during the first stage began to weaken. Petty-bourgeois revolutionvsm was largely to blame. It had a considerable influence on journalists and its negative tendencies were felt increasingly in the government and in the political coalition supporting it.

This phenomenon was not, of course, confined to the mass media. It was only a specific reflection of a more general problem. 'The revolution,' said Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the CPC, in his report to the August (1977) plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 'was propelled by forces differing in their social origins and ideology. This unique feature, which reflected the breadth of the alliance that had formed round the working class and was in itself a positive phenomenon, ultimately determined the diversity of assessments and positions in respect of many basic questions. This was not inevitable.

It stemmed from the insufficiency and intermittent character of working-class hegemony and consensus of views in this alliance.'*

Mistakes in a rightist direction, particularly the weakness in dealing with the abuses practised by the right-wing press and radio, also played a negative role in the process that led to the predominance of the reaction-controlled media. Both the Communist Party and the Socialist Party called frequently for energetic measures against the activities of reaction. In August 1972 the Communist Party's Political Commission sent President Allende a letter which stated: 'Recognition of the rights of the opposition cannot be taken to mean that we approve all excesses and crimes. Some of the opposition think they can do what they like with the law. There are radio stations and newspapers whose daily output consists of lies, insults, calumny, and false and panic-spreading reports. . . . We believe that appropriate legal measures . . . should be taken against the crimes. The people will never criticize the government for taking energetic measures against those who break the law, spread blatant lies, create a black market and indulge in smuggling and speculation on foodstuffs.'

But the process of change in the balance of forces against Popular Unity accelerated daily. It culminated in considerable sections of the intermediate strata of town and country going over to counter-revolutionary positions. Some sections of the working class, too, were paralyzed by the atmosphere of uncertainty, doubt and confusion. The main factor in all this was the skillfully orchestrated propaganda campaign mounted by the media under the control of imperialism and reaction.

**Boletin de Exterior del Partido Communista de Chile*, pp. 17-18.

Subscribe to
Communist Viewpoint

Single copy $1.00
1 year's subscription $5.00
U.S. and foreign $7.50

PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE
71 BATHURST STREET, THIRD FLOOR
TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5V 2P6

Steadfast service in the cause of peace and socialism

Fraternal parties congratulate *World Marxist Review (Problems of Peace and Socialism)* on its 20th anniversary.

A message of greetings to the Editorial Board and the Editorial Council of WMR from Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, says:

'On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and all the Soviet communists I congratulate you whole-heartedly on the 20th anniversary of the founding of the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism*.

'The journal has carried on a consistent struggle for the cause of peace and security of the nations. All these years, it has concentrated on the most important problems of our day, the new phenomena in social life, in the working-class and national-liberation movement, and in the development of the revolutionary struggle. It has undoubtedly done much for the creative elaboration of many of these problems on a Marxist-Leninist basis. It also has a big part to play in the struggle against anti-communism and diverse anti-Marxist views, which are increasingly becoming obstacles to the development of the revolutionary process.

'We believe that the journal has done and is doing very much useful work in the mutual exchange of experience of the highly diverse activity and struggle of the fraternal communist and workers' parties in their respective countries and in the international arena. It has always taken an active and militant stand for solidarity with the fighters against capitalism and reaction, and against imperialism, colonialism, racism and fascism.

'We in the Soviet Union are grateful to the journal for the friendly attention it has given to presenting our party's experience and the problems of communist construction in our country.

'By initiating theoretical conferences and other forms of contact among Marxists of various countries, the journal has greatly helped to develop cooperation, and exchange of experience and opinions be-

tween the communist and workers' parties, which is of such importance in the present conditions. The journal's international collective is a living epitome of the communists' joint and concerted work with complete observance of the principles of equality, independence and solidarity of the fraternal parties.

'I wish the information and theoretical journal of the communist and workers' parties further successes in spreading the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and in creatively elaborating major questions in the theory of scientific communism. May your journal continue to serve the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism by comradely, internationalist cooperation of the communist and workers' parties.'

In a message of greetings to WMR, Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and Chairman of the PRB State Council, says:

'The Bulgarian Communist Party, one of the founders of the journal, puts a high value on its role as a most authoritative tribune of communist truth. We are happy to see *WMR* make an important contribution to spreading the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, to the ever more successful elaboration of present-day problems in the international communist and working-class movement, to the exchange of valuable experience in building socialism and communism, and to the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and every other manifestation of reaction.'

'The day-to-day cooperation in *WMR* among communists from all continents,' *says a letter of greetings from Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the CP Czechoslovakia Central Committee and President of Czechoslovakia,* 'clearly shows that it is possible effectively to strengthen relations of international cooperation among all the fighters for peace, democracy, socialism and communism, while respecting and applying the principles of independence, equality of each Communist Party, while being aware of one's international duty and solidarity.

'WMR's stimulating articles have made it a source of inspiration for all the revolutionary forces and democratic movements carrying on a courageous struggle for their peoples' progressive and socialist future, and for unity of action against monopoly power and oppression. It is natural and logical, therefore, that the journal reflects and sums up above all the revolutionary experience and example in the struggle of the international working class, whose class and internationalist positions have been forged and tempered by Lenin and the triumphant Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet communists' rich and well-tested experience in building the new, socialist society,

and also the experience of other countries where socialism has been established.'

'We believe that the journal's contribution to a scientific analysis of the deep-going changes now taking place in the world is highly valuable,' *says a message of greetings from the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, signed by Erich Honecker, CC General Secretary and Chairman of the GDR Council of State.*

'The peoples' urge to make use of the improved conditions for peace and international security, for national independence and a life in human dignity has drawn mounting attacks by reactionary forces, which threaten the cause of peace and which are hostile to progress. We believe that exposure of the true aims of their schemes and mustering of the peoples for struggles against them is a primary task.

'As an international communist journal, *WMR* has an important position in the present-day revolutionary battles, in the fight against the policy and ideology of imperialism, and in spreading the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Its activity promotes collective and creative discussion of new theoretical and political questions in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.'

In its message of greetings, the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party expresses the hope that the journal will 'continue, in the light of the fraternal parties' recommendations, its activity which shows the way forward, and promote joint and effective action against diverse sorties and ideological attacks by imperialism. May the journal do even more in helping to turn into a common asset the rich experience of the communist and workers' parties and to encourage creative and comradely exchanges of opinions and discussions. May it promote joint action by the fraternal parties fighting for a common goal in various parts of the world, and for the establishment of a socialist and communist society, and their even closer cohesion under the banner of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.'

In a message of greetings, Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First Secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of Mongolia's People's Great Khural, says:

'The journal is an important element within the system of the world communist press, and it has become a genuine rostrum for the exchange of opinions and articles by prominent leaders of the communist movement and the peoples' revolutionary struggle, and has been helping to solve the cardinal problems of our day.

'We emphasize, in particular, that the journal's systematic presentation of questions of theory and practice in building the new society in the socialist countries and the rich experience of the fraternal parties and countries is of invaluable importance for our party and

people, for equipping communists and working people with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, and for the successful construction of socialism in the Mongolian People's Republic.'

A message of greetings from Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the PUWP Central Committee, says:

'By spreading the ideas of progress and freedom of the nations, your journal is highly important in extending the world anti-imperialist front and strengthening the cooperation of all its forces. The journal plays a highly significant role in promoting détente and in creating a climate of friendly cooperation in international relations. The items which appear on the pages of your monthly journal abound in the noble ideas of socialist humanism and serve to defend the rights of the peoples and human rights, and promote the struggle for genuine democracy. *WMR's* consistent and correct line and high journalistic level have won it well-merited prestige among the communist and workers' parties and all the forces of progress, democracy and peace. Your journal is highly appreciated by our party and broad public circles in Poland.'

The communist and workers' parties of the capitalist countries regard *WMR* as an important aide in their practical and theoretical activity, and a valuable rostrum for the exchange of experience and views.

Franz Muhri, Chairman, and Erwin Scharf, PB member, CC Secretary, CP Austria, say in their message of greetings:

'We Austrian communists put a high value on the Journal. It is an important instrument in our political and ideological struggle and in deepening our Marxist-Leninist knowledge, a publication which testifies to the vitality of Marxism-Leninism and its creative power. Its development over the past 20 years and its ever wider distribution throughout the world meet the vital need of the communist parties of the world for a joint rostrum for Marxist thought and research, a forum for the exchange of ideas, opinions and information.'

Josef Turf, Deputy Chairman, CP Belgium, stresses *WMR's* valuable assistance as a source of information. 'In view of the complexity of the world situation and the rapid developments, we hope that *WMR* will continue to promote the diverse forms of development of revolutionary forces all over the world.'

On behalf of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Canada, its General Secretary William Kashtan, writes:

'Today, with the mighty advances in growing unity of the forces of socialism, of national liberation and of the international working class; with imperialism in ever-deepening crisis; the ideological struggle against the obscurantist, splitting anti-Soviet and anti-communist

campaign of imperialism and its accomplices has assumed ever greater importance. Confident that *World Marxist Review* will continuously increase its Marxist-Leninist contributions to the ideological struggle, we wish to assure you of our party's fullest cooperation with the journal as we have done since its founding.'

A message of greetings from the CC Secretariat of the Communist Party of Denmark emphasizes:

'The journal's activity is in itself a striking expression of proletarian internationalism, of the communist parties' free and fruitful cooperation in fulfilling common tasks on the basis of the well-tested principles of our movement.

'The Communist Party of Denmark wishes to express its high appreciation of the journal's work, because for the Danish communists the journal has been and remains an important means for strengthening ties with the international communist movement by gaining a knowledge of the activity and experience of the fraternal parties.'

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Finland in its message emphasizes that "during its 20 years, the journal has done very valuable work in spreading the experience of the communist parties, in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, in the field of information and analysis of the socialist countries' achievements, regularly describing the struggle of the communist parties and other progressive forces in various countries for strengthening the principles of peaceful coexistence, détente and disarmament.'

Herbert Mies, Chairman of the German Communist Party, writes:

'The journal has been firmly and irreplaceably established in the communist and anti-imperialist movement. By shedding light on questions which are central to the international class struggle and by carrying on a principled struggle with every brand of bourgeois ideology, with right and left opportunism, with anti-communism and its most pronounced form, anti-Sovietism, the journal has given members of our party great assistance and support.'

'The fact that in this period the number of national editions has increased from 22 to 57, and that the journal is now read in 145 countries, is graphic testimony to the work of the staff and the ever widening interest in the world changing ideas of Marxism,' says *Gordon McLennan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain*. He adds:

'I believe that *World Marxist Review* can play an important role in assisting the enrichment of the ideas and practice of scientific socialism. By exchanging experiences between parties, by examining in depth the new phenomena in the world, by promoting debate around all the big problems facing the revolutionary movement, the

journal can help forward the movement in all countries, and, in this process, reinforce international unity.'

A letter received from Athens says: 'The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece sets a high value in particular on the contributions made by the journal, *Problems of Peace and Socialism,* to the development of the spirit of internationalist cohesion of and solidarity among the fraternal communist and workers' parties and of devotion to the immortal principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology. It highly appreciates the important role the journal plays in every aspect of our struggle and activity and, especially, on the ideological front; it regards it as a powerful weapon in the hands of the communists and of all the progressive forces of our country.'

In their letter, Michael O'Riordan, General Secretary of the CP Ireland, and Andrew Barr, National Chairman of the party, emphasize that *World Marxist Review* 'in its role as journal of the communist and workers' parties of the world has supplied an essential platform to all parties seeking to build and strengthen the unity, theoretical clarity and effective activity of the world communist movement. It has also helped to develop and build communist and workers' parties in their individual countries through sharing common experiences on its pages.'

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel says in its message of greetings:

'During 20 years, since its foundation the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* has been defending the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the creative development of scientific socialism. Its devoted struggle against nationalism, opportunism, revisionism, dogmatism and anti-Sovietism constitute a source of inspiration to the revolutionary working-class movement and great help for the work and struggle of our Communist Party. The important task carried out by the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* in exchanging the experience of communist and workers' parties has helped our efforts to develop and advance the work of our Communist Party.

Giancarlo Pajetta, member of the CC Secretariat, Italian Communist Party, considers the results of the journal's activity over the past 20 years as a joint publication of the fraternal parties, and emphasizes in his message:

'This 20-year period has shown how complicated the work we undertook has been: there has been no lack of difficulties, but the results of the distribution in a large number of countries, and the possibility of acquiring new knowledge testify perhaps to a difficult but undoubtedly useful effort.'

Greetings to the journal have come from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan. Its message says:

'We wish *World Marxist Review* further development in conformity with its character as an international information journal, through which the communist and workers' parties of various countries working in diverse conditions exchange practical experience and theoretical achievements, and reciprocally and independently study them.'

A message from the Luxembourg communists, signed by Rene Urbany, Chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, says:

'We are sure that in view of the dynamic development of our revolutionary epoch, which constantly confronts the communists with new and complex problems, there will be a steadily growing need for the existence and further development of the joint theoretical and information publication.'

'As a young contingent of the international communist movement,' *says a letter from Anthony Vassallo, General Secretary of the CC of the CP Malta,* 'the Communist Party of Malta values highly the role *World Marxist Review* is called upon to play in exposing national and international exploitation and in providing the necessary objective and balanced ingredients in the world struggle for peace, détente, national liberation, social emancipation, against racism and for socialism.'

George E. Jackson, National Secretary of the New Zealand Socialist Unity Party, notes that '*World Marxist Review* has played and will continue to play an important part in the development of unity between all our parties.'

A cable addressed to the Editorial Board and the Editorial Council by Martin Gunnar Knutsen, Chairman of the Communist Party of Norway, says:

'The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Norway sends you its heartfelt congratulations on the 20th anniversary of the Journal and wishes it fresh successes in the struggle for peace, progress and socialism, for the unity of the world communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.'

Congratulating *World Marxist Review* on its anniversary, *Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party,* says that the journal 'truthfully informs its readers about the struggle of the working people and the peoples, and also extensively describes the activity of the communist and workers' parties, expressing constant solidarity with their struggle inspired by the principles of proletarian internationalism. The journal opposes any distortion of Marxism-Leninism and provides theoretical analyses of problems of the modern world on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.'

The International Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain sends congratulations to the journal on its 20th anniversary from Spanish communists and says that 'these have

been 20 years of great battles, in which the imperialist system has been dealt heavy blows.' The letter goes on:

'Observing the principles of non-interference, equality and mutual respect, we will be able to advance to a new type of relations which will enable us to ease and overcome our differences and disagreements, which today weaken our common struggle, and so help to intensify the national character of our parties. At the same time, we must strengthen our international solidarity in the struggle against imperialism, and for peace and social progress.'

'We completely agree with the principles for cooperation that were expressed in the Berlin Document of 1976 and with the political goals that were put forward at the Conference of the European Communist and Workers' Parties,' *says Lars Werner, Chairman of the Left Party — Communists of Sweden.* 'It is now extremely important that these goals are materialized and here *Problems of Peace and Socialism* has an important role to play.'

A message from the National Secretariat and Political Bureau of the Swiss Party of Labor conveys congratulations to the journal 'in connection with the work it has done over this period.' It goes on:

'We are sure that the journal, working on the decisions of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Berlin on June 29 and 30, 1976, will increasingly become a rostrum for discussions that will help to clarify the problems facing our parties and the peace movement.'

Henry Winston, National Chairman, and Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party USA, writes:

'Throughout these two decades which were crammed with events of world-changing import, it has conducted an unremitting struggle to strengthen the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and proletarian internationalism. We are particularly gratified to see the increased attention given in its pages to specific features of the class struggle in the capitalist world and to the exposure of capitalist reality. Of special value to our party are the journal's analyses and polemical articles against the exploiters' ideological weapons for perpetuating the subjugation of the working people.'

The fraternal parties of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America note the great importance of the journal for the activity of communists, revolutionary democrats and all progressive forces engaged in struggle against imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and local reaction.

In its letter on the journal's anniversary the Central Committee of the Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria emphasizes the significance of *World Marxist Review* for the national-liberation movement, above

all for the newly-independent states of socialist orientation, and notes that 'the journal has been illuminating the unexplored and difficult roads of the struggle waged by the revolutionary democrats and their allies, the communists. The numerous articles and materials of the seminars and colloquies on these problems have helped the communists and all revolutionary forces in these countries to clarify the prospects of their struggle in the face of insidious propaganda by imperialism and neo-colonialism.'

'As the Journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* marks its 20th anniversary,' *says Jeronimo Arnedo Alvares, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Argentina,* 'there is an ever greater deepening of class contradictions all over the world and in each capitalist country. We witness the development of the struggle of the masses for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The forces of imperialism, led by the multinational and above all U.S. corporations, seek to resolve their deep crisis by stepping up the arms drive and threatening to start local wars. These forces have dangerous plans for a return to the cold-war period, and seek to conceal the triumphant advance of existing socialism. In these conditions, the Journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* has an ever greater part to play and is becoming a weapon which all communists need.'

A message of greetings from the Brazilian communists, signed by Luis Carlos Prestes, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party, says:

'As a result of an inexorable growth of the strength of the working class and the influence of Marxism-Leninism on ever broader social sections new and serious problems inevitably arise, and the question of struggle for the unity of the international communist movement increasingly appears on the order of the day. This "disorder" stems from growth itself, and this further enhances the importance of the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* and its efforts aimed to help the revolutionary struggle of each people for social progress merge with the mighty world movement based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.'

The 13th Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela unanimously adopted a message of greetings to WMR, which says, in part:

'The CP Venezuela Central Committee pays tribute to this remarkable revolutionary publication. It is a great honor for our party that the journal has continued to be published in Venezuela and that its circulation has been growing. For our part, we shall make even greater efforts to circulate it among our people.'

The summary of messages, which are still coming in, will be continued in the next issue.

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, 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:

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.

DUTCH EDITION: Institut voor
marxistische vorming (IMAVO),
Stalingradlaan 18-20,
1000 Brussel, Belgique

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti
Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11,
00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

GERMAN EDITIONS:

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandels-
betrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig,
Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITIONS:

Stephanos N. Papayannis,
Menandrou 66, 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.

Empresa Editora e Importadora
C.A., Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador

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: Agence de
diffusion, 16616 Praha 6,
Thakurova 3, CSSR

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp khâu
sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi,
Vietnam